

Marija S. Terzić
THE NEW HISTORICIST PARALLELS OF *HAMLET*
AND *DEATH AND THE DERVISH*

BOOK SERIES

• POETIKA •

BOOK 16

Editor-in-chief

SVETLANA ŠEATOVIĆ, PhD

Reviewers

Professor ZORAN PAUNOVIĆ, PhD,
the full member of SASA, *Department of Language and Literature*,
full professor at Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade

SVETLANA ŠEATOVIĆ, PhD,
Poetics of Modern and Contemporary Serbian Literature
department head, Institute for Literature and Art, Belgrade.

JELENA JOVANOVIĆ, PhD,
Department for Serbian and Comparative Literature,
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš

MARIJA S. TERZIĆ

THE NEW HISTORICIST PARALLELS
OF *HAMLET* AND *DEATH*
AND THE DERVISH

INSTITUTE FOR LITERATURE AND ART
BELGRADE 2025

This book was written as the result of research in the department
Poetics of Modern and Contemporary Serbian Literature,
Institute for Literature and Art, Belgrade.

*In loving memory
of Bora and Rada Mosurović.*

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY NOTE	9
1. INTRODUCTION: NARROWING DOWN THE SCOPE OF THE TOPIC	11
1.2 NEW HISTORICIST PREMISES TO <i>HAMLET</i> AND <i>DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i>	40
1.3 NEW HISTORICISM: THE ROLE OF HISTORY	63
1.4 THE <i>HAMLET</i> AND <i>DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i> 'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: THE APPLICATION OF GREENBLATT'S SELF-FASHIONING.....	71
1.5 <i>THE NEW HISTORICIST INTERPRETATION OF POWER IN HAMLET AND DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i>	91
2. <i>HAMLET</i> AND <i>DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i> AS REVENGE TRAGEDIES: THE SITUATION AND THE ACT.....	107
2.1 THE MACHIAVELLIAN HERO IN <i>HAMLET</i> AND <i>DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i>	142
3. THE MASK AS <i>HAMLET</i> AND AHMED NURUDDIN'S WAY OF SOCIAL REPRESENTATION.....	173
3.1 MASKING: BETWEEN THE TRUTH AND AN ILLUSION.....	194
3.1.1 THE ROLE OF ACTING IN <i>HAMLET</i> : "THE MOUSETRAP"	205

4. SUBJECTIVITY AND IDENTITY IN <i>HAMLET</i> AND <i>DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i>	221
5. HAMLET AND AHMED NURUDDIN: THE TRAGIC HERO AND HIS SELF	255
6. THE FUNCTION OF INNER CONFLICT IN HAMLET AND AHMED NURUDDIN	277
7. DIONYSIAN AND APOLLONIAN ELEMENTS IN <i>HAMLET</i> AND <i>DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i>	341
8. THE ROLE OF KING HAMLET'S GHOST AND IS-HAQ, THE FUGITIVE, IN <i>HAMLET</i> AND <i>DEATH AND THE DERVISH</i>	365
9. HAMLET: MADNESS AS AN INSTRUMENT OF SUBVERSION	391
10. THE ESSENCE OF HAMLET'S REVENGE	421
11. NURUDDIN'S REVENGE	451
12. CONCLUSION	469
13. BIBLIOGRAPHY TRANSLATED IN ENGLISH.....	485
14. BIBLIOGRAPHY IN SERBIAN	503
15. INDEX OF NAMES.....	519




INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This book is amended and refined version of the doctoral dissertation *The Analysis of Subjects Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin through Nietzsche's Disguise Principle and the Use of Mask* defended in 2022. It is divided into 15 chapters, some of which represent a theoretical introduction to the topic, whereas others are devoted to the analysis of the aforementioned play and novel. Furthermore, it contains some of the author's modified and supplemented parts of previously published research papers listed in the "Bibliography" section.

Firstly, I would like to thank Svetlana Šeatović, PhD, the head of *the Department of Poetics of Modern and Contemporary Serbian Literature*, then to Bojan Jović, PhD, the director of Institute for Literature and Art in Belgrade.

I owe many thanks to the academician Zoran Paunović, PhD, who was my mentor during the preparation of my doctoral dissertation. I am grateful for their help, for the valuable advice and suggestions I received during the process of writing this book.



1. INTRODUCTION: NARROWING DOWN THE SCOPE OF THE TOPIC

This monographic research strives to examine the phenomenon of masking (disguising) founded on the principles tackled by the worldwide renowned philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. The vital purpose of putting the mask on is producing an illusion through behavior so as to protect the genuine self. The monograph argues both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are Nietzschean subjects, divided within themselves, torned by an inner conflict and the Althusserian ones, the ideologically fashioned subjects. Hence, there are contradictions between their being and their public persona, the mask itself, worn in front of other people as a means of reaching a goal whereas their being is their true self, who they in fact are.

According to Jovan Hristić, this constitutes

“[...] the basic and most important theme of Shakespeare’s tragedy: the topic of the ambiguity of human and human actions. A person is not only torn between opposites, but a human being combines those conflicted tendencies within oneself. As a result, it makes a person a contradictory being with two sides and two faces”¹ (Hristić in: *The Scene* 1967: 380).

¹ „[...] osnovnu i najvažniju temu Šekspirove tragedije: temu dvosmislenosti ljudske ličnosti i ljudskih postupaka. Čovek ne samo što se nalazi između suprotnosti, on u sebi spaja suprotnosti, i to ga čini protivrečnim bićem sa dve strane i dva lica” (Hristić u: *Scena* 1967: 380).

This motif will be researched through the analysis of two ideologically conditioned subjects. One of them is Hamlet, the Shakespeare's *Hamlet's* protagonist, and the other one is Ahmed Nuruddin, the main hero of Meša Selimović's *Death and the Dervish* in the light of the unity of the Apollonian and Dionysian principles within their beings with regard to the tragedy of revenge (revenge tragedy) that will be used as the research framework.

This monograph represents an attempt of New Historicism readings of the Shakespeare's play *Hamlet* and the famous Serbian novel *Death and the Dervish* authored by the Serbian writer of Muslim origin Mehmed Meša Selimović. This very notion introduces the topic of duality which is the gist of this book in the key of Nietzsche's masking principle. It coincides with the Jungian dividing of the Self on its antagonistic parts one of which is Persona whereas the other is the Shadow. With this in mind, we will be using this division applied to Meša Selimović's protagonist Ahmed Nuruddin. This is the topic further elaborated on in the Jasmina Ahmetagić essay "Private and public in Selimović's novels *Death and the Dervish* and *The Fortress*"².

Furthermore, this book compares and contrasts Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, the protagonists of two great literary works of two literatures, British and Serbian, will be striving to penetrate into their diversity. On the one hand, Harold Bloom notes that "all that matters is Hamlet's consciousness: endless, boundless and at war with itself"³ (Bloom in: Bloom (ed.) 2008: xii). As opposed to this is, at first, a literary character whose consciousness is painfully limited by his absolute dogmatic blindness to which he is utterly dedicated given being a dervish. He truly believes in the objectivity of the law, in the meaning of the principles, rules and regulations that are the

² Svi prevodi su ili komercijalni prevodi knjiga ili originalni prevodi na engleskom jeziku u zbornicima, časopisima, itd. ili ih je uradila sama autorka osim ukoliko nije drugačije naznačeno.

³ "All that matters is Hamlet's consciousness: infinite, unlimited, and at war with itself" (Bloom's *Shakespeare Through the Ages: Hamlet*, Edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom Sterling Professor of the Humanities Yale University 2008: xii;)

same for everyone and that must not be challenged, even when it comes to his own next of kin because that would betray his service to the principles that he puts above everything and everyone, including his birth family, brother, blood kinship on the basis of which, like Hamlet, he is obliged to sanctify the murder of his closest biological relative. His consciousness starts a fight against itself when Harun is killed, and he opts for revenge, at least in front of others, justifying it as fighting for justice.

Additionally, the monograph tackles the phenomenon of a moral duty in both the play and the novel, as well as rebellion and the acts of rebellion of the protagonists, and, lastly, the revenge aimed at against those in power representing the most influential decision-makers and political mechanism's gears. It is a reaction to a gross and cruel injustice on a personal level caused by the aforementioned authority figures resulting in them obtaining and keeping their political position thus ensuring power and influence. Unlike Nuruddin's, however, Hamlet's revenge bears the mark of moral superiority as it contains the statehood foundation whereas Nuruddin's is entirely marked by his dogmatic mindset even though it is also generated by the sense of biological and social duty. This is the main difference between the doom found in both characters.

Hamlet's revenge is not completely devastating, while Nuruddin's, however duty-oriented, undoubtedly is. Bearing this in mind, this book aims to portray in great detail why both of them seem to be revenge tragedy tragic heroes. But it will also advocate that they might not entirely be those types of characters despite these two literary pieces belonging to the revenge tragedy genre.

Both of these pieces of writing are immensely related to politics. Just like the plethora of literary texts, they tackle the topics such as political persecution, murder, political order and an eye for an eye principle. This conclusion can be made based on the fact that both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin eventually kill those who had killed or are responsible for having their next of kin killed first. Deaths are revenged by deaths of the killers and the victims are the members of their close family.

At the same time, the killings are politically motivated. It goes without saying that the phenomenon of political power is a large theme in *Hamlet* as well as in *Death and the Dervish*. That is the basis of our research. *Hamlet* and the Serbian novel resonate with the Grand Mechanisms analyzed in the chapter “Kings” of the book *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*⁴ by Jan Kott (Kott 1990: 17–69).

This book seeks to portray their mutual aspects, criteria and on what grounds both of them are considered a revenge tragedy, and how they are intertwined through the existence of the subject as a plurality that eventually shrinks to one element. They both depict protagonist as Althusser’s subjects. The tragic feature is analyzed on the basis of A.C. Bradley’s interpretation of Shakespearean tragedy and *Hamlet* and Hamlet, the play and as the character. This monograph dives into what is tragic in both writings and within both heroes’ mindsets and psychological composition, as well as whether and in what way both of the protagonists (do not) contribute to their own tragic end in terms of their relationship with the fate. Hamlet, the protagonist of the play, surrenders to it at the end. On the other hand, Ahmed Nuruddin tries to navigate it, which is very obvious during the course of his revenge in *Death and the Dervish*.

Moreover, this book provides the revenge tragedy genre development brief overview and its ancient roots. It will explain how Lucius Annaeus Seneca is tied to the Elizabethan dramatic tradition, tackles the role of the morality plays within this period of the English literature, and how the vice-related characters appearing in them can be related to the rulers in the two selected pieces of writing on the basis of the moral corruption and the wrongdoings of those in power.

This monograph places the emphasis on the phenomenon of the Machiavellian hero. Exploring the Niccolò Machiavelli’s political doctrine, the book points out similarities between Claudius and Aini-effendi, or the figure of the musellim in *Death and the Dervish*.

⁴ Kott, Jan, *Shakespeare Our Contemporaries* (srp. Jan Kot, *Šekspir naš savremenik*, Beograd: Sarajevo: Svjetlost, preveo Petar Vujičić, 1990).

As well as the figure of a ruler in the Middle Ages in England. Moreover, it will tackle a relationship between monarchs and history in the Renaissance texts and merging history and policy in those texts in the light of New Historicism, as politics is a key motive both in the play and the novel. With this in mind, it deserves to have our attention drawn to it. Additionally, we will analyse the relationship of fathers and sons in these two pieces of writing. Consequently, we will be able to compare and contrast those family relations and portray the closeness or the lack of it and how it influences the feelings and behavior of the most prominent male figures in the play and the novel that make the scientific corpus of this book.

The backbone of Shakespeare's play and the Serbian novel written by Meša Selimović is the murder of the member of the close family, which sheds light not only on the individual lives of their next of kin, but also on politics on a wider, social level which is the functioning of the society, its rulers as well as their subordinates in the context of the kasba in *Death and the Dervish* that is, the state in the *Hamlet* play. The thread that connects them is New Historicism, based on Stephen Greenblatt's understanding of it and his interest in the socio-historical-religious context of Shakespeare's age and its cultural aspects such as institutions and their role within the society, so richly depicted in the novel.

With regard to this, this monograph intends to investigate the cultural position of the Other in two contrasted pieces of writing. The theoretical frame of this point of view is a study of Stephen Greenblatt *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* as far as *Hamlet* is concerned. When it comes to the Serbian novel, professor Aleksandar Jerkov's text "Meša Selimović's Golden Book"⁵ will be used to show the different approach to the Other Stephen Greenblatt offers in his book. Given that both of them tackle the same phenomenon, we will try to compare and contrast their writings.

⁵ Јерков, Александар, „Златна књига Меше Селимовића” у: Меша Селимовић, *Дервиш и смрт, њиредио и њојовор најисао Александар Јерков*, НИН: Београд: 2004.

Moreover, the genesis of the revenge tragedy in Renaissance literature in England, as well as the sources that preceded today's *Hamlet*, including the ones originating from the other literary traditions as well as from the domestic one is what we should pay our attention to. Hence, this book provides the versions related to *Hamlet* written by some of the authors who influenced Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and the mark they left in the contemporary play. The authors we will rely on are Francois de Belfort, Saxo Grammaticus, and Thomas Kyd.

The book explores the connection between the private experience of a loss and the motives of the loss in two analyzed writings, that is the way in which the authors coped with the transformative moments in their lives representing the thematic thread of two pieces of writing forming the monograph corpus.

Next, what these two pieces of writing share is a relationship between the motives of crime and revenge present in both the play and the novel. The protagonists will be analyzed in the light of Hugo Klein's essay "What happens in "Hamlet"" published in *The Scene, Theatre Arts Review*. He claims Hamlet is "the avenger unequivocal with his own matter" (Klein in: *The Scene* 1967: 298), while, unlike, the first part of the novel, the dervish Ahmed Nuruddin is the avenger imbued with his own matter in its second part. Based on this insight, we could draw the contrasting parallel of *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish's* protagonists Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin: *The avenger (not) pregnant with his cause* (*Hamlet*, 2. 2. 552) Consequently, we will analyse the reasons behind these two types of behaviors of the main characters.

Eventually, the mutual motive in these two pieces of writing is a dire need of literary heroes, Nietzsche's subjects, for putting a mask on. The essence of Nietzsche's understanding of the subject rests on an inner conflict between how the subject behaves in front of others and who he really is. The mask denotes the difference between the essence, what is true and what is shown by them, for example on social occasions. It is a gap between their personal identities, or what they think and feel and their mask which is how they present themselves in the social context, i.e. their *Persona* as the separation of the individual

and the role falls under the category of crucial aspects of modernity according to Espen Hamer who is cited by Jasmina Ahmetagić in her essay “Private and Public in Selimovićs novels *Death and the Dervish* and *The Fortress*” (Espen Hamer in: Ahmetagić in: Palavestra (ed.) 2010: 145).

We can consider the mask in the light of binary oppositions. To be precise, we will look into Hamlet’s behavior as a prince, that is a ruler, a man in love, a grieving son, a (fake) lunatic and *who becomes an avenger more due to the externally imposed circumstances than to his own wishes*. This will be compared to Nuruddin’s behavior as a dervish, that is a priest, a high-ranked member of a society, a son, a failed lover, a brother without a brother and, lastly, *an avenger on purpose, directing his own revenge*. This is a major difference between the two of them.

In this monograph, Ahmed Nuruddin being the dervish will be analyzed as an (anti) Apollonian mask containing many elements of the Apollonian mask. However, what separates these two is the consciousness regarding it being an illusion. In order for him being the dervish to be the Apollonian mask, the dervish should have been aware of it being an illusion, but he is not until after his brother being murdered. That is why his mask is the anti-Apollonian one. If he had been aware of it not being genuine, it would then have been the Apollonian mask. Since he hadn’t been, it is the opposite of it. Hence, the anti-Apollonian one.

The mask hides and protects what is under the mask in situations that precede or are a consequence of truly seeing “[...] to the essence of things [...]”⁶ (Nietzsche 2003: 39). In the case of the dervish, his belonging to the Mevlevi dervish order and life in the tekke will be analyzed in the light of Nietzsche’s mask hiding a ‘private being’ (Bećanović-Nikolić 2013: 100). It will surface upon facing the boundary situation which is his brother’s death. In Hamlet’s case, however, that mask will be Dionysian. The emphasis will be placed on the feigned madness as a sign of overstepping psychological boundaries, and con-

⁶ [...] „bacilli pronicljiv pogled u suštinu stvari” [...] (Niče 2020: 43).

sequently, the (mis)use of affects for the purpose of exaggeration with the aim of subversive action against the political order represented by his step-father, Claudius, who is also the new, illegitimate ruler owing to having married Hamlet's mother, Gertrude.

Much like Hamlet, Ahmed Nuruddin is an idealist. He cannot accept reality as it deviates from the rigid concept of the religious dogma he is accustomed to. The dissonance of reality and the transcendental idealism he lives in causes the need to escape the reality inside his being, the hurt the reality bears such as his girlfriend marrying another man while he is on the battlefield and returning from the war, the constant necessity to remove himself from participating in it by taking refuge at a safe distance from the beastly face of reality on which the ugly features of death, hatred, betrayal, and love that never stopped hurting him are still so very alive and present regardless of the fact that it happened a long time ago. He is reminded of it at the beginning of the novel through meeting with another beautiful woman reminding him of his girlfriend and at the end, in the scene with a young man sent to him by his mother, Nuruddin's former lover.

He rejected love proudly and vainly since he was disappointed by the woman whom he used to love, who did not wait for him to get back from the war but got married to another man instead. He also dismissed the possibility for love embodied in her proposal to escape together (Selimović 2018a: 384). The resignation towards that and any other woman connects Ahmed Nuruddin and Hamlet, who is revolting with Ophelia's makeup because it reminds him of a female pretending which is aimed at his shameless mother.

Their behavior is the expression of indignation, "[...] against the injustice and cruel logic of political pragmatism [...]"⁷ (Vučković in: Delić (ed.) 2014: 521), which they experienced by facing the death of family members. Victims, however, are not only their deceased ones, but Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin as well, given being burdened with

⁷ Њихово понашање израз је револта „[...] против неправде и сурове логице политичког прагматизма [...]” (Вучковић у: Делић (пр.) 2014: 521).

the moral duty of revenge resulting in their own death as well. This duty implies what the two of them are the weakest at – acting on it. For this reason, *the Hamletism as a delayed action* (Klein 1964: 63) is a very important place in *Hamlet*, which is less present in the *Death and the Dervish*. Its more significant function is to highlight the differences, presumably one of the key ones, in the behaviors of the two protagonists.

Both of them are metaphorically woken up from their previous reflexive comfort and forced to dedicate themselves to acting in accordance with the new situation. The notion of murder prevents them from keeping their position between two (im)possible choices, two contrasting options that divide their Self since each requires the absolute subordination to their imperatives. This is the gist of Hamlet's and Ahmed Nuruddin's inner conflict. Given more than one choice and more than one way in which they can act according to their feelings, principles, wishes and beliefs, they are the embodiment of the Nietzsche's concept of subject (Đurić 1997: 95). By making a (non)conscious decision to opt for one of the two possibilities, they are reduced to a single entity (*Ibid*: 107). This is a new insight when compared to the author's doctoral dissertation.

Neither of them portrays any Machiavellian tendencies or traits at the beginning. The motivation of revenge is what puts two protagonists in the conflicting position. For Ahmed Nuruddin, the matter of revenge is a personal issue, motivated by a Dionysiac heated hatred towards those who are to be blamed for killing his innocent brother. Moreover, they brought his moral purity in which he invested his entire identity as the dervish in question prior to that moment. At the end of the novel, however, he is degraded as a human being by making a conscious identification with those he had hated the most after having found out about his brother's murder and especially facing musellim in the Kuyunjluk against whom he wanted to take revenge on. But, by doing so, he takes revenge on himself as well. His revenge is driven by hatred, *his personal tragic character flaw*.

For Hamlet, on the other hand, the revenge is not *entirely* a personal matter, but it has a statehood-related character. He did not

take revenge on Claudius just for killing his father and marrying his mother. The Prince took revenge on the decadent usurper who had disgraced Denmark and deprived it of its legitimate heir (Klein in: *The Scene* 1967: 298). That is why there is something sublime in his act, unlike in Nuruddin's, as well as in his death, unlike in Nuruddin's. Hamlet's tragic flaw is not the revenge which he had to carry out due to tradition but *persistently postponing acting on it*.

This is why, in the interspace of the essence and form, truth and illusion, what they really are and how they behave in social situations, that is the mask, primarily the Dionysian one, characterized by swirling passions and intense emotions, they are (not) revenge tragedy heroes.

There is an inner conflict in both protagonists. When it comes to Hamlet, it is a conflict rooted in the difference between the past version of himself, who was not (considered) crazy, and him in the present, who, in the court's opinion, is, in fact, (considered) insane. In addition, there is a conflict within himself between his masculine and social identity. In other words, he is torn between contradictory aspirations of Hamlet, the man and Hamlet, the ruler. Next, there is a conflict between Hamlet, the believer, to whom faith prohibits to commit a murder and Hamlet, the son, who should be obedient and revenge his father by committing it that is killing Claudius.

In Nuruddin's case, it is about the conflict between the dervish, the kadi, the believer and the man within himself. As a dervish, kadi and believer, he is subordinate to the law and obliged never to deviate in any way from *the Koran*, which determines what is common in a superior position compared to the personal and individual, what he must do as a man, a son, a brother on the basis of humanity and *the biological imperative* (Ivanov 2017: 384).

Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are beings within whom "[...] the conflict of two worlds, two truths and two forms of moral behavior"⁸ (Kovač 1975: 55) fight for dominance and seek loyalty to themselves and their principles. Their "[...] personality and its actions

⁸ „[...] sukoba dvaju svetova, dviju istina i i dvaju oblika moralnog ponašanja" (Kovač 1975: 55).

are constantly in the conflict of contradictory motivations and determinations [...]”⁹ (*Ibid*). Their identity becomes divided into several components such as a private, social and mask. It is the way of their social presentation, as they represent in the collective, when they are in front of others or in society in general.

The matter of identity is considered in the key of social identity based on belonging to a certain collective, be it a group, order, family and social class. The mask is the way in which the two protagonists present themselves in the context of the social community which hides how they really feel and what they genuinely think.

The position of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin is the position of a man in time, the social community – the society to which he belongs, the position of a failed man, a man who renounces love and, consequently, rejects the meaning of existence, which is why he failed, the position of a high-ranking member of the system, “[...] the “sheikh”, or head of a religious community”¹⁰ (Cooper, Jr. in: Selimović 2018a: 8) obliged to bow his head in the name of ideology the position of the idealist in the world of cruel utilitarianism, the position of the intellectual in the world of political cruelty and, finally, the position of man facing death.

In such a system in which one man or a few of them decide on life and death, it is the position of a powerless man in front of a society as a whole in which those in power are ready to do everything it takes to protect their personal interests, which they will defend at all costs, even if it takes sacrificing an innocent man. It is a system that imposes political practice through its institutions and accompanying ideology that comes down to the binary opposition of domination: subversion, which is one of the most interesting relationships New Historicism deals with. The political systems in question in this monograph are tyrannical, authoritarian and absolutist.

⁹ „[...] ličnost i njeni postupci nalaze se neprekidno u sprepu oprečnih motivacija i određenja [...]” (*Ibid*).

¹⁰ „[...] šejh ili glava verske zajednice” (Cooper, Jr. in: Selimović 2018a: 8).

Such a system is ruled by the Machiavellian heroes whose hypocrisy and humiliating indifference and immorality can be explained in a meaningless conversation with obvious superiority rooted in knowing more than those they talk to. We see that in *Death and the Dervish* in the scenes in which the dervish goes to those in power to ask what his brother did and why he is imprisoned. We also notice this when Gertrude and Claudius criticize Hamlet for suffering too much while mourning his father, whom Claudius had killed earlier, before the play even starts. However, Hamlet does not know that yet at that moment.

Those scenes portray two kinds of relationships. First, the relationship of a man towards a member of his family who has passed away or who thinks he is imprisoned in a fortress, and the relationship of a political authority who hides behind his title. But since they are not conducted at the same level of consciousness, those conversations are meaningless (Petrović 1981: 39). And that shows the meaninglessness of the position of man in a totalitarian society because the only language that such societies speak, and are capable of understanding, is the language of raw violence and repression (*Ibid.*). It is a language that neither Hamlet nor Ahmed Nuruddin speaks. In order to adapt to the rules of an environment that is not close to them in any way, they must first learn to behave in it. That is why they wear masks. The mask is the difference between their “*private being*”¹¹ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013:100) and their social representation as a means of protection from the hostile environment.

The purpose of the mask is to protect them in the community from which they are alienated, even physically distant, at the University, and in tekke in which the only thing that matters is the word of Allah. In this book, it is viewed as the external authority influencing Ahmed Nuruddin’s mindset and his behavior. Even in the second part of the novel, he claims that his revenge originates from this standpoint. The dervish’s mistake is that what he thought was also valid outside the space he is used to, which is the tekke, in the space which begins after the tekke threshold is crossed. But the murder of

¹¹ „[...] приватно биће” [...] (Бечановић-Николић 2013:100).

his brother proves him wrong. It is only then that he starts realising that his founding premise, according to which the government is there to exercise the law, is not true. The power is there to protect its own interests and remove anyone jeopardizing it. In *Death and the Dervish*, Harun is the collateral damage of such an utilitarian approach. In *Hamlet*, Hamlet himself is the only threat to Claudius when it comes to benefiting from the fratricide he had committed including ruling the state, marrying the women he wants, obtaining the throne and the status he earns as a ruler.

A couple of sets of requirements of Nuruddin's awareness, his inherent one and the one he as the dervish acquires, adopts and internalizes as his own create the inner conflict, the dilemma embedded in Hamlet's doubt, "to be, or not to be: [...]"¹² (Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 3, I, line 56) life and death, obey or not to obey the ghost we find in the in the scenes with Is-haq in the Serbian novel as in those scenes the man and the dervish fight for supremacy. This is obvious in his attitude portrayed when Ahmed Nuruddin goes to meet the rulers hoping secretly that the meeting will not be held after all, although he knows that his fraternal and family duty require him to ask for Harun.

This book explores *the internal antinomy* (Ivanov 2017: 380) of the literary characters Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, their internal doubling of the Self due to the Nietzschean multiplicity of consciousness and will (Đurić 1997: 97) because

"this game of self-splitting is only possible in the conditions of an internal antinomy, [...] the searching for oneself game, the self-stalking, self-withdrawing, the vivid feeling of one's inner wanderings and meeting oneself, almost sensing one's dead-end roads and unexplored secret chambers of the soul-related labyrinth"¹³ (Ivanov 2017: 380).

¹² „Бити ил' не бити? [...]" (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 64)

¹³ „[...] игра трагања за самим собом, самоухођења, самоузвицања, живо осећање својих унутрашњих лутања и сусрета са самим собом, готово чулно виђење безизлазних путева и неистраживих тајних одаја дувеног лавиринта" (Иванов 2017: 380).

Both of them *are condemned by the truth*¹⁴ (Selimović 2018a: 106) obliging them to act, even when they would rather not do so. The moment of the mufti's and the dervish's meeting is metaphorically represented by an interrupted game of chess perhaps an already finished one. This detail can be interpreted as the government playing with those making a plea to them. They end the party when it best serves their agenda on purpose thus pulling the rank.

They are the heroes of a revenge tragedy because the key motive of both pieces of writing is the revenge. The accompanying motif is hesitation. For instance, Hamlet's endlessly contemplate two conflicting possibilities. He is ethically neutral. Nuruddin's dervish passivity, which, being grounded in his idea of his own service to "the Islamist dogma"¹⁵ (Petrović 1981: 42), prevents him from fighting for his brother. He convinces himself and others to fight for the principle, which he is proud of, because for him it is the essence of the dervish calling, the fascination with the common and the collective. What he does not admit to himself is that this is his way of escaping from himself by escaping from the personal.

Ahmed Nuruddin will die a hostage to his own demonic passion of hatred, and Hamlet dies having freed Denmark from a decadent ruler thus giving it a bright future by leaving it in the hands of Fortinbras, a man suitable to be king. Because of this difference, the two of them, the failed Hamlet and the failed Ahmed Nuruddin, are (neither) the tragic heroes of the revenge tragedy. Applied to Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, these two contradictory principles, Apollonian and Dionysian, build their personal tragedy because, according to Ivanov,

"Apollonian – the forming, connecting and centripetal elements of personal predispositions and compositional influences were necessary to Nietzsche's genius as borders, to frame the boundlessness of music, acquittal and centrifugal Dionysuses. However, the dualism

¹⁴ „[...] осуђен сам истином” (Селимовић 2004: 103).

¹⁵ „islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

of his gifts, or, according to himself, his „virtues”, had to take them to mutual conflict and condition their fateful internal racing”¹⁶ (Ivanov 2017: 380).

In case of Hamlet, his revenge is full of the Apollonian light embodied in his statesman-like behavior overcoming his personal vengefulness. This makes his revenge, however unconvincing it might be, an act of a dignified ruler. His reconciliation testifies to the harmony of these two opposing principles. In Nuruddin’s case, his hatred fueled his vengefulness, which he conducted to heal his personal injury, or, more precisely, him being and feeling offended. The tragic dimension overwhelmed sobriety because there was not sobriety in him from the very beginning.

Hamlet and *Death and the Dervish* are the pieces of writing tackling the idealist’s disorientation in the reality of political utilitarianism perpetuated by his Machiavellian-minded executors. The main feature of such political practice is interest. Being ready to do anything for the sake of one’s own goal is the credo of the rulers in both parts, backed up by a powerful but inhuman system of government. Idealism has no place here because the naivety and moral purity on which it is based is not possible within the framework of totalitarian societies ruled by Claudius, Aini-effendi, musellim, mufti, Piri-Voivode and vali. It is a world where Hamlet, Harun and Nuruddin are defeated as moral idealists. And, even more, as beings of emotions. Both writings depict the tragedy of “[...] consciousness caught in the focus of an internal subjective drama”¹⁷ (Vučković in: Delić (ed.) 2014: 522).

¹⁶ „аполонски – формирајући, повезујући и центрипетални елементи личних предиспозиција и спољашњих утицаја били су неопходни Ничеовом генију као границе, да би уоквирили безграничност музике, ослобађајуће и центрифугалне Дионисове стихије. Међутим, дуализам његових дарова, или, како би он сам рекао, његових „врлина”, морао их је одвести до узајамног сукоба и условити њихов судбоносни унутрашњи расцеп” (Иванов 2017: 380).

¹⁷ Оба дела приказују трагику „[...] свести ухваћене у жижи унутрашње субјективне драме” (Вучковић у: Делић (пр.) 2014: 522).

The collision of two realities, the Hamlet's and Nuruddin's inner one and Machiavellian – marked physical reality changes their emotional, psychological and moral structure through a process of metamorphosis leading them to revenge. Nuruddin opts for revenge out of hatred, whereas Hamlet does that out of the statesman's need to free his country from the Machiavellian who usurped it. Revenge leads both of them to tragedy, but Hamlet's, unlike Nuruddin's, is not absolute. The main problem faced by both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin is (not) crossing the line.

In order for the border to kept on the safe distance, in addition to internal will and strength, one of the main factors is finding meaning. That is why "[...], Shakespeare tried to portray us how to Hamlet, even more than gross, nothing but meaning is missing for action"¹⁸ (Koljevic 1981: 175). Finding them in love did not go for their hand, they became alienated from members of their family, and to the end of the other faithful detention each in their own fortress, Hamlet to their statesman role, and Ahmed Nuruddin in the roles of the dervish and the kadi.

On the universal level, if the primordial meaning is found, the one leading a man to Apollonian sublimity, he then has a longer way to go to cross the line, which gives him more room to maneuver to keep a safe distance from the part of himself, symbolized by Dionysus. In every person, he implies tragedy embodied in an altered state of consciousness, where meaning cannot reach due to exceeding one's own emotional and affective capacities. The higher a man rises, but only in a way that truly fulfills him, the further he will move away from the dangerous border. In Hamlet, the dangerous line has not been crossed, although it seems that it has been, because in his "madness" there is an Apollonian element of sobriety. He rules his madness, not the other way around.

However, if a man rises in the Apollonian heights, and, if he does that even with his whole heart, like Ahmed Nuruddin, but owing to

¹⁸ „[...] Шекспир се потрудио да нам покаже како Хамлету, још више него Бруту, ништа друго осим смисла не недостаје за акцију” (Кољевић 1981: 175).

certain circumstances such as losing a beloved woman, to which he responds by becoming the dervish, he does that out of spite, because he is hurt as opposed to truly feeling the need to do so, then he can approach a dangerous situation such as in case of the change of the circumstances, e.g. the death of his brother. If so, he might fall, but not on the border but in the boiling destruction such as hatred in which everything will eventually burn until this flame gets drowned in the water. This is a sad story of a man who failed at being a human being, whose life has lost its meaning by letting love, the golden bird of happiness.

The meaning of Hamlet's suffering is given by statesmanship because he removed the malignancy from the organism of the suffering body of his state. This is discussed in the essay "Hamlet: The Analogy of Action" by Francis Fergusson in *The Scene*, Theatre Arts Review (Fergusson in: *The Scene* 1967: 337–352). Hamlet is, in this way, a healer. On the other hand, he too has lost meaning, Ophelia and love, which makes him akin to Ahmed Nuruddin

Nuruddin's state of intoxication by the religious doctrine was a surrogate of the existing world with whom the dervish did not want anything, an illusion that was destroyed by the death, by the sobering up of Ahmed Nuruddin caused by his brother's death, which he experienced as an injustice caused not just to Ahmed Nuruddin personally, the epigon of the ruling government.

Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin "[...] have truly seen to the essence of things [...]"¹⁹ (Nietzsche 2003: 39) leading to a Dionysian crossing the boundaries on their part:

"[...] the living forces' polarities are resolved in liberating terrors. In this case, what is essential spills over the phenomena boundaries. The god, which starts dancing in the womb of a divided non-being here breaks through its boundaries by growing in it. [...]. Inspired by Dionysian drunkenness, Nietzsche was aware that (as he did not want anything less than that) our heart must change, some deep change must take place inside us, some transformation of the entire soul-related structure

¹⁹ „[...] bacila pronikljiv pogled u suštinu stvari [...]" (Niče 2020: 43).

for the purpose of the earthly character enlightenment [...]”²⁰ (Ivanov 2017: 381–383).

In case of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, this type of transformation is noticeable in the form of madness and hatred, but also in the way in which their being is changing. Their transformation takes place in opposite directions. At first, Nuruddin appears as a passive man grounded in his belief in God and serving to it as the dervish. Eventually, owing to the course of tragic events, he becomes an avenger, whereas Hamlet becomes passive after having completed the revenge that had been imposed on him, the way he was prior to the chain of events forcing him to act. Becoming aware of the situation and circumstances significantly contributed to their inner change.

Hamlet’s and Ahmed Nuruddin’s gaining awareness regarding the other world existing outside the one they believed in before he has “[...] truly seen to the essence of things [...]”²¹ (Nietzsche 2003: 39) shaking their faith in the existence of reality in which they had believed. Their root were severely shaken by the boundary situation which is the tragic death of the family member upon which they realized and acknowledged the existence of the another, horrifying world full of primordial moral evil embodied in the highest political structures striving to preserve their position no matter what. This entails the matter of both morality and protagonists’ obvious ethical neutrality under new circumstances.

The social context is an important dimension of Nietzsche’s masking/disguising principle as the subject has the need to distance

²⁰ „У овом патосу богообухватања, поларитети живих сила разрешавају се у ослобађајућим ужасима. Овде се сушто прелива преко границе појава. Овде бог, заигравши у уторби раздељеног небића, својим нарастањем у њему пробија његове границе. [...]. Надахнут дионизијским пијанством, Ниче је био свестан да за просветљење земаљског лика (јер ништа мање није хтео) наше срце мора да се измени, да унутар нас мора да се догоди нека дубока промена, неки преображај целокупног душевног склопа [...]” (Иванов 2017: 376–383)

²¹ „oboјica su bacila pronicljiv pogled u suštinu stvari” (Niče 2020: 43).

himself thus enhancing his position in the threatening surroundings by distancing himself. He wants to both remove himself from that space and to achieve his goal. Hamlet aims to provide himself with a valid justification for what he, heavily influenced by Cristian moral norms, believes to be an inappropriate behaviour. The place where that kind of behavior should take place is the court, which is, by definition, the heart of the political power. Self-fashioning of identity depends immensely on the institutions deciding what behavior is desirable and what is inexcusable. For example, the rebellion against the ruler and his God-given authority is absolutely prohibited.

Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are very contemplative heroes whose reflection occupies an important place in their understanding of the world. This book wants to explore the reasons why there is an inner conflict within the protagonists between their own opinion and what is the voice of another structure or authority embedded in our very core, which happens to be the source of our own awareness stemming from the outside of our being. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are the victims of the authority and the tradition of the society and temporal context they live in, in which social circumstances play a crucial role in (self-) fashioning of their identity.

The aforementioned source of consciousness until Harun's murder for Ahmed Nuruddin is "the Islamist dogma"²² (Petrović 1981: 42). Just like any other, it implies absolute belonging and the radical renunciation of the world, while medieval, Christian understanding of suicide plays a major role in Hamlet's hesitation. "The medieval view of suicide as a sinful and punishable act is expressed in [...] Hamlet's complaint that God has given a law according to which man has no right to kill himself"²³ (Milošević in: Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, trans. Simić and Pandurović, 1966: 10–11). Throughout the play, Hamlet regrets this.

²² „islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

²³ „Srednjovekovno gledište o samoubistvu kao grešnom i kažnjivom aktu dolazi do izraza u onoj [...] Hamletovoj žalbi što je bog dao zakon po kome čovek nema prava da dignu ruku na sebe” (Milošević y: Šekspir, *Hamlet*, prev. Simić i Pandurović, 1966: 10–11).

On the other hand, Ahmed Nuruddin considers the law fascinating. His upbringing rooted in him a reflexive reaction to what is considered generally and commonly accepted. What signifies his submission is complying with what the majority adheres to. The act of surrendering one's will is not simply a submission to something arising from the belief a moral act is embodied in the act of that surrender. If the subject of the moral component as the basis of submission, it becomes devoid of significance. A mental framework functioning as a main condition for mental clarity is, therefore, necessary (Petrović 1981: 27).

Any individual's aspiration is to harmonize with what is considered common, that is, to comply with the law. The comprehensive sin draws an individual away from the life which considers the law the supreme power instance within a society. Achieving harmony with what is permanent is the human existence unchangeable purpose. Are there bigger virtues from helping one's brother who is in trouble thus meeting both human and divine orders? On the other hand, helping his brother who brought him to difficulties means confrontation with the law. Hence, for the law to be obeyed, it must also be disputed (*Ibid.*).

To stay alive or kill oneself is the core of Hamlet's doubt. In the *Death and the Dervish*, it is mostly present in his pondering the situation in which Is-haq appears. He is constantly debating what he should do as a man contrasted to what his duty is as a dervish and vice versa. Hamlet's doubt presents the oscillation between two opposing extremes, such as Nuruddin's weighing for and against helping the fugitive, that is, his brother at that moment while he thought Harun was still alive. The inability to decide for either of the two possible options creates an inner conflict within the two protagonists.

The monograph draws attention to two tragic heroes who are the bearers of the inner plurality arising as a result of the plurality within oneself in the light of consciousness and will (Đurić 1997: 96–97). Their plurality leads to an inner conflict within the two protagonists due to their contradiction. Each of these identities, namely, is based on certain principles that are opposite to each other. The mutual exclusivity of the principles causes the inner conflict of the two characters. Their contradiction in the

consciousness of the protagonists causes Hamlet's and Nuruddin's split, which makes it difficult for them to ethically determine themselves and (self-)affirm. This contributes to their neutral position which is always between one or the other choice instead of opting for either of them.

Nietzsche tackles the phenomenon of inner plurality, the multiplicity of consciousness on one hand and the will, on the other hand. Human identity is based on the consciousness. Opposing identities entail a myriad of conflicting principles within subjects thus causing an inner conflict. Interpreters "in this diversity, in that chaos, notice two plans, the voices of heroes and the narrator, consciousness and subconscious, to put it simply, dualism"²⁴ (*Ibid.*). Within both protagonists, it is related to the "[...] deep, inner division of the self"²⁵ (Vattimo 2011: 108), the polarity existing between one's own and voice of the Other's conscience, that is external and externally imposed (Bećanović-Nikolić 2007: 312).

It represents an authority such as religion, politics, ideology, or any other collective matrix including morality, which is the case in the *Death and the Dervish* given that

"[...] Nuruddin's moral viewpoint has an authoritarian character. The source of his opinion about the world does not originate from his own core values, but from a source existing elsewhere, outside of himself. He simply complies with its rules"²⁶ (Petrović 1982: 49).

Upon facing his brother being arrested and meeting Is-haq, the duality within dervish's being emerges.

The duality in these writings is also noticeable in the intertwining of two worlds, one of which is the world of the deceased ones, communicating with Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, such as the King Hamlet, which literally speaks to his son, at the beginning of the play,

²⁴ „у тој разноврсности, у том нереду, примећују двострукости плана, гласова јунака и наратора, свести и подсвести, дуализам” (Исто).

²⁵ „[...] korenito samorazdeljivanje Ja” (Vattimo 2011: 108).

²⁶ „Nurudinovo moralno stanovište ima autoritarni karakter. Izvorište njegovog prosuđivanja sveta nije u njemu samom no je izvan njega. On mu se samo priklanja” (Petrović 1981: 49).

imposing on him the obligatory task, which is the revenge, for him to complete, and Harun, whom or what he believes is his dead brother's bones Nuruddin buries "[...] next to the tekke wall [...]"²⁷ (Selimović 2018a: 266) aiming to remind him of his own moral duty to avenge his brother to revenge his brother's victimhood and to be, "[...] a vindication of my hatred"²⁸, (*Ibid.*) as he says in the second part of the novel, after organizing the burial of what should be his brother's remains. This portrays two worlds' interaction in the Serbian novel.

Furthermore, in the *Death and the Dervish* there is a figure, the fugitive named Is-haq, entailing both worlds with its mystical occurrence in the pitch-black night. This can be related to Hamlet's experience, which is the encounter with his late father's ghost. Is-haq is a fugitive, which is, as is the ghost of King Hamlet, Nuruddin's moral temptation requiring him to make a decision and break free so as to act, to choose the side instead of constantly debating whether he should behave as a dervish or as a brother.

This book aims to explore the motivation of the (in)action of the two protagonists in the light of the conflict that exists between their thoughts and actions. In the sense of the unity of thoughts and actions, thinking and action, hesitation and determination in execution, a man is the result of the mutual action of two phenomena. One is consciousness. The second is the will. Their conformity determines man as a willing, thinking and acting being. Their dissonance is a phenomenon we will examine using the examples of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin.

The reasons why the two heroes hesitate to act will be looked into by examining their subjective experiences in boundary situations, "[...] dramatic, boundary events, kicking the man from his routine [...]"²⁹, (Milosevic 1978: 167) they face for which they are neither guilty nor responsible. Their guilt lies in their (not) acting properly on it. King Hamlet and Harun are Hamlet's and Ahmed Nuruddin's closest male

²⁷ „[...] уз текијски зид [...]" (Селимовић 2004: 274).

²⁸ „[...] оправдање моје мржње" (Исто: 273).

²⁹ „[...] dramatična, granična zbivanja, koja čoveka izbacuju iz njegove svakodnevne kolotečine [...]" (Milošević 1978: 167).

relatives, a father and a brother, who were killed. In both cases, the death in question is the one of the closest members of the close family, both subjects are related to on the account of biological relationships, that is, by blood. Both of them, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, are obliged to revenge their loss.

These situations are the points after which the lives of the protagonists are no longer as they were, marked by intellectual work, ideals, and away from reality. Prior to those boundary situations, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin were only aware of the physical, tangible, sensory, material, concrete world. The moment of dealing with boundary situations for two protagonists is a moment of gaining tragic knowledge – “[...] The man in that knowledge seems as if, in fact, he just got awake. Because now he is face to face with boundary situations, full of unrest, making him moving on”³⁰ (Jaspers in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 234). According to Novica Milić, this is the “[...] Dionysian moment of sobering up – a moment of gaining insight in horror and meaninglessness”³¹ (Milić 2000: 133).

Their overall engagement was directed towards their personality enhancement, as well as philosophy, Koranic exegesis and a wide array of long-lasting principles and rules tradition and religion rest upon. Those should be adopted and not re-examined, thus making them a their social identity cornerstone. The identity in question is based on belonging to collective matrices such as family, state, army, religion, such as Christianity in Hamlet, as well as the feudalism, tradition, culture, morality.

As a consequence, by being fashioned in an ideological way through the influence of an external authority (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 312), a literary character became ideological conditioned, the product of external impacts of tradition, culture, morale, religion deeply rooted in their personality thus replacing the individuality as the personal identity foundation.

³⁰ „[...] čovek u tom znanju deluje kao da je, u stvari, tek postao budan. Jer sada je n licem u lice sa graničnim situacijama, pun nemira koji ga goni napred” (Jaspers u: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 234

³¹ „[...] dionisovski trenutak otrženjenja – čas uvida u užas i besmisao” (Milić 2000: 133).

The foundations these influences rest on include the worldpicture, the religious systems signifying the compass navigating the right direction based on choosing between right and wrong, by advocating what is right and what is wrong, good and evil. The politics and ideologies as a matrix of turning a man into the subject through the impact of institutions' authority overridden their personal voice. Therefore, the natural starting theoretical point of this monography is new historicism.

This book attempts to tackle the inner conflict emerged from the contradictions of multiple duality: the union of the Apollonian and the Dionysian the personal and the collective level, the self and the mask opposition in two tragic heroes. Being torn between one's own voice and the voice of an externally imposed authority in Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin is the combination of the Apollonian and the Dionysian in the two heroes, which is the source of tragedy within them. It is based on the conflict between measure and not having the sense of it, boundaries and their violation. It is an internal boundary between what is personal, what is the social identity of the protagonists and which parts are considered their masks.

While the protagonists' personal identity rests deeply buried in their self that it could no longer have been seen, not even below layers of these external authorities' influence, their personality seemed to be intact. But when the boundary situations have initiated issues that caused "the private being" (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 100) to a moral and emotional duel between monarchs, sheikh, brother and son, and when personal categories violently opposed the common and socially acceptable ones within two characters, a fierce inner conflict between their intense emotions, passions, feelings and affects on one hand and the rigid rules on the other. Thus, in the mind of a single person a plurality was born. That plurality is tragic to its very core because "the internal freedom and external necessity are two half of the tragic world"³² (Schlegel in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 75). *Death and the Dervish*

³² „unutrašnja sloboda i spoljašnja nužnost su dva pola tragičnog sveta” (Šlegel u: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 75

and *Hamlet's* protagonists are morally trapped and torn between these irreconcilable extremes. One is a firm believer, the other is not.

On that note, in order to portray the vital differences between Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, we will rely to August Wilhelm von Schlegel. He argues it is true that he is a prince with royal manners and a highly developed mind. He is honest, open and capable of noble ambition with the best sense of propriety, highest level to fervently applaud that excellence in other people. Something he himself lacks. He never completes tasks. He is not only driven to fabricate because of necessity. He is hypocritical and has a natural propensity for immoral behavior toward himself his absurd scheming is frequently just a front for his evil. lack of resolve: ideas as he states on another occasion which. own. But one part coward three parts wisdom. Primarily he has been criticized for his harshness in rejecting love of Ophelia whom he himself had loved and for his insensitivity to her death. He is too consumed by his own grief to have any. In addition to his apparent apathy his compassion for others allows us to survive by no means the extent of his inner disturbance. In contrast, we clearly see a malevolent glee in him after he has achieved his goal, eliminated his adversaries more by accident and necessity than by any other means rather than on his own merits to force him to take prompt and decisive action of bravery as he admits after Polonius is killed and with deference. To Guildenstern and Rosencrantz. Hamlet does not really believe in himself or in anything else from displays of religious assurance that he disregards. As long as he can see he believes in his father's ghost despite skeptics doubts it but as soon as its gone he sees it almost in the morning light. A lie. He has even descended to the level of saying that here is nothing good or awful but thinking makes it so the poet loses himself in this with him. Thoughts that are like labyrinths with no obvious beginning or end (August Wilhelm von Schlegel in: Bloom (ed.) 2008: 142–143).

Through facing the boundary situation, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin became the Nietzschean subjects, deeply divided, with a

few conflicting kinds of will and consciousness within himself that defines the personal identity of Hamlet and Nuruddin as being a son, and Nuruddin as being a son and a brother. Hamlet is also defined as a carrier of social identity of monarchy, he is the prince, whereas Nuruddin is the dervish, sheikh, the member of the political system, just like Hamlet. Their representation in the social context is the Nietzsche's mask. Both of them are, in addition to this, defined as men that are the representatives of the masculin discourse.

The aforementioned identities implying their respective consciousnesses and wills, and founded on different systems of values are mixed within the same being. their mutual conflict causes a contradiction in the two protagonists. Each of the irreconcilable contradictions demand from both of them an extreme loyalty. The attempt of both of them to simultaneously adhere to all those extremes and to be faithful to the identity of a son, brother, man, and ruler within themselves requires them to enter the arena with Machiavellian heroes hungry for power. The two heroes, in order to fight with themselves and others within themselves, but also with others in the society, poisoned and rotten as Claudius and the rulling cast in the Serbian novel camouflage themselves in the social environment. The mask is the way in which Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin present themselves in the social milieu surrounding them because otherwise they would not have been able to carry out the revenge in the first place.

Hamlet's madness and Nuruddin's being a dervish are masks. Hamlet's madness is far from genuine, he has total control over it, meaning he is not entirely overwhelmed and consumed by it, he is not lost in its web, unlike Ahmed Nuruddin, who is absolutely subordinated to his dervish-related social identity, a dervish title. During the conversation with musellim, however, it proved to be irrelevant. In the second part of the novel, his personal identity is grounded in hatred which turns out to be the main force of his revenge. Hamlet, too, takes revenge, but in a different way when compared to Ahmed Nuruddin.

The crucial differences between the two protagonists are the driving forces behind their motivation for conducting their revenge

and how fast they act on it. for Hamlet, in addition to fulfilling the task of the ghost of his father, it is also the act of liberating the state, and for Nuruddin, the revenge represents an expression of the highest degree of his hatred towards the killers of his brother. In order to carry it out, he adopts their means. That sealed his moral decline with a wax of Machiavellian dehumanization. It is quite a change from a God-obedient priest he used to be in the first part of the novel.

This book analyzes the metamorphosis of Hamlet and Nuruddin from the very beginning. At first, both of them are warriors, Hamlet is a swordsman while Ahmed Nuruddin was fighting in the war which was waged for Islam. Moreover, Hamlet is a student, Ahmed is the dervish, a Muslim priest, therefore an intellectual, both of them are sons of their fathers. Additionally, Ahmed is an older brother. Both of them are lovers up to some extent that were deprived of the love of a beloved woman. The only difference being that in Hamlet, she has the name. It's Ophelia. Then, Hamlet is starting to seem to be a disturbed mind. Nuruddin, on the other hand, fully identifies himself with his dervish function and title, prior to finding out his brother had been killed. Next, he becomes a kadi thus replacing the previous one, to whose death he contributed. In the end, he is the victim, as is Hamlet.

Since this book finds ideology as a common characteristic of the two pieces of writing, the motif of the two heroes as Althusserian subjects will run through it. These are subjects who are ideologically conditioned by institutions and under the influence of ideologically colored authorities whose voice they adopted while growing up thus having their personality fashioned in the given circumstances. The presence of the urge to perform certain "moral" actions in us is what is called the voice of conscience. For Nietzsche "[...] it is nothing but the presence in us of the authority of the community in which we live"³³ (Vattimo 2011: 104). The conflict that exists in the two protagonists is the one between the personal and the socially imposed and internal-

³³ „[...] to nije ništa drugo nego prisustvo u nama autorteta zajednice u kojoj živimo" (Vatimo 2011: 104).

ized as their own, which intrudes into their moral being and calls into question their ethical indeterminacy, and thus dims the confirmation of themselves as morally conscientious individuals.

Hamlet's and Ahmed Nuruddin's revenge was aimed at Machiavellian heroes, which are in both the play and the novel portrayed as the ruling villains. They are the representatives of worldly, judicial and spiritual authorities, musellim, kadi and mufti in the *Death and the Dervish*. In both writings, criminals are *machiavelistic* characters. Politics is the field of their action, the chessboard where the pawns that are regular, common, ordinary people are placed. Their destinies are in the hands of the rulers which make decisions not by the law, but on the basis of their own conviction, predominantly and more often than not in the light of their personal motifs and interests, as Claudius in Hamlet and musellim, kadi and mufti in *Death and the Dervish*.

In both writings, in the English/Shakespearian play and in the Serbian novel, the individual enters the conflict against a repressive regime, with the state, or at least with the part of the state, involving the ruling structures, the so-called "state ideological appliances"³⁴ (Althusser 2009: 26–34) and institutions whose task is to maintain the system in power by support the ideological matrix of the dominant class, which is most positioned within the system of state status hierarchy. It is about rulers, who bring and implement laws that serve their personal interests as opposed to the community and its members.

The irony of both pieces of writing is that the protagonists themselves belong to the layer against which they rebel thus personally witnessing the hypocrisy of the authorities. In other words, both depict the relationship between authority and subversion. Needless to say, the authority rests on repression. The cornerstone of repression is committing violence. It is a common theme layer both in the play and in the novel. What is more, committing violence is what their plots are all about. To begin with, the motif of a violent murder is what connects these two writings before any other parallels are noticed. They narrate

³⁴ „државне идеолошке апарате” (Althusser 2009: 26–34).

the story about the victim that is an innocent person killed by the corrupted power. Killings require vengeance. Hence, the revenge tragedy.

In case of Ahmed Nuruddin, there will come the time for transformation motivated by the dark side of man's being, the destructive passion of hatred, casting the shadow on what could very conditionally, be called aspiring to reaching the dervish-related correctness that was not based on a sincere need for devoting his life to serving the God and the religion, but the way in which Nuruddin watched his morally baffled reflection in the mirror of "Islamist doctrine" (Petrović 1981: 42) is why hatred the beginning of his dehumanization, his failing at being a dervish as being one entails moral purity and superiority. More importantly, that represents his defeat as a man. In Hamlet's case, it is a simulated madness. Nuruddin will eventually die because he allowed himself to be infinitely seduced by his personal hatred as he will get arrested and will be waiting to be killed in the prison. His magnificent revenge plan backfired.

Nuruddin's tragedy partially lies in the fact that his actions are not the ones of an injured man, a grieving brother, but of an insulted man whose brother's misfortune called into question the only thing he found in himself, his substance, meaning and purpose. It is his vocation. According to Popović,

"dervish is a man who thinks dogmatically, his mind is molded, regardless of personal honesty, and life sets traps for him and breaks the armor of his supposedly stable thinking and attitude towards the world"³⁵ (Popović 1988: 77–80).

It portrays the lack of his humanity.

It is the same lack of humanity Hamlet possess when killing Polonius. The trap that changes Nuruddin's life is the execution of revenge in order to settle for the death of his brother in the name of which he uses Machiavellian means.

³⁵ „Derviš je čovek koji misli dogmatski, ukalupljeno, bez obzira na lično poštenje, a život mu stavlja zamke i razbija oklop njegovog tobož stabilnog mišljenja i odnosa prema svetu” (Popović 1988: 77–80).

Finally, Jan Kott in the book *Shakespeare, our contemporary* says the following: "In Shakespeare's royal tragedies there is only hatred, lust and violence, there is only the Great Mechanism [...]"³⁶ (Kott 1990: 60). This monograph tries to deal with the motives of hatred and violence and the Grand Mechanism (*Ibid*: 52) in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* and as well as masks of hatred and madness.

In addition, this book aspires to withdraw the parallels between revenge in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* in terms of antagonistic engagement as well as to highlight the similarities and differences between them through the perspective of their (not) doing.

The aspect of doom that is common for both literary pieces is worth being mentioned. It is especially emphasized in the section dealing with the motive of revenge in the Serbian novel. The tragic dimension naturally builds on the disposition of protagonists due to the fight of different identity constructs within them. It resonates with the Nietzsche's plurality of subject philosophy.

1.2 NEW HISTORICIST PREMISES TO *HAMLET* AND *DEATH AND THE DERVISH*

New Historicism is the theoretical framework cornerstone i sve isto do kraja. It will be used as the foundation for the political aspects' interpretation this book provides not only in terms of themes and motives that can be compared and contrasted by drawing parallels and conclusions on the basis of their similarities and/or differences, but also in the light of cultural studies as this particular approach to literature allows less rigid points of view aiming at expressing more broadly the mutual connections between culture and society (Veeser in: *Dometi* 2002: 63) as the impact culture has on a single being is quite significant.

This is especially obvious when it comes to Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. The focal point of this comparison is religion or, rather, the

³⁶ „U Šekspirovim kraljevskim tragedijama postoje samo mržnja, požuda i nasilje, postoji samo Veliki Mehanizam [...]" (Kot 1990: 60).

dogmatic influence of religious matrix/matrices on the to protagonists' mindset and, consequently, behavior.

Vladislava Felbabov's essay in *Dometi* magazine bearing a simplified yet straightforward title "New Historicism", that was also edited by the aforementioned contributor to the magazine, tackles the New Historicism genesis, its crucial characteristics and most significant representatives, as well as why it differs from prior critical schools. Namely, its founder, Stephen Greenblatt became aware of the existence of a new direction of interpretation rejecting the principles that used to be used when analyzing literary and art. Instead, it provides us with a fresh, independent and original, comprehensive reading and understanding of the text. He was dissatisfied with the ways in which literary texts were tackled prior to that period, as exclusively aesthetic phenomena that are observed and experienced exclusively as aesthetic creations without any contact whatsoever with culture, that is, with the cultural production and writings it produced during the Elizabethan Renaissance. To put it in another words, the text was regarded completely isolated, without any relation with the cultural tradition, and equally reluctant to look for a mirror, the worldpicture, in which a large number of people believed when it comes to reading and interpreting a piece of writing (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 10).

The emergence of New Historicism in Great Britain and America was not overlooked by Stephen Greenblatt. For him and his fellow like-minded colleagues, pieces of writing are not and cannot be inseparable from culture. Quite the opposite, actually, they seem to be on a certain culture-oriented mission consisting of serving as a cultural training ground where cultural tendencies, whether it is about difficulties or desires or preoccupations, are adopted or not. For this reason, they thought that the best and most expedient way to assert such tendencies of the given era of the Renaissance in England, which are present in a piece of writing, is if it is not viewed narrowly, only as a text, but in a way that will more fully and deeply explain its meaning and be a reflection of all the elements contained in it, using the time

in which it was created. That time is, when it comes to literature, “[...] its historical context”³⁷ (*Ibid.*).

The function of adhering to this critical practice, then newly established, is that interpretive hubs will be linked to the then adversity related to history and culture. [...]. At that time, when the English was ruled by Elizabeth I followed by James I Stuart was the time of confusion in terms of the orders of collective cultural matrices and visions, concepts, templates, rituals, rites, manners that derived from them. These authors noticed. For them, these extremes had labels of dedication to the virtue of correctness, loyalty, obedience, obedience, loyalty, obituousness from one and a spronial effect, diversarian, destructive urge, undermining on the other. This is seen in the texts from that time (*Ibid.*: 8).

These two extremes have always been associated with rulers, decision-makers, influential politically powerful men who were at the top of the class ladder. Taking into account the social, and thus, inevitably, the political context, New Historicism provides an opportunity to observe the interaction of a piece of literary text with “[...] the complex structure of institutions, practices and beliefs that shaped the culture and society of the English Renaissance as a whole”³⁸ (*Ibid.*).

The essence of New Historicism is studying historical texts, both literary and non-literary, with reference to the sociocultural and historical context of their creation. For New Historians, history has an important place in the study of literary texts. It is important because the writings are “[...] constitutive parts of historical parts, not their reflex or mere image”³⁹ (Lešić 2003: 19).

New Historicism examines texts belonging to the past, regardless whether they are literary, i.e. literary and artistic, or non-literary. It does not concentrate exclusively on literary texts, though, nor does it

³⁷ „[...] njen istorijski kontekst” (Isto).

³⁸ „[...] složenom strukturom institucija, prakse i verovanja koji su oblikovali kulturu i društvo engleske renesanse u celini” (Isto.).

³⁹ „[...] konstitutivni djelovi istorijskih delova, a ne njihov refleks ili puka slika” (Lešić 2003: 19).

give them any kind of primacy over non-literary ones. To put it briefly, it tackles the texts belonging to that particular period in general. Additionally, it pays attention to both kinds of texts so that, based on their reading through the prism of the context and its relevance to the piece of writing in question, so that it would know the conditions that prevailed at the time and how they were incorporated into the text, that is, what we learn about them based on the text (Lešić 2003: 20).

“Attributing importance to all preserved texts belonging to the same epoch, they read both literary and non-literary texts side by side, equally carefully. At the same time, they do not consider literary texts to be primary (as the main subject of study), and non-literary texts to be secondary (as documents that shed light on literary texts), but treat both in the same way, as equal and equally relevant „textual traces“ which were left by the past and which, together, form that network of textuality (or “culture”) that we call “Renaissance” or “Classicism” or “Romanticism” etc.”⁴⁰ (*Ibid*: 20).

The supporters of New Historicism believe in an unbreakable and undeniable relationship between the circumstances in which the text originated and the text itself. They represent the point of view that history is not available to us in any other way except in the texts that survived to this day (*Ibid*: 19). Although it would be too easy to claim that the texts fully reflect the epoch of their creation, it can be argued that they represent valuable, although not fully authentic testimonies about the period when they were created. Therefore, all the text traces from that time available to us should be thoroughly read (*Ibid*: 23).

⁴⁰ „Pridajući istu važnost *svim* sačuvanim tekstovima izjednog vremena, oni čitaju uporedo, i podjednako pomno, i književne i neknjiževne tekstove. Pri tome oni ne smatraju da su književni tekstovi primarni (kao osnovni predmet izučavanja), a neknjiževni sekundarni (kao dokumenti koji osvjetljavaju književne tekstove), već i jedne i druge tretiraju na isti način, kao ravnopravne i podjednako relevantne „tekstualne tragove“ koje je ostavila prošlost i koji, zajedno, čine onu mrežu tekstualnosti (ili „kulturu“) koju nazivamo „renesansa“ ili „klasizam“, ili „romantizam“ i sl.” (Lešić 2003: 20)

The representatives of New Historicism want to tackle the way of life the texts describe. Hence, they examine non-literary texts such as “[...] legal, judicial and medical documents, court and social declarations, official reports from the conquest of overseas countries, marine diaries, ship logs personal letters, etc.”⁴¹ (*Ibid*: 25) that are historical documents. What we need to be aware of nowadays is the fact that we cannot look at the text as such, which entirely resonates with the circumstances given the influence history, ideology, understanding and way of thinking, as well as discursive practice. And the language itself does not provide us with absolutely clear insight into reality. For this reason, it should be considered in the light of the dominant socio-historical processes, turmoil and impacts that have texts, and not focusing exclusively on its content outside of its context (Lešić 2003: 26).

It is important to accentuate that New Historicism does not insist on the connection between text and history being one-sided in the sense that only history has impact on the text. It advocates the view that this connection is mutual, and that the text also influence history hand in hand with its other factors (*Ibid*: 19). New Historicism focuses on topics such as power, state, culture, ideology, but interprets them in a new way by analyzing them with reference to the context. New Historians expand the field of their own interest and action to non-literary texts (historical, political, economic, cultural, sociological) in order to gain knowledge about that time and its social, cultural, political and ideological constants that had to shape discourse, social practices, and even literature, as one of the forms of culture.

This method examines written texts more fully than some of previous methods. In response to a New criticism, which considers a text to be a separate entity that has nothing to do with the history or culture in which it was created (Felbabov in *Dometi* 2002: 7), nor with the author, and the poststructuralism that focuses only on the text in question (Lešić 2003: 17). New Historicism advocates that history and culture that existed

⁴¹ „[...] pravne, sudske i medicinske dokumente, dvorske i društvene proglase, zvanične izvještaje s osvajanja prekomorskih zemalja, brodske dnevničke, privatna pisma, itd.” (Исто: 25)

in the past occupies an important place, and that the writings are the exponents of those circumstances. Pieces of writing do not have to be only literary, because non-literary texts also testify about the cultural codes of a given historical period in which they arose (*Ibid*: 20).

On the other hand, New Historicism advocates the post-structuralist position that texts are actually the only point of encounter with the past and that it can only be found in them and only in them it makes sense to search for the past. The historical context that New Historians tackle is England in the 16th and 17th centuries, that is, England during the Renaissance, ruled by Queen Elizabeth, including the worldpicture of that time Tillyard writes about.

The supporters of this method of the study of literature seek to penetrate the causal connection between society, culture, social practices of that time and literary and non-literary texts that have arisen. They, as Pechter says, believe that texts were used as an instrument of society and culture (Pechter in: *Dometi* 2002: 119).

“[...] Literary pieces of writing are not observed as privileged and unstable achievements that occur at a historical background but each text, whether literary or not, is considered equally historical and each text record is treated equally. In light of such access to Shakespear’s historical dramas, the drama text points out as ‘functional’ discourse within which ideological conflicts and conflicts can be more or less open articulated”⁴² (Holderness in: Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 31).

New Historicism supporters “[...] strive for literary texts to interpret the effects as “historical fields” on which something else happens than a clean act of artistic creation”⁴³ (Lešić 2003: 30).

⁴² „[...] književna dela se ne posmatraju kao privilegovana i neistorična ostvarenja koja se javljaju na nekoj istorijskoj pozadini već se svaki tekst, književni ili ne, smatra podjednako istorijskim i svaki tekstualni zapis se tretira ravnopravno. U svetlu takvog pristupa Šekspirovim istorijskim dramama, dramski tekst se ukazuje kao ‘funktionalni’ diskurs u okviru kojeg ideološki sukobi i sukobi moći bivaju manje ili više otvoreno artikulisano” (Holderness u: Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 31).

⁴³ „[...] teže da književne tekstove protumače uravo kao „istorijska polja” na kojima se događa i nešto drugo nego čisti čin umjetničkog stvaranja” (Lešić 2003: 30).

The connection between society, culture, discourse which “[...] represents a system of opposing forces in which the rules determine what is valid, expressible and possible [...]”⁴⁴ (Spremić 2011: 14) and texts implies a way of which society is depicted in the texts. “The ultimate goal of analysis in the texts of representatives of new historicism in the sphere of political [...]”⁴⁵ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 32) as well as the way in which those texts influence the creation and shaping of social tendencies, but he does not focus only on those elements in the text, but also takes them into account. Hence, “dramatic texts [...] are interpreted as places where the dynamics of the actions of authority and subversion directed against that same authority can be followed”⁴⁶ (*Ibid*: 33).

New Historicism focuses on the interrelationship of the historical circumstances of that moment that influenced the authors of the Renaissance, since New Historicism studies pieces of writing in the light of Renaissance social events and by focusing on the privileged upper social classes, such as members of the royal family or church dignitaries, it is a member of the privileged classes and the benefits they achieve, whether it's social status, influence, money or power. This is also noted by Edward Pechter in his essay New Historicism and its discontents: the politicization of Renaissance drama, saying, “[...] New Historians constantly focus and limit themselves to the leading institutions of Renaissance society, especially the monarchy”⁴⁷ (Pechter in: *Dometi* 2002: 116). The political implications as well as the relationship between the power of society and culture

⁴⁴ „[...] diskurs predstavlja sistem suprotstavljenih sila u kojem pravila određuju ono što je validno, izrecivo i moguće [...]” (Spremić 2011: 14).

⁴⁵ „Krajnji cilj analiza u tekstovima predstavnika novog istorizma u sferi je političkog [...]” (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 32).

⁴⁶ „dramski tekstovi [...] bivaju tumačeni kao mesta na kojima se može pratiti dinamika delovanja autoriteta i subverzije usmerene protiv tog istog autoriteta” (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 33).

⁴⁷ „[...] нови историчари се стално усредсређују и ограничавају на водеће институције ренесансног друштва, нарочито на монархију” (Пехтер у: *Дометии* 2002: 116).

and the relationship towards the individual are the subject of the study of New Historicism.

The institutions themselves are not important as such, but due to the impact that they have on society and individuals through generally accepted cultural codes that shape the rules of conduct in society and, thus, what is socially accepted by the majority, or, in turn, which is not accepted, and individuals and marginalized groups have two choices: or to accept the dominant political order, or that fighting him actually fighting for his self.

The struggle for a 'private being'⁴⁸ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 100) and the humane in man, his humanity and personal autonomy is hampered by the rigidity of the government and its institutions, which oppose all attempts by man to gain independence, since indoctrinated people are easier to manage, and manipulation is one of the means by which dominant order is preserved.

“The representations of the world in a written discourse participate in the creation of the world; they participate in shaping the modality of social reality and in adapting writers, interpreters, readers, and audiences to numerous and changing subject positions in the world they create and live in”⁴⁹ (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 15).

It is the most obvious on the example of King Hamlet, committed by Claudius, after which he accepted the throne, who, in line with Elizabethan rules, should belong to Hamlet, based on the primogeniture rule. Claudius is, therefore, absolutists, who is in a dishonest, immoral, blasphemous manner won the authorities. It signifies the dominant discourse of Elizabethan England in a dramatic form against which subversive discourse is released in *Hamlet*.

⁴⁸ „[...] приватно биће [...]” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 100).

⁴⁹ „Прикази света у писаном дискурсу учествују у стварању света; они учествују у обликовању модалитета друштвене стварности и у прилагођавању писца, тумача, читалаца и пзблике на бројне и променљиве субјекатске позиције у свету који они стварају и у коме живе” (Фелбабов у: *Дометии* 2002: 15.)

New Historicism interprets the texts by concentrating on the dominant discourse whose discursive practice was to implement ideology through government institutions with the aim of completely subjugating those who belong to that society (Lešić 2003: 28). This direction is of interest to the State's relationship with Society, because this is where the space is hidden where elements that are a threat to the system can appear. In other words, it is a space for subversion and "[...] traces of diversity and unusualness that meant resistance to the discourse of the Government"⁵⁰ (Lešić 2003: 28).

Self-fashioning of identity in the Renaissance is, therefore, a process that involves the individual and the influence that ideology has on him indirectly, through the institutions that embody it, and with the aim of encouraging the individual to be in the function of the ruling ideology in order to spread its influence and reduce the possibility of being heard the voice of diversity, which is a threat to the dominant circles and, being such, a potential threat.

"Since people constituted themselves as individuals when they obeyed one of those cultural authorities, their behavior was shaped by the codes that supported the institutions with which they identified [...]"⁵¹ (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 18)

in this way, the individual was less of an individual, and more and more social subject, and there is an undeniable connection between the identity of the individual and the institutions of society that govern the process of identity creation, which is the result of their actions, as Greenblatt says (*Ibid*). "Creating a recognizable self is a process of weighing forces with powerful control mechanisms"⁵² (*Ibid*). In the

⁵⁰ „[...] tragove različitosti i neuobičajenosti koji su značili otpor diskursu Vlasti” (Lešić 2003: 28).

⁵¹ „Пошто су се људи конституисали као јединке када би се повиновали неком од тих културних ауторитета, њихово понашање се обликовало кодовима који су подржавале институције са којим су се идентификовали [...]” (Фелбабов у: *Домети* 2002: 18).

⁵² „Стварање препознатљивог ја је процес одмеравања снага са моћним механизмима контроле” (*Исфо*).

monograph *Shakespeare Behind the Mirror: Conflict of Interpretations in the Reception of Shakespeare's Historical Plays in the Twentieth Century*⁵³, Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić states that

“[...] several general properties of the hermeneutic practice of New Historicism. First of all, the interpretations of New Historicism are approached in the same text (literary, but also any other, because their status, in accordance with Foucault's understanding of textuality, is equal) as a cultural artifact and culture as a text. The text is never interpreted outside of the context, the conjunction of the text and the context (which may constitute another text, but may also be social acts or conditions) is the focus of the reader's attention. The symbolic and material combination of the text and the culture to which it belongs is interpreted. Next, dynamics, or circulation, circulation, as Greenblatt says, of social energy is a complex and two-way process in which social practice creates certain discursive strategies and influences them, but these discursive strategies also influence social practice. But this circulation of social energy most often takes place in a closed circle of power that itself produces subversion, allows it to be advertised, and then, once advertised, it includes it, tames it, deprives it of its radical and effective edge. Then: the immutability of human nature is excluded, the human being is seen as a social construct of the time in which he lives”⁵⁴ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 283).

⁵³ Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić, *Šekspir iza ogledala: sukob interpretacija u recepciji Šekspirovih istorijskih drama u dvadesetom veku*, Geopetika, Beograd: 2007.

⁵⁴ „[...] nekoliko opštih svojstava hermeneutičke prakse Novog istorizma. Najpre: interpretacijama novog istorizma prilazi se u isti mah tekstu (književnom, ali i svakom drugom, jer je njihov status, u skladu sa fukoovim shvatanjem tekstualnosti, izjednačen) kao kulturnom artefaktu i kulturi kao tekstu. Tekst se nikada ne tumači izvan konteksta, sprema teksta i konteksta (koji može činiti drugi tekst, ali ga mogu činiti i društveni činovi ili stanja) nalazi se u fokusu čitalačke pažnje. Intepretira se simboličko i materijalno sadržajstvo teksta i kulture kojoj pripada. Potom: dinamika, ili kruženje, cirkulacija, kako kaže Grinblat, društvene energije složen je i dvosmeran proces u kojem društvena praksa stvara određene diskurzivne strategije i utiče na njih, ali i te diskurzivne strategije utiču na društvenu praksu. No ta cirkulacija društvene energije najčešće se odvija u zatvorenom krugu moći koja sama proizvodi subverziju, omogućava da ona bude oglašena, da bi je potom, tako oglašenu, sobom obuhvatila, pripitomila, lišila radikalne i dejstvene oštrice. Zatim: isključena je

However, it is not an official set of rules of the New historical approach. Since the absence of these rules met with strong opposition from the academic community, Greenblatt tried to argue why that direction could not be narrowed down to any set. He tried to explain it in the essay "Toward the Poetics of Culture". The most concise and general answer, of course, to the question of what New Historicism deals with is that its scope is the connection between art and society. Greenblatt's understanding of New Historicism implies that this critical pioneer should be seen as a common denominator for a wide range of possible ways in which a text can be read and analyzed, different keys in which it can be interpreted, i.e. a variety of perspectives and prisms that can be applied to a certain text. Each of them examines from its own domain the dilemmas and difficulties that arise when scholars examine how literary creations reflect and maintain social norms, as well as their influence on prevailing cultural codes (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 9).

As Felbabov says, Montrose agrees with Greenblatt. Montrose thinks the creation of a new basis for the interaction between literature and non-literary texts of cultural formation from which the task to which New historicism should be dedicated. He wrote an essay in which he contrasted texts that do not only belong to literature, but also those in relation to the literary part of the undeniable authority various by type and nature. He also included other spheres such as social practice and political institutions (*Ibid*: 17).

"In an essay from 1986, Luis Montrose briefly tried to formulate and reexamine some of the theoretical, methodological and political assumptions and implications of the pieces of literature written by experts on the English Renaissance – "the New Historians". Such writings aimed to reshape the areas of society and culture in which the canonical literary, primarily dramatic pieces of writing of the English Renaissance were produced by positioning them not only against other literary genres and forms of writing outside the literary canon, but also against other areas

nepromenljivost ljudske prirode, ljudsko biće se posmatra kao socijalni konstrukt vremena u kojem živi" (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 283).

of culture, including social practice and political institutions at the time of the origins of the modern English state”⁵⁵ (*Ibid*).

In his opinion, a good starting point would be to neglect the formalistic understanding of literature as exclusively aesthetic creative creation. He also thinks that the same should be applied to the theory of reflections, which, as its name suggests, tackles literature as a reflection of an ideological commitment unanimously accepted and adopted by the whole society.

“Since it does not accept such paradigms, a new historian, he must explain how texts not only represent the forms of knowledge and authorities that shaped the culture, but in the legislation of the practice and codes that embodied”⁵⁶ (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 10).

New Historicism is, therefore, a new approach, bearing new insights and assumptions. It examines a new chapter in the history of England – the birth of its modernity. In addition, “[...] New Historical criticism can claim to be new because it refuses to accept the difference between “literature” and “history”, between “text” and “context”, as well as because it he refuses to imagine an autonomous and privileged individual – either the author or the work – as opposed to the social or literary one background (*Ibid*: 18). Stephen Greenblatt writes about such individuals in his book *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*.

⁵⁵ „U eseju iz 1986. godine Luis Montoruz je ukratko pokušao da formuliše i preispita neke od teoretskih, metodoloških i političkih pretpostavki i implikacija radova koje su pisali stručnjaci za englesku renesansu – „novi istoričari”. Takvi radovi su želeli da ponovo oblikuju oblasti društva i kulture u kojima su nastala kanonska književna, prvenstveno dramska dela engleske renesanse tako što su ih postavili ne samo prema drugim književnim žanrovima i oblicima pisanja izvan književnog kanona, već i prema drugim oblastima kulture, uključujući društvenu prasku i političke institucije u vreme nastanka moderne engleske države” (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 283).

⁵⁶ „Пошто не прихвата ове парадигме, нови историчар, тврди он, мора да објасни како текстови не само да представљају облике знања и ауторитета које је обликовао култура, већ и читаоцима понављају праксе и кодове које утеловљују” (Фелбабов у: *Дометии* 2002: 10).

On the other hand, New Historicism in its methodological foundations shares a certain similarity with approaches such as the poetics of culture, feminism, and revised Marxism that contribute to the literature by establishing connections with new discourses. These directions have influenced Anglo-American literature by opening new fields, and thus new ways and new angles from which literature can be considered by which “[...] they find dialectic between literary text and its world”⁵⁷ (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 10–11).

In *Death and the Dervish*, the dominant topic is Ahmed Nuruddin's, the tekki Sheikh's loyalty to dogma. On the basis of Meša Selimović's book *Memories*⁵⁸, a clear parallel with the communist ideology and loyalty to the revolution, due to which an innocent man, his brother, died can be drawn. He was the role model for portraying Ahmed Nuruddin's death owing to believing in religion. The dervish's brother's death is used in the novel as an illustration of what might happen if/when someone jeopardizes the political system, just like the Ševkija Selimović death is used to portray the strength of communist ideology in Yugoslavia. The novel was published in the late 1960s (1966).

The analysis of the two aforementioned pieces of writing is focused on their protagonists. This is important when it comes to their interpretation in the light of New Historicism because “Gallagher and Greenblatt mark New Historicism as a history of possibilities, a critical practice interested in the general, but also in favor of a special – individual voice”⁵⁹ (Spremić 2011: 21). In these two writings, it is the voice of Hamlet, the Danish prince and the dervish Ahmed Nuruddin's voice. In order to portray the position of these two pieces of writing within socio-cultural codes, New Historicism seems to be an appropriate methodological position because

⁵⁷ „[...] они налазе дијалектику између књижевног текста и његовог света” (*Ibid*: 10–11).

⁵⁸ Meša Selimović, *Sjećanja*, 2018, Vulkan, Beograd.

⁵⁹ „Galagerova i Griinblat označavaju novi istorizam kao istoriju mogućnosti, kao kritičku praksu zainteresovanu za opšte, ali i naklonjenu posebnom – individualnom glasu” (Spremić 2011: 21).

“[...] New Historicism was constituted as a place of academic ideological struggle between containment and subversion. Critics who advocate the possibility of effective mediation of individual or collective subjects against forms of domination, exclusion and assimilation vigorously oppose critics who emphasize the ability of the early modern state, personified in the image of the monarch, to restrain the subversive action of the individual”⁶⁰ (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 29).

She notices that of all critical theories applied to the study of English Renaissance literature, New Historicism managed to appear as the most dominant and most influential in the last two decades of the twentieth century and the early years of the twenty-first century. The founder of this movement is Stephen Greenblatt, who used to teach England Renaissance literature at the University of Berkeley, at the beginning of the 1980s, and currently teaches at Harvard University. In 1980 he published a key book *Renaissance Self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*, and two years later in his *Genre* magazine preface, the term New Historicism, unknown prior to that, emerges (Spremić 2011: 11).

The common goal that brought Greenblatt and his collaborators together was to question the position of English Renaissance literature within the wider network of discourses and social practices during the 16th and 17th centuries. Their position was that literature does not exist as an autonomous aesthetic sphere, cut off from the history that produced it, unlike the New Criticism, whose reduction of the literary work to the aesthetic dimension was one of its main premises. In the opinion of modern historians, the pieces of writing of the English Renaissance are inextricably linked with other cultural productions of that time (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 7).

⁶⁰ „Нови историзам се конституисао као место академске идеолошке борбе. Критичари који заступају могућности ефикасног посредовања појединачних или колективних субјеката против облика доминације, искључивања и асимилације енергично се супротстављају критичарима који наглашавају способност ране модерне државе персонификоване у лику монарха да обузда субверзивно деловање” (Фелбабов у: *Дометии* 2002: 29).

By connecting literary pieces of writing with non-literary situations and other sciences, above all with history, he put the followers of New historicism in a position to oppose some other literary theories. Specifically, with this attitude, the New Historians opposed the older, positivist historicism, which assumes that a literary piece only reflects the prevailing circumstances and a consistent view of the world within which it appeared (Spremić 2011: 11).

Greenblatt learned that in the United States of America's academic circles, there is a new phenomenon called New Historicism that considers literary pieces of writing cultural artifacts; Therefore, the historical context offers the best tool for their interpretation. The professors who established New Historicism in these academic circles matured during a very turbulent period and turmoil in America in the 1960s. Therefore, they strive to interpret and understand social issues of that time (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2022: 8).

Above all, what stands out is the contribution of Johann Gottfried, who says that there is no human nature that can be said to exist outside of the historical context of people. He states that humans are born with very few instincts and are therefore highly adaptable in nature. As such, identity is a product of the human learning process, which can either lead to perfection or corruption. Diversity in human beings is purposeful, and it is wrong to reduce such diversity to anything that implies unification and sameness. On the contrary, we should insist on individuality and individuality both at the level of the individual and at the level of culture (Spremić 2011: 12). Moreover,

“[...] Hereder's view that differences between cultures and individuals are a reason for hope, and not for endless conflicts the representatives of New Historicism consider stimulating for the study of the individual and specific”⁶¹ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 284–285).

⁶¹ „[...] Herederovo viđenje su različitosti među kulturama i pojedincima razlog za nadu, a ne za beskrajne konflikte, predstavnici novog istorizma smatraju podsticajnim za proučavanje pojedinačnog, specifičnog, individualnog” (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 284–285).

The academics looked at New Historism as a doctrine or movement and therefore expected Greenblatt and his followers to come up with a comprehensive program (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2022: 8-9). The New historism resists being reduced to the set of principles that can be defined. From the very beginning, the theoretical framework was lacking, and there was obviously no program for its performance. This means that no one is tied together with a set of questions to be deciphered in a certain way to get a new historical reading of the text. Galager and Greenblatt are skeptical towards the role of designing an abstract prior framework for explaining the literary piece. This view opens a valid critique space due to the lack of theoretical basis. However, such ambivalence according to the theory is inherent to new historism, because it combines attractiveness and repugnance directed towards theoretical constructs at the same time (Sprenić 2011: 19).

New Historicism is an approach that examines a piece of writing not only narrowly, as an artistic creation, within the limits of the text, but more broadly, looking at the socio-cultural context in which the work was created. Applying the New Historicism critical approach implies that attention is directed to politics, history, culture and the context from which the pieces of writing arose. One of the key points of this approach is that reality can only be understood in the light of the culture that the literary work reveals, and that an objective observation of history is impossible [...] (Vesić 2013: iv-v).

She indicates how culture shapes society and vice versa, thus redefining the interplay between the texts and other key forms of action. It is thus able to express intricate and relations that are not managed that exist between social and cultural events, portraying their reciprocal impacts and confronted attempts to affect each other (Sprenić 2011: 21-22).

Supporters of New Historicism seek to penetrate the causal relationship between society, culture, social practices of that time and literary and non-literary texts created within it. They, as Pehter says, believe that texts were used as an instrument of society and culture (Pehter 2002: 119). Supporters of the New Historicism, “[...] strive to interpret literary texts as “historic fields” where something

else happens rather than a pure act of artistic creation”⁶² (Lešić 2003: 30), connecting society, culture, discourse, which “[...] is a system of opposing forces in which the rules determine what is valid, indictable and possible [...]”⁶³ (Spremić 2011: 14).

A literary text is related to other pieces of writing within and outside the domain of literature; however, the goal of the connection is not to understand society as a whole. New Historicism is interested in historical particulars causing breaks, changes and discontinuity (*Ibid*: 13). One of such breaks is the Renaissance.

“When asked how Renaissance looked like from the new historicism point of view of, it can be answered that it is indicated as a dynamic, discontinuous and radically heterogeneous discursive creation in which a plethora of discursive practices circulate – and disappear, conflict and complement –. Among them, in which apart from the texts, institutions, models of behavior and material production that also fall into the same category, primary importance for New Historians, by all means bear texts, without a doubt, literary as well as non-literary, canonical as well as marginalized. For that reason, they [...], read, next to each other, Shakespeare’s plays and private diaries, writing manuals, religious tracts, witchcraft tractates, moralizing writings, sermons, colonial writings, writings in the field of state theories, archival and legal documents. The juxtaposition of various texts expands the range of knowledge about the Renaissance and confirms another Greenblatt’s thesis, the one on the circulation of social energy. Reading each of the four great tragedies reveal a diverse and specific features of the Renaissance, but are often repeated main preoccupations of New Historians – exploring the forms of power of dominant order, subversion and its limitation”⁶⁴ (*Ibid*: 112).

⁶² „[...] teže da književne tekstove protumače upravo kao „istorijska polja” na kojima se događa i nešto drugo nego čisti čin umjetničkog stvaranja” (Lešić 2003: 30).

⁶³ „[...] diskurs predstavlja sistem suprotstavljenih sila u kojem pravila određuju ono što je validno, izrecivo i moguće [...]” (Spremić 2011: 14).

⁶⁴ „Na pitanje kako izgleda renesansa iz vizure novog istorizma može se odgovoriti da se ona ukazuje kao dinamična, diskontinuitetna i radikalno heterogena diskurzivna tvorevina u kojoj cirkulišu – izranjaju i nestaju, sukobljavaju

The Renaissance was previously viewed as a bridge towards the accented Christian and monolithic Middle Ages, but also as the hand outstretched towards the modern epoch. Jonathan Dollimore complains that the human condition essentially influences social and historical environments, contrary to an essential point of view. Dollimore describes the seventeenth century as a transitional stage between medieval essentialism, which, as such, defines and recognizes as a unique creation based on God, and humanism of Enlightenment, which emphasizes human individualism. Dollimore in a Renaissance dramatic literary tradition finds ideas on the nature of human identity, which is not anchored in continuity, but in discontinuity and, which is, on top of that, entirely determined by the society. (*Ibid*: 23–24).

In her research paper “New Historicism and Cultural Materialism in Serbian Literary Thought”⁶⁵, Jana Aleksić tackles the connections between these two literary schools and the context of Serbian literature from the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century. Her paper deals with the connections between New Historicism and domestic literary tradition, together

se i dopunjuju – mnogobrojne diskurzivne prakse. Među diskurzivnim praksama u koje, pored tekstova, spadaju i institucije, modeli ponašanja i materijalna proizvodnja, primarni značaj za novoistoričare svakako imaju tekstovi, književni kao i neknjiževni, kanonski kao i marginalizovani. Zato oni, kao što je u prethodnim poglavljima prikazano, Šekspirove drame čitaju naporedo sa privatnim dnevnicima, priručnicima za učenje pisanja, verskim traktatima, traktatima o veštičarenju, moralizatorskim spisima, propovedima, kolonijalnim spisima, delima iz oblasti teorija države, arhivskim i pravnim dokumentima. Jukstaponovanje raznorodnih tekstova proširuje domete saznanja o renesansi i potvrđuje još jednu Grinblatovu tezu, onu o cirkulisanju društvene energije. Čitanja svake od četiri velike tragedije otkrivaju raznorodna i specifična obeležja renesanse, ali neretko i ponavljaju glavne preokupacije novoistoričara – istraživanje oblika moći dominantnog poretka, subverzije i njenog ograničavanja” (Spremić 2011: 112).

⁶⁵ Алексић, Јана, „Нови историзам и културни материјализам у српској књижевној мисли” у: *Књижевна историја*, Vol. 54 (2022) No. 177, Article 2 (p. 33–60), <https://doi.fil.bg.ac.rs/pdf/journals/kis/2022-177/kis-2022-54-177-2.pdf>

with many other authors, she refers to Predrag Palavestra, Milan Radulović, Svetozar Petrović, Milan Kašanin, Zoran Milutinović, Tihomir Brajović, Boris Bulatović, and Vladimir Dimitrijević, Zoran Milutinović, Vladislava Felbabov, Zdenko Lešić, Vladimir Gvozden, Stephen Greenblatt, Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić, Gerald Graf. All of them are experts on New Historicism. She also uses additional material on this topic such as its elaboration in various doctorates and monographs such as the doctorate of Violeta Vesić and the monograph of Milica Spremić. The author clarifies the positions and premises of the New Historians from the point of view of the Anglo-American tradition, thus building a bridge to our literature and culture which is, like many others, influenced by new historicism and cultural materialism.

According to the author's opinion, Zoran Milutinović holds a significant position when it comes to the presence of New Historicism in our literary and cultural space. He is recognized as a pioneer who introduced this approach to Serbian literature by dealing with the topic "New Historicism in the science of literature", which he edited. It was published in the magazine *The Word (Reč)*, 1995). His perspective highlights the influence of Stephen Greenblatt, a prominent literary historian and scholar of Shakespeare. Milutinović tries to investigate the reading of literary texts from the English Renaissance through a cultural prism within the American academic sphere, as presented in the text "Poetics of Culture" by Stephen Greenblatt (Milutinović 1995: 59) in: Aleksić 2022: 37–38).

Acting as a defense counsel of Greenblatt's ideas, he emphasizes their critical significance in contemporary literature. This approach connects historical literary forms with contemporary contexts, distinguishing it from traditional historiography, formalistic methodologies and historicism. The new historians concentrate on shedding light on a sociocultural landscape in which the Renaissance literature was created, examining its mutual relations with different discourses and contemporary social institutions, as well as non-discursive practices (*Ibid*).

„The consequence of this is to move traditional historical interest from making a single diachronome text of autonomous literary history on synchronical text of one cultural system”⁶⁶ (*Ibid*: 38).

She also mentions Stephen Greenblatt's book *Culture*, translated by Vladimir Gvozden and published in *Golden Beam* (*Zlatna greda*) magazine in November 2004. In this book, Greenblatt explores the importance of culture in literature (Aleksić 2022: 40–41). The goal of cultural analysis is to expand the scope of the text and establish connections between the text and various discursive forms, practices and values within the culture. The context in which the literary work is created is essential for the correct interpretation of the layers of meaning that the text conveys to the culture and vice versa. Accordingly, literature and art play a vital role in both the transmission and transformation of cultural narratives (Greenblatt: 41 in: Aleksić 2022: 41). Prominent authors, through their literary pieces of writing, skilfully manage cultural patterns, whether they reproduce, change or facilitate their exchange, thus illustrating their power over permanent narratives (codes) of culture that affect people's movement and limitations (Greenblatt: 43 in: Aleksić 2022: 41).

Acting as cultural patterns intermediators, writers draw elements from the cultural sphere and transfer them to the artistic domain, resulting in writings that serve as “architectural buildings of accumulation, transformation, presentations and making transfers of social energy and practice” in time and space. They also consider their own relationship with cultural patterns and their own position within that culture, given that each artistic creativity serves as an educational instrument (*Ibid*). Following up these theoretical premises and through thorough examination of non-literary texts, which can be accessible, that are first-class historical events, Greenblatt articulates his premise on self-fashioning during Renaissance, whether it is literary, social or personal, resulting

⁶⁶ „Последица тога је премештање традиционалног историјског интересовања са сачињавања једног дијахроног текста аутономне књижевне историје на синхронијски текст једног културног система” (Алексић 2022: 38).

in a comprehensive book on the development of Shakespeare literary art and self-fashioning in his plays (Aleksić 2022: 41).

This anthropological-sociological critique is present in Greenblatt's famous book *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Its goal is the poetics of culture. Influenced by authors such as Clifford Gertz, James Boone, and Mary Douglas, Greenblatt sought to portray how social context, cultural framework, and patterns of behavior influenced the fashioning of individual identity during the Renaissance period. The purpose of anthropological research is to find and analyze the interpretative structures through which individuals and societies express their identities and what they have gone through. According to Greenblatt, literature and culture are connected to each other as follows:

“Literary study that leans towards that practice should take into account that the status it has, which implies the interpretation and the intention to decode literature as part of the sign system of which culture is composed; its real goal [...] is the poetics of culture”⁶⁷ (Greenblatt 2011:23-24 in: Aleksić 2022: 40).

A comprehensive meta-theoretical examination of the philosophical foundations, critical methodologies and British and American scholars' procedures dedicated to the historical interpretation of literature as cultural artifacts was presented by literary theorist Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić in the monograph *Shakespeare Behind the Mirror: Conflict of Interpretations in the Reception of Shakespeare's Historical Plays in the Twentieth Century*. In her analysis, she investigates how proponents of New Historicism perceive literary writings or plays. For these scientists, such writings are not primarily aesthetic creations, but manifestations that must be examined in the full complexity of their cultural functions, both in their original context

⁶⁷ „Литерарно проучавање које нагиње ка тој пракси треба да узме у обзир да је статус који има, а који подразумева интерпретирање и намеру да се књижевност декодира као део знаковног система од којег је култура састављена; њен прави циљ [...] је поетика културе” (Гринблат 2011: 23–24 у: Алексић 2022: 40).

and in the cultures that receive them (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 277 in: Aleksić 2022: 42).

The influence of culture in the two selected pieces of writing is performed through religion, i.e. through the relations of the protagonists, and the ratio of the individual according to any collective dogmatic practice refers to Althusser, and his understanding of the subject that is precisely based on that relationship. In his essay *Ideology and state ideological apparatus*, he underlines the importance of an imaginary relationship that individuals have in relation to their actual circumstances, which is ideology (religious, moral, legal, political, whatever other). He equates ideology with an illusion but provided that an ideology in an individual's awareness did not become dogma, that is a person does not experience it as a true criterion based on which he is positioned in the world, his own existence and within society (Althusser 2009: 53–54).

In addition, the influence of Clifford Geertz on New Historicism is obvious. Some of his concepts and premises new historians took over from his piece of writing *Interpretations of Culture*. His settings concern the interaction of an individual, society and culture (Felbabov 2002: 26).

“In Geertz's symbolic anthropology, culture is a medium of symbiosis “set of control mechanisms – plans, recipes, rules, instructions”. The code system regulates the life of society by “managing” the production of conventions, practices and artifacts that are often credited the term culture”⁶⁸ (Marshal Sahlins. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1975, VIII, 55 in: Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 26).

This is why the role of religion is the bearer of meaning in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, because the protagonists are guided by

⁶⁸ „У Гирцовој симболичкој антропологији култура је медијум симбиозе „скуп контролних механизма – планова, рецепата, правила, упутстава”. Систем кодова регулише живот друштва тиме што „управља” производњом оне скупине конвенција, праксе и артефаката којима се често непрецизно приписује назив култура” (Marshal Sahlins. *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1975, VIII, 55 у: Фелбабов у: *Дометии* 2002: 26).

the dogmatic patterns that greatly limit the process of their (self-) fashioning. Everything that is not in accordance with the principles propagated by Christianity or Islam is perceived as a hostile Other, against which there is a resistance in advance. That is what prevents Hamlet from acting. Just as service to Islamic doctrine prevents Ahmed from actually living. "Religious apparatus remind in sermons and other great ceremonies of birth, marriage and death that man is only ashes and that he will be saved only if he loves his neighbor [...]"⁶⁹ (*Ibid*: 42).

This irresistibly recalls "the quintessence of dust"⁷⁰ mentioned by Hamlet (2,2, 302) and his attitude towards Christianity, which has a decisive influence on his (non-)determination to kill Claudius, as well as on the introductory scenes from the novel *Death and the Dervish* in which Nuruddin makes a contrast between his dervish role before and after his brother's imprisonment, when his attitude towards death changes (Selimović 2018a: 28). That is the place in the novel where the beginning of the conflict. The gist is the protagonist's conflict with the world, with the authorities, and actually with himself and the religious principles within either Hamlet or Ahmed Nuruddin.

Conflict is the most common interaction which New Historicism studies. The topic of conflict is something that occupies Greenblatt's attention. "Greenblatt is less interested in the broad and constraining frame pieces of writing of some established social practice, and more in the individual conflicts and restraints that these frame pieces of writing impose as restraints on individual authors"⁷¹ (Felbabov 2002: 20). Namely, "he [...] analyzes the techniques that numerous institutions

⁶⁹ „Религијски апарат путем подсећања у проповедима и другим великим церемонијама рођења, венчања и смрти да је човек само пепео и да ће бити спасен само уколико воли воли ближњег свог [...]" (Исто: 42).

⁷⁰ „квинтесенција прашине" (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 52)

⁷¹ „Гринблата мање интересују широки и спутавајући оквири неке устаљене друштвене праксе, а више појединачни сукоби и спутавање који ти оквири намећу као стеге појединачним ауторима" (Фелбабов 2002: 20).

use to discipline individual behavior”⁷² (*Ibid*: 22). Those techniques are closely related to the degree of control they want to achieve over members of the society.

For this purpose, they use hypocrisy, repression, different punishment forms, threats so as to intimidate the individual thus preventing him from undermining order. Violence is a mutual technique rulers in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* opt for. The result of that violence is death. It is the mutual motif in private lives of two authors, William Shakespeare and Meša Selimović, and has a significant impact on both of them and their aforementioned pieces of writing.

1.3 NEW HISTORICISM: THE ROLE OF HISTORY

For Serbian novel and Shakespeare’s tragedy, which Lenard Tennenhouse also analyzes as a historical play, socio-historical occasions are refracted on their textological, thematic and motif-related area in such a way so as to become crucial factors of the text. On the other hand, both pieces of writing had an impact on the time when they were created. Both of them entail history, politics and literature. This is most obvious in the motif of power, which is one of the most important ones in this analysis of the Serbian novel and Elizabethan play.

Almost throughout the entire 20th century, history was considered not to be a literary phenomenon ensuring that literary interpretation is correct. It was supposed to be the foundation for reading a literary part (Vesić 2013: I). Literary writings are re-analyzed through the prism of their historical and political context.

The question arises as to what history is for Shakespeare and how it fits into his oeuvre in the light of New Historicism. This is possible because new historians call for a reorientation towards history, culture and society, which goes beyond the framework of mere Marxist anal-

⁷² „[...] анализира технике које бројне институције користе да би дисциплиновале понашање појединца” (Исто: 22).

ysis. Abstract allegorical meanings of fiction texts can be exposed to critical examination, as well as the political-historical meaning of that criticism. This was one of Weber's important contributions, calling for self-reflexivity in scientific research. Criticism seeks to chase itself, that is, to reveal vulnerabilities until it reaches a stage where culture can no longer be criticized. Since our temporary world is recorded in one text or another, there is a great need to understand the textuality of history as well as the historicity of the text (Grubačić 2012: 373–374).

The supporters of New Historicism, headed by Stephen Greenblatt, were against the formalism, which propagated the interpretation of literature is insulated from her historical context [...], nor did they adhere to historicism, that prevailed at the beginning of the 20th century, emphasizing the connection between literary pieces of writing and the worldview of the epoch in which they were formed (Felbabov in: Vesić 2013: 10–11).

“While an interest in historical text, which has a role to produce reality was in the spotlight of the Old Historicism, new historicism focuses on the exploration of ideological distance between text and historical reality”⁷³ (*Ibid*: 28).

It creates the text, but the text also participates in the creation of historical continuity. It collaborates with other historical forces having shaped it and often changing them (Lešić 2003: 19). By placing history high on that bar “[...] what used to be the background all of a sudden requires attention that was once given only to the foreground and a privileged piece of art”⁷⁴ (Spremić 2011: 21).

The relationship between the foreground and the background somewhat reminds of the center : margin relationship. This is one

⁷³ „Dok je u središtu starog istorizma bilo interesovanje za istoriografski tekst, koji ima ulogu da proizvodi stvarnost, u središtu novog istoizma je istraživanje ideološke relacije između teksta i istorijske stvarnosti” (Исцо: 28).

⁷⁴ „[...] ono što je bilo pozadina odjednom zahteva pažnju nekada pri davanu samo prednjem planu i privilegovanom umetničkom delu” (Spremić 2011: 21).

of the relationships New Historicism is interested in. They argue that history is not available to us in any other way than in the texts lasting to present day (Lešić 2003: 19). Namely,

“traditional terminology makes the difference between a literary text and history as the foreground and background. Hence, it perceives literature as a reflection or refraction of its context”⁷⁵ (Spremić 2011: 22).

For this reason, they believe that examining texts in a historical key is vital. Therefore, new historians are not only interested in reading and interpreting the text itself, but also in history, the past in which the text was created, as well as in the mutual influence of history and the text.

New Historicism and, critical trends related to it attempt to grasp the connection between literature and other society discourses as well as their interweaving.

“Critics who want to understand English literature of the 16th and 17th centuries must establish how the texts they are studying are connected to the complex structure of institutions, practices and beliefs that shaped the English Renaissance culture and society as a whole”⁷⁶ (Felbabov in: *Dometi* 2002: 8),

given literature develops under the influence of culture, and society as such.

This introduces an interest in politics and the importance of the political element in Renaissance pieces of writing, above all the ones written by Shakespeare.

“Shakespeare’s great tragedies represent a kind of treasure trove of topics for new historicism studies of the social scene of the Elizabethan

⁷⁵ „[...] ono što je bila pozadina odjednom zahteva pažnju nekada pridavanu samo prednjem planu i privilegovanom umetničkom delu” (*Ibid*: 21).

⁷⁶ „Критичари које желе да схвате енглеску књижевност XVI и XVII века морају да установе како су дела која проучавају повезана са сложеном структуром институција, праксе и веровања који су обликовали културу и друштво енглеске ренесансе у целини” (Фелбабов у: *Домети* 2002: 8).

and Jacobean eras, especially for the investigation of how institutions such as court, church and family, and various forms of practice and beliefs, shaped the culture of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Some of those themes are revenge, witchcraft, ghosts and the supernatural in general, melancholy, simulated or true madness as a subversion of the dominant order [...]”⁷⁷ (Spremić 2011: 25).

New Historicism tackles political implications as well as the relationship between the power of society and culture and relationships to the individual. This approach is engaged in interwiving of society and culture or reportedly autonomous I and political and cultural institutions which actually fashion it” (*Ibid*: 33). Institutions are important because of the influence they have on society and individuals who constitute it through commonly accepted cultural codes that shape the rules of conduct in society and, thus, what is socially accepted by the majority, or, in turn, what is not.

According to New Historians, the relationship between the individual and society can be a relationship of binary oppositions, the power of unquestioned authority and resistance. “According to them, power is still embodied in the king, or in a certain series of certain institutions, and the discourse is located within the framework of a stripped-down and simple model of domination and subversion”⁷⁸, (Spremić 2011: 118) discussed in *Hamlet* and *Death the Dervish*.

“New Historians” believe texts both reflect and participate in the generating history; they emulate main cultural codes while simulta-

⁷⁷ „Šekspirove velike tragedije predstavljaju svojevrsnu riznicu tema za novoistorijska proučavanja društvene scene elizabetinskog i jakobinskog doba, posebno za istraživanje načina na koji su institucije poput dvora, crkve i porodice, i različiti oblici prakse i verovanja, oblikovali kulturu poznog šesnaestog i ranog sedamnaestog veka. Neke od tih tema jesu osveta, veštičarenje, duhovi i natprirodno uopšte, melanholija, simulirano ili pravo ludilo kao subverzija dominantnog poretka [...]” (Spremić 2011: 25).

⁷⁸ „Po njima moć je još uvek otelotvorena u kralju, ili u određenom nizu određenih institucija, a diskurs je lociran u okvirima ogoljenog i jednostavnog modela dominacije i subverzije [...]” (Spremić 2011: 118).

neously offering individual responses to prevailing discursive practice. They reveal various totalitarian maneuvers of the Government that is everywhere, sees everything and monitors everything, as well as forms of individual resistance. The existence of Power is emphasized in the interpretation of a text. Consequently, the discursive practice of the authority possessing power spread to other discursive forms (literature and theater)”⁷⁹ (Lešić 2003: 33).

Claiming that the texts completely faithfully reflect the era of their creation would be overly simplifed. It can, however, be argued they represent valuable, even though not entirely authentic, evidence of the period in which they were created. For this reason, it is necessary that all the textual traces from that time available to us are thoroughly read (*Ibid*: 23). As far as the New Historians are concerned, this particularly refers to Renaissance texts: “They interpret the Renaissance texts they read in relation to the discursive practice of the Renaissance culture, especially to the prevailing discourse which was an instrument of repression, and which spread and renewed the ideology of the State, the King, Churches, Ruling Classes, Masculinity”⁸⁰ (*Ibid*: 28).

New historicism focuses on topics such as power, state, culture, ideology, but interprets them in a new way by analyzing them with reference to the context. Additionally, it interprets the texts by focusing on the dominant discourse whose discursive practice was to implement ideology through government institutions aiming to completely subjugate those belonging to that society. All these categories

⁷⁹ „Po uvjerenju „novh istoricista”, tekstovi reflektiraju istoriju, ali je i sami proizvode; u njima se odražavaju dominantni kulturni kodovi, ali i individualni „odgovori” na vladajuću diskurzivnu praksu; oni svjedoče o različitim represivnim strategijama sveprisutne Vlasti, ali i o različitim mogućnostima individualnog otpora. Pri tome se u tumačenju teksta naglasak obično stavlja na otkrivanje prisustva Moći, što onda ukazuje na širenje diskurzivne prakse Vlasti nadruge diskurzivne forme (književnost, teatar)” (Lešić 2003: 33).

⁸⁰ „Renesansne tekstove koje iščitavaju, oni tumače u odnosu na *diskurzivnu praksu* renesansne kulture, naročito na prevladavajući diskurs koji je bio instrument represije, i koji je širio i obnavljao ideologiju Države, Kralja, Crkve, Vladajuće Klase, Muškosti” (*Ibid*: 28).

are connected by power. Its presence in the texts is one of the crucial phenomena modern historians dwell on because:

“[...] they recognize the authoritarian presence of power [...], which imposed its controlled, “ideologized” discourse on them in those texts. Simultaneously, however they find a refreshing variety of discursive practice and try to recognize the traces of diversity and unusualness that meant resistance to the discourse of the Government in those texts. (In this respect, too, they followed Foucault, whose pieces of writing offered strong arguments for the rebellion of the individual against all systems of domination”⁸¹ (*Ibid*).

New Historicism focuses on the privileged upper social strata, such as members of the royal family or church dignitaries, that is, members of privileged classes and the benefits they achieve, whether it is social status, influence, money or power. The most significant privileged class in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* is the government whose representatives are the rulers. They establish and maintain power and dominance through violence.

Both, New Historians and Cultural Materialists, are engaged in culture. They both define a culture as a conflict of two opposing tendencies; on the one hand, there is a tendency to “dominant discourse” or „discourse of power” to limit everything by exercising immense control. On the other hand, there is resistance of subordinate or dissident entities such as opposit political ideologies, marginal social groups or subversive art movements challenging discourse power and trying to demonstrate their own power (*Ibid*: 45).

Additionally, Foucault’s theory clearly resonate with New Historicism. It reflect the discontinuity: places or moments of rupture, transformation of metamorphosis, opposite the Tillyard’s coherently

⁸¹ „[...] u tim tekstovima oni prepoznaju autoritarno prisustvo *moći* [...], koja im je nametnula svoj kontrolirani, „ideologizirani” diskurs. Ali u isto vrijeme oni u tim tekstovima nalaze osvježavajuću raznovrsnost diskurzivne prakse i nastoje prepoznati tragove različitosti i neuobičajenosti koji su značili otpor otpor diskursu Vlasti. (I u tom pogledu oni su slijedili Fukoa, čija su djela nudila jake argumente za pobunu pojedinca protiv svih sistema dominacije” (Ис्रो).

presented 'Elizabethan world picture'. For this reason, England renaissance can no longer be considered a monolithic period, but it is deconstructed through "[...] conflicting orthodox and subversive impulses in social practice and in texts, anxiety between acceptance and refusal of certain cultural matrices, between assimilation and resistance"⁸² (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 275).

Not only are concrete expressions of power and its institutional attributes explored, but also the omnipresence of power and the resistance that naturally comes into contact with it. Moreover, the dynamics of power and resistance, that is, suppression of subversion is also examined (*Ibid*: 276).

This means that cruel authoritarian procedures are a product of history. They are portrayed on the theater stage, indicating it takes over the same discourse. The text can also be interpreted as a chess game in which there are rigid figures of the government on one side, and on the other one there are those rebelling against that discourse, who are opposed to it through subversive action (*Ibid.*), by which the individual tries to express his own subjectivity in the social context.

The relationship between the social context and immanence asks dependence on the external world as opposed to autonomy. In the interpretive sense, this fundamental contrast between these two visions has never been finally resolved. On one hand, there is the pursuit of justifying its existence as looking outside of the scope of the text; it is opposed to, perhaps, a certain fear expressed in front of a piece of art autonomous nature which exists according to its principles. On the other hand, there is a fear of a possible illusion that this view has – the point of view that there is an internal force in a piece of writing, whether it is intoxicating or frightening, historical or transcendent. This can either convert an artistic text to a mere social construct or appear alternatively as a "principle of creativity" acting independently

⁸² „[...] sukobljavanje ortodoksnih i subverzivnih impulsa u društvenoj praksi i u tekstovima, napetosti između prihvatanja i odbijanja određenih kulturnih matrica, između asimilacije i otpora" (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 275).

through history, enumerating all possible events under the umbrella of the sky. Such an eternal conflict of autonomy and heteronomy, with tension between individual affirmation and longing for its abandonment, can be seen as one of the basic questions of interpretation which goes much deeper than the domain of literature (Grubačić 2012: 381)

Milica Spremić, the author, of the monograph *Politics, Subversion, Power: New Historicist Readings of Shakespeare's Great Tragedies*⁸³ provides a brief overview of this method at the very beginning of her book. She focuses on the roots of this critical practice. Specifying the data on its historical development, she records when and where it appeared for the first time, mentions its most prominent representatives and what some of them such as Stephen Greenblatt and Katarin Gallagher agree about.

She also singles out Michael Foucault and Clifford Geertz, whose influence on new historicism and cultural materialism is immense. It is especially reflected in the difference in understanding the phenomenon of power, which is one of the vital ones when this practice is considered. Her study offers several possible New Historical interpretations that do not insist on unilateral interpretation of the text, but provides an opportunity for analyzing Renaissance plays through their reading in the light of politics and history (Šofranac 2011: 158).

1.4 THE *HAMLET* AND *DEATH AND THE DERVISH*'S HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: THE APPLICATION OF GREENBLATT'S SELF-FASHIONING

The historical framework of both pieces of writing is important for understanding and analysis of the play and the novel because it portrays the objective circumstances of a given historical moment and thus provides a political-ideological framework within which the two authors shaped their worldview and the identity of their protagonists

⁸³ Milica Spremić, *Politika, subverzija, moć: novoistorijska tumačenja Šekspirovih tragedija*, Zadužbina Andrejević, Beograd: 2011.

in accordance with the then-current social norms in Elizabethan England, i.e. communist Yugoslavia. The (self-) fashioning of identity is an important element of the *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*.

Special emphasis in these two pieces of writing comparative analysis is on the binar opposition: those in power vs the subversive, hostile, threatening Other that needs to be eliminated, as is the case with King Hamlet, and then with his son, Hamlet, and with Harun, and, then, Ahmed Nuruddin. It must be done by the ruling structures as that is the only way to preserve their social position. Both writings tackle the relationship of repression portrayed in control mechanisms such as state repressive network, those turning to committing violent deeds (Althusser, prev. Filipović, 2009: 27) and subversion, as well as the positioning of the individual and his identity self-fashioning within the absolutist political system.

The system recognizes Other as a threat that needs to be dealt with, permanently removed if/when portraying signs of rejecting the subordination and willingness to be shaped within cultural matrices or practices conducted by the state ideological apparatus such as churches, schools, families, legal, political institutions, etc. (Althusser, prev. Filipović, 2009: 28). Subjects' fitting into the cultural matrices is performed through ideology, (*Ibid*: 30). "Ideology is a system of ideas and representations dominating the mind of a man or social group"⁸⁴ (*Ibid*: 47). For example, such a system of ideas is religion, which is very important in *Hamlet* and the novel *Death and the Dervish*. A considerable amount of their plots is based on their pondering this motif and their behavior revolving (or not) around it.

In his book *Self-Fashioning in the Renaissance: from More to Shakespeare*, Stephen Greenblatt ponders the identity of an individual in Elizabethan England. In a concise but very detailed preface, he explains his approach to this topic and provides the premises his study is based on. In the introductory section of this study, Greenblatt

⁸⁴ „Ideologija je sistem ideja i predstava koje dominiraju umom čoveka ili društvene grupe” (*Истито*: 47).

states his point of view that in sixteenth-century England, individuals recognized the existence of selves and the potential to shape them. One of the clearest observations we can make is that during the sixteenth century, there seems to be an increased awareness of the construction of human identity as a process that can be manipulated and created (Greenblatt 2005: 2).

While such self-awareness was prevalent among the elite in the classical era, the advent of Christianity ushered in a progressive skepticism regarding humanity's ability to shape its own identity. Although this perspective was not the only point of view in the following centuries, it had considerable influence, and a strong alternative did not begin to emerge until early modern period (*Ibid*: 2).

For example, mid-wives of that time often tried to shape the skulls of newborns to comply with social standards (*Ibid.* : 2). The same goes for the personality and behavior of people. They must fit in the socially-imposed mold and behave according to well-established cultural, political, institutional and ideological matrix. The design concept can involve an abstract form: recognizable identity, unique approach to the world and a consistent manner of observation and action (Greenblatt 2005: 2).

Self-fashioning draws its significance from its action without drawing attention to a rigid separation of literature and social life. It consistently exceeds the boundaries that exist between the creation of literary characters, personal identity development, the experience of the influence of external forces and efforts to shape others. Although such boundaries must be rigorously maintained in critical analysis and in the fact that we make a difference between literary styles and behavioral styles, this approach reduces our understanding of intricate interrelationships within a certain culture (Greenblatt 2003: 3).

Self-fashioning can be seen as a renaissance interpretation of these control mechanisms, a system of meaning that shapes individuals navigating the process of transformation between intangible potential to tangible historical existence. In this framework, literature acts on three interconnected ways: as a reflection of specific behavior of its

author, as the embodiment of behavior-shaping codes and as a critical examination of the codes themselves (*Ibid.*).

Language like other sign systems, is a collective construct. Our interpretive endeavor must include a more nuanced understanding of the implications of this reality by examining both the social context of the literary text and the representation of the world within that text. The literary text remains the primary focus of this research on self-formation. Each of these texts is considered a center of gravity for intersecting forces in the sixteenth-century culture (*Ibid.*).

The importance of texts does not lie in our ability to discover the underlying historical principles behind them, but in our ability to analyze the interaction between their symbolic frame pieces of writing and those observable in the lives of their creators as well as in the wider social context. This analysis reveals a unique and intricate process of self-creation, allowing us to gain deeper insight into the formation of literary and social identities within this culture. In this way, we can achieve a tangible understanding of the implications for the concrete “I” of different types of power that are both concentrated in institutions, such as the court, the church, the colonial administration and the conservative family, while also spreading through the meaning-ideological frame pieces of writing, the prevailing modes of which person expresses himself and repetitive narrative patterns (*Ibid.*: 3).

In 1589, Spenser articulates that the fundamental aim and importance he has “crafted” in *The Faerie Queene* is “to cultivate a gentleman.” This sentiment is echoed through his knight Calidore’s assertion that “within each individual’s self... it is to shape his own lives ’estate.” Additionally, when Spenser conveys to his beloved in one of the Amoretti, “You shape my ideas and mold me from within”, he is alluding to the distinct connotations of the verb “fashion” in his time – a term conspicuously absent from Chaucer’s work. While the term has long been employed to denote the act of creation or to describe particular traits and appearances, as well as unique styles or designs, it is in the sixteenth century that “fashion” emerges as a

prevalent concept for articulating identity formation. This process of shaping can be interpreted quite literally as the physical formation of an individual; as Job poses in the King James Bible, “Did not someone create us in the uterus?” (*Ibid*: 2)

Fashioning may suggest another recognizable shape—a more or less distinct personality or manner of addressing the world itself, and a persistent way of seeing and behaving. As would be presumed, the Christ is the recurrent model for this last fashioning (Tyndale in: Greenblatt 2005: 2). The apostle Paul wrote in the epistle to the Romans that those whom God hath foreknown “them he fashion’d unto the shape of his son”: which means, according to Tyndale in the Obedience, that “the true Christian, He felt himself altered and fashioned like unto Christ” (*Ibid*: 3)

Archbishop Sandys preached that “we must fashion ourselves according to that similitude and likeness which is in him”, while the 1557 Geneva New Testament says that Christ “was disfigured to fashion us, he died for our life.” The ultimate example for this line of thought was Scripture itself: Paul, also to the Corinthians, says in Tyndale’s translation, „to the weak was I made weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some” (1 Cor. 9:22). This principle of adaptation is not only in service to the propagation of the gospel: in Richard Taverner’s *Garden of Wisdom* (1539), for example, we are informed that he who would be conversant in public affairs “must ... fashion himself to the manners of men,” and this admonition is promptly reiterated without ceasing (Greenblatt 2005: 3).

When it does not refer to Christ, which is a separation that can give rise to much anxiety—self-styling thus acquires a range of other meanings, it is the practice of parents and teachers; it is linked to manners or demeanor, more particularly that of the elite; it suggests hypocrisy or deception, an adherence to outward ceremony; it suggests representation of one’s nature or intention in speech or actions.

“And with representation we go back to literature, or rather we may see that self-fashioning derives its interest precisely from the fact that it functions without regard for a sharp distinction between

literature and social life. It invariably transcends the borders of the creation of literary characters, historico-cultural formation of one's own identity, the experience of being molded by forces over which one has no control, the attempt to fashion other selves"⁸⁵ (*Ibid*).

In essence, self-fashioning is a Renaissance form of evolutionary self-control i self-culturalization mechanism of the society that moves from an abstract to a material individual. Literature operates in the enclave as a form of manifestation of the concrete actions of the specific author, as an artwork or a literary piece is a depiction of the conduct of the conduct-forming codes, and as a notion of those codes. These practices of interpretation are, in my opinion, illustrated in the preceding essays, and they should be concerned with all three of these behaviors. If an interpretation restricts itself to the author's action, that becomes a literary biography (in a traditionally historical or meta-analytic manner), and there is a danger of not seeing the big picture of other meanings in which both the author and his works are woven. On the other hand, if literature is seen only as a system of social rules and orders, then it is in danger of losing its identity altogether as an ideology (Greenblatt 2005: 4).

The concept that is usually related to the British version of the New Historicism is Cultural Materialism. This syntagma was used by a British Marxist, Raymond Williams. This critical methodology is more harmonized with Marxist principles, and therefore has a certain degree of concern for social and political issues that are not in the academy-oriented US perspective. Cultural Materialism is the opposite of the internal approach to literature. He suggests combining historical context, theoretical frame pieces of writing (those covering

⁸⁵ „А са представљањем се враћамо на књижевност, или пре, можемо да схватимо да самообликовање изводи свој интерес управо из чињенице да оно функционише без обзира на оштру разлику између књижевности и друштвеног живота. Оно без изузетка прелази границу између стварања књижевних ликова, обликовања сопственог идентитета, доживљаја да вас обликују силе ван ваше контроле, покушаја да обликујете и друге идентитете" (Гринблат, прев. Невена Мрђеновић и Јелена Стакић, 2011: 22).

Marxism, feminism, structuralism, psychoanalysis and poststructuralism), and commitment to political engagement, with textual analysis (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 301).

In 1984, Jonathan Dollimore wrote about the double function of the text in his book *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology, and Power in Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries*. According to him, the text can be and is both a product and a producer. It is part of the culture and cultural framework of a given time, a certain community and their cultural matrices. As such, it has the power to influence the current discourse through various texts, influence social institutions as well as social self-awareness, as these elements also influence it, which is why it is a product. In Dollimore's view, materialist criticism connects the literary canon and its changeable interpretations to the cultural matrices that create them, while studying how those interpretations can reproduce or change those matrices. This reveals the non-existence of a complete, monolithic reality, because it, in that form, does not exist: there are disagreements and conflicts of interests under the "hegemonic" (Dollimore in: Grubačić 2012: 375–376).

The preface of the book *Political Shakespeare*, written by Dollimore and Sinfield, is based on Williams and Althusser's claim that the essence of cultural materialism is to understand a literary text in a very specific historical context (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 308).

For new historians and cultural materialists, a literary text is considered a concrete product of a certain historical epoch. According to this group of critics, any text can be considered a political act if the social, political and cultural structure of the context in which it was written can be recognized in it (Spremić 2011: 22). In Renaissance England, the context implies rigid institutions of power.

Social institutions such as the court, parliament, church, judiciary and educational institutions during the Elizabethan period were in charge of preserving a monolithic ideological image in the society. The theater in particular was under strict state control; acting troupes were obliged to have a nobleman as a patron, and scripts had to be approved by the authorities. The theater was, in a way, the

place where the king's rule continued. The period was notable for social mobility (especially under Cromwell), and Catholic-Protestant conflicts, as well as the beginnings of global ubiquity as England first established naval supremacy. The theater was a place of significant ideological struggle, where contradictions within the prevailing culture were very pronounced (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 323).

Ideological struggle rests on power and relationships of power. Like New Historicism, cultural materialism considers power relationships an important paradigm constituting the foundation for interpreting any text. However, one of the main differences differentiating these two focuses on their time: while New Historicism tackles power relations in societies that are historically far away from the modern ones, cultural materialism connects literary texts with current power relations (Spremić 2011: 23).

“Since ideas are transferred by material institutions – ideological state appliances, which, in parallel, with repressive state apparatus, maintain social system and shape material practice. Althusser claims that both ideas, as drivers and realization of the material world – material. The category of the subject is, according to him, an integral part of ideology, which constitutes subjects.”⁸⁶ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 309).

Greenblatt says that his method requires careful balancing, as it involves reconciling the various functional perspectives mentioned earlier. It is inherently complex; the main issues at hand make it impossible to completely isolate one type of discourse from another or to distinctly separate artworks from the thoughts and lives of their creators and audiences. Social actions are always situated within frameworks of public meaning and are interpreted, even by their creators. Similarly, the text of the literary works we analyze inherently reflects

⁸⁶ „Budući da se ideje prenose posredstvom materijalnih institucija – *ideoloških državnih aparata*, što, uporedo s *represivnim državnim aparatima*, održavaju društveni sistem i blikuju materijalnu praksu, Altiser tvrdi da su i *ideje*, kao pokretači i ostvarenje materijalnog sveta – *materijalne*. Kategorija subjekta je, po njemu, sastavni deo ideologije, koja konstituiše subjekte” (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 309).

this embeddedness. Language, similar to other systems of signs, is a collective creation; our task is to more sensitively understand the implications of this by examining both the social context of the literary text and the reflection of society within that text, including oral responses, innovations, and counter influences (Greenblatt 2005: 3).

The efforts of authorities to assert power and control during the Renaissance in England are evident in their treatment of language. This era featured distinct linguistic variations employed by different sectors, including the State, the Church, everyday citizens, families, and the lower classes. Each of these groups utilized diverse registers of language. The State, as an embodiment of Power, Authority, and Control, aimed to overshadow other forms of expression and influence within social discussions. Consequently, its 'language' permeated various forms of renaissance prose, alongside fiction and artistic works, as well as bureaucratic documents, medical texts, personal correspondence, and marriage certificates. Through this approach, the government aimed to regulate social interactions and the structural components of state mechanisms, encompassing law, religion, medicine, theater, and literature, as their absence could lead to political instability. In the sixteenth century, there is no singular narrative of the self, but rather a result of our tendency to simplify the complexities of intricate and creative individuals into manageable and orderly forms (Greenblatt 2005: 2).

The writers discussed here share several notable characteristics.

First, none of these figures hold a title, a longstanding family legacy, or a status that ties their personal identity to "a clan or caste". With the exception of Wyatt, all these authors belong to the middle class (*Ibid*: 9).

Second, self-fashioning for these individuals requires submission to a higher power or authority that exists outside of themselves, such as God, a revered text, or institutions like the "church, court, or colonial and military administrations". While Marlowe stands out due to his intense opposition to hierarchical authority, this very defiance can sometimes reflect a form of submission (*Ibid*).

Third, self-fashioning occurs in relation to something perceived as foreign, unusual, or threatening. This menacing Other – be it a “heretic, savage, witch, adulteress, traitor, or Antichrist” – needs to be identified or fabricated for the purpose of confrontation and destruction (*Ibid*: 9).

Fourth, the authority views the foreign element as either chaotic and lacking order or as a false representation of order, which is often seen as a demonic distortion. Consequently, descriptions of chaos tend to become organized and thematic, with the chaotic easily transforming into the demonic, leading to a perception of the alien as a warped reflection of authority (*Ibid*: 9).

Fifth, what one person sees as authority may be perceived as alien by another (*Ibid*: 9).

Sixth, when one form of authority or alien presence is eliminated, another inevitably emerges (*Ibid*: 9).

Seventh, multiple authorities and aliens coexist at any given moment (*Ibid*: 9).

Eighth, although authority and alien presence are external, they are also experienced as internal necessities, meaning that both submission and destruction are internalized processes (*Ibid*: 9).

Ninth, self-fashioning is primarily, though not solely, expressed through language (*Ibid*: 9).

Finally, the power harnessed to confront the alien on behalf of the authority often exceeds its intended purpose, posing a threat to the very authority it seeks to uphold. Thus, self-creation is consistently accompanied by feelings of threat, erosion, or loss of self (*Ibid*: 9).

Self-fashioning takes place at the intersection of authority and the outsider. The outcome of this interaction reflects both the authority and the outsider who is often seen as a target. As a result, any identity that is formed through this process inherently carries the indicators of its potential undermining or erosion (*Ibid*: 8–9).

The process of shaping oneself and undergoing the process of shaping by cultural institutions such as family, religion, and the state was deeply interconnected. There were no instances of complete,

unrestricted subjectivity. In fact, the human subject often appears to lack freedom, emerging as an ideological creation influenced by the power dynamics present within a specific society (*Ibid*: 256). The sixteenth-century English figures remain firmly attached to the human experience and the concept of self-fashioning, even when they reflect on themes like the absorption, corruption, or loss of the self. What other options were available to them? What is the alternative now, for that matter? The Renaissance individuals we have examined recognize that in our society, forsaking self-fashioning equates to relinquishing the desire for freedom and surrendering one's tenacity (Greenblatt 2005: 256–257).

Meša Selimović used his own personal, ideologically-related tragedy as the thematic backbone of his most famous novel (Cooper Jr. in: M. Selimović 2018: 9). In the book *umesto in Vil iz Stratforda: Kako je Šekspir postao Šekspir*, Greenblatt writes that Shakespeare may have received the news of his son's illness in 1596. It was a turbulent period in his life. At that moment he was in London, where a lot was happening. First, the patron of the theater company to which the writer himself belonged, Henry Carey, died. In addition, the voices of clergymen and political leaders of the gutter started to be heard again about how, for the sake of protecting the health of the city, both moral and physical, the theaters should be closed. This must have had a negative effect on the other members of Shakespeare's acting company. Moreover, it was not only talked about, but also acted upon. Performances could not be performed in the locations where the city inns were located, and there was even a possibility that it would have gone one step further – that the rulers had caused all the theater houses to be closed for an indefinite period of time. Because of this inhibition, the actors were forced to play their plays elsewhere. They did it, and spent the summer months outside of London, on tour, traveling. Greenblatt gives several options as to where Shakespeare was at that time: either he was on tour with his theater colleagues or he was staying in London writing one of his plays: *King John*, the first part of *Henry IV*, or *The Merchant of Venice*. But what Greenblatt considers certain is that the news reached the great writer

that his son was ill, which resulted in his returning home to Stratford as soon as possible. And it may be that he arrived too late to find Hamnet alive. There is no record of how Shakespeare felt at the time, but what is known is that it was not the first death he faced in his life. Namely, when he was a 15-year-old boy, his seven-year-old sister passed away (Greenblatt, trans. Stojanović, 2006: 288–289). Greenblatt writes that the connection between the personal experience of losing a child and the play *Hamlet* was very clear to the audience at the time (*Ibid*: 311).

Shakespeare's tragedy *Hamlet* fundamentally explores suicidal ideas that stem from losing a loved one, which the audience intuitively realized. This topic can also reflect the author's internal turmoil. The playwright named his twins Judith and Hamnet, according to their neighbors, Judith and Hamnet Sadler, in Stratford. Historical records from Stratford indicate that Hamnet was alternately called Hamnet and Hamlet Sadler, which is the result of flexible writing conventions. Often writing the name of his son, together with the remaining name, could re-open an emotional wound that never fully healed, even if the decision was to look again at this tragic narrative was motivated by financial reasons. It is important to note that the plunging of the main character in madness in *Hamlet* caused by the death of his father, not the son. If the tragedy is really rooted in Shakespeare's personal experiences, it could be speculated that he connected his son's death with an imaginary death of his father. The term "imagined" is used here because Shakespeare's father is buried September 8, 1601. In the church of the Holy Trinity in the cemetery. Although perhaps approached to the end of its life, he was probably still alive during the creation of the play and its first performances. Shakespeare thinking about his father's death and son raise intriguing questions regarding their interconnection in his psyche (*Ibid*: 311).

Milica Spremić writes in her book that Shakespeare lost both his son and his father within six years". Maybe he was still under a lot of stress as his father's death is deeply woven into the plot of the play. His son's death as well as the certain death of his father – are difficult moments of mourning and memories – representing a mental anxiety that could

describe the explosive power and the depth of pronounced feelings in *Hamlet*⁸⁷ (*Ibid.*: 317). It is, therefore, reasonable to assume Shakespeare's son's death could have been the foundation for *Hamlet*.

The common characteristic of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and Meša Selimović's novel *Death and the Dervish* is the fact that: "between the order of action and the moral order in Shakespearean world, there is an opposition, which is human destiny. It is impossible to escape from it"⁸⁸ (Kott 1990: 30). Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin were made sure that was true, being put in a situation that they had to decide for either of those two opposing orders. This is how their identity is fashioned, that is shaped.

The formation of a recognizable self involves a delicate balance against powerful control mechanisms. Regardless of whether it focuses on the autonomous self or the self presented in literature, through the literary character, Greenblatt positions subjectivity in the context of mutually contrasting forces. This relationship includes "the Other" on one side while absolutist authorities are on the other. As such, they represent a threat and undermine the possibility of developing and achieving human autonomy. Moreover, Greenblatt claims that writers, as they are deeply ingrained in their cultural mile, produce pieces reflecting political tensions the Tudor state faced and document their complex relations with Others and authorities. He refrains from putting these texts in a separate aesthetic area, and analyzes them in relation to the political challenges of England from the sixteenth century instead. His examinations reveal that Renaissance literature can be understood in the light of its institutions, customs and ideologies, whose importance was reflected in its power and ability to influence

⁸⁷ „Možda su mu misli bile još napregnutije jer je razmišljanje o očevoj smrti duboko utkano u zaplet drame. Sinovljeva smrt kao i neumitna očeva smrt – teški su trenuci žalosti i uspomena – predstavljaju duševnu uznemirenost kojom se može opisati eksplozivna snaga i dubina izraženih osećanja u Hamletu” (*Исцїло*: 317).

⁸⁸ „Između poretka delovanja i poretka moralnog u šekspirovskom svetu postoji suprotnost. Ta suprotnost je ljudska sudbina. Iz nje je nemoguće istrgnuti se” (Kot 1990: 30).

culture fashioning, its discourses and matrices significant for the development of society and collective awareness during the Tudor dynasty reign (Greenblat 2005: 256–257).

They tried to control the medium and high layers of society and restrict them in building their own identity. “It may be the simplest and say that it was increased in 16th century in terms of human identity design as a skill, procedure subject to manipulation”⁸⁹ (Greenblatt, trans. Mrđenović and Stakić, 20). The essence of the relationship is in the efforts of the institution or more of them to support the individual and thus maintain its absolutist order that generates a high degree of control over all members of society, through which control is established.

Moreover, a multitude of empirical data suggests that the 16th century may be a small degree of autonomy in the process of self-fashioning than in previous centuries, as institutions (families, state and church) imposed rigid discipline with their subjects who belonged to higher and high social stations. Although important, the issue of autonomy is not crucial. The ability to fashion its own identity is a subset of much wider capabilities of fashioning the identity of others, at least to some extent (*Ibid*: 19).

This means that as far as the individual is concerned, self-fashioning, “[...] involves subjugation of absolute power or authority, which is at least partially situated outside the person – God, a holy book, institutions like the church, the court [...]”⁹⁰ (*Ibid*: 28).

In his research, Greenblatt focuses on the sixteenth century and how “I” was created and presented because he believes it was the first period in England in which human identity was considered flexible both

⁸⁹ „Можда је најједноставније и рећи да је у 16. веку постојала повећана самосвест у погледу обликовања људског идентитета као вештине, поступка подложног манипулацији” (Гринблат, прев. Мрђеновић и Стакић, 2011: 20).

⁹⁰ „[...] укључује потчињавање апсолутној моћи или ауторитету, који су бар делимично смештени изван особе – Бог, света књига, установа попут цркве, двора [...]” (*Исцито*: 28).

on social and individual level. He names it “fashioning”, a term he believes represent its own consciousness of that period. Greenblatt attributes credit for influencing his work to Burckhard’ *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, especially the perception of both the state and the individual in Italy in the fifteenth century as subject of art (Strir 1982: 383–394).

Greenblatt’s deviation from Burkhard lies in his perception about how deep culture defines and limits the available models available for the individual inside it. Greenblatt initially accepted Burkhard’s view [...], but gradually became aware of social impacts on individual decisions and opportunities. Greenblatt represents the position that satire and psalms express two dialogical modes of self-coupling: satire through negation and psalms through subordination. After reading the book, one does not only think about one’s freedom or its appearance, but also where they themselves and their presentations are positioned in societies with strict and specific standards (*Ibid.*).

Greenblatt says that

“[...] in the early modern period, there is a change in intellectual, social, psychological and aesthetic structures that govern identity creation. [...] If we say that there is a new emphasis of the executive power of will, we must say that there is also the most persistent and most unusual attack on will; If we say that there is new social mobility, we must say that there is a new determination of power, both families and the state, which determine any movement within society; If we say that there is an increased awareness of alternative ways of social, theological and psychological organization, we must also say that there is a new commitment to these ways and, finally, destroy these alternatives. It may be simplest to notice and say that in the 16th century, it seems, there was an increased self-consciousness in terms of human identity shaping as a skill, procedure subject to manipulation. This self-awareness was widespread among the elite in ancient world, but Christianity brought a growing doubt in the power of a man to shape himself. [...] as a term that means the activity or process of creating special features, a certain style or pattern, it has been in use for a long time, but it seems to the

16th century shaping entered wide use as a way to mark the shaping of one's own identity. This shaping can be understood quite literally, as imposing personalities of body form [...]”⁹¹ (Greenblatt 2005: 2).

Each intention of deviations from subjugation is a space for subversion and,

„[...] traces of diversity and unusual meaning resistance to the revision of government”⁹² (Lešić 2003: 28). The New Historians took over the idea of the state from Michel Foucault. He saw the state as a monolithic, ominous force, which his institutions (“discursive practice” or “repressive structures”, in order to say Althusser) holding society under strict supervision [...]”⁹³ (*Ibid*: 29).

⁹¹ „[...] у раном модерном периоду постоји промена у интелектуалним, друштвеним, психолошким и естетским структурама које управљају стварањем идентитета. [...] Ако кажемо да постоји ново наглашавање извршне моћи воље, морамо рећи да постоји и најупорнији и најнеуморнији напад на вољу; ако кажемо да постоји нова друштвена покретљивост, морамо рећи да постоји и ново утврђивање моћи, и породице и државе, које одређују свако кретање у оквиру друштва; ако кажемо да постоји повишена свест о алтернативним начинима друштвене, теолошке и психолошке организације, морамо рећи и да постоји нова посвећеност наметању тих начина и, коначно, уништавању ових алтернатива. Можда је најједноставније уочити и рећи да је у 16. веку, како изгледа, постојала повећана самосвест у погледу обликовања људског идентитета као вештине, поступка подложног манипулацији. Оваква самосвест била је распрострањена међу елитом у античком свету, али је хришћанство донело растућу сумњу у моћ човека да сам себе обликује. [...] као термин који означава делатност или поступак стварања нарочитих одлика изгледа, одређеног стил или обрасца, реч је дуго била у употреби, али је, изгледа, у 16. веку обликовање ушло у широку употребу као начин да се означи обликовање сопственог идентитета. Ово обликовање може се разумети прилично буквално, као наметање личности телесног облика [...]” (Гринблат, прев. Мрђеновић и Стакић, 2011: 19–20).

⁹² „[...] tragove različitosti i neuobičajenosti koji su značili otpor diskursu Vlasti” (Lešić 2003: 28).

⁹³ „[...] Državu vidio kao monolitnu, svebuhvatnu silu, koja svojim institucijama („diskurzivnom praksom” ili „represivnim strukturama”, kako bi rekao Altiser) drži društvo pod strogim nadzorom [...]” (*Ibid*: 29).

The relationship between the individual and the state as the relationship of resistance and subversion reasoned with New Historicism.

The opposing forces play the game of history as the movements of discourse formations, and Foucault's power theory explains the position of the genealogists. Considering Nietzsche's argument that no historical description is ever complete, Foucault's genealogy turned to history and power phenomena. In genealogy, power, interest and will are in the foreground. While traditional history gives events that logically and organically result in the present, a genealogist presents arguments for heterogeneity and forces of power that produce heterogeneous present (Sprenić 2011: 16).

The genealogy, developed by Foucault, changed the perception of power as a negative construct, which is experienced as domination over the existing element in something much more complex. The power did not only remain repressive, exclusive or only limiting. It is characterized as positive and productive. Individuals, discourses and events occur as a product of power network and what this dynamic can create (Sprenić 2011: 16). The text is, "[...] viewed as a field where political battles are taking place between the superior forces of repression and subversive individuals"⁹⁴ (Lešić 2003: 33), as in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*. With this in mind,

"[...] it describes the practice of parents and teachers; it is linked to manners or demeanor, particularly that of the elite; it may suggest hypocrisy or deception, an adherence to mere outward ceremony; it suggests representation of one's nature or intention in speech or actions"⁹⁵ (Greenblatt 2005: 3).

⁹⁴ „[...] promatra kao polje na kojem se odvijaju političke bitke između nadmoćnih snaga represije i subverzivnih pojedinaca" (Lešić 2003: 33),

⁹⁵ „Самообликовање добија нови низ значења: оно описује оно што раде родитељи и учитељи; повезано је са манирима или понашањем према другима, нарочито понашањем елите; оно може да укаже на лицемерје или обмањивање, склоност према пуком спољашњем представљању; указује на представљање нечије природе или намере у говору или на делу" (Гринблат, прев. Мрђеновић и Стакић, 2011: 21–22)

The institutions of authority in Renaissance keep their position that the God himself gave them since in Elizabethan Age, the ruler is a representative of God on Earth and any rebellion against him is inadmissible, because it is a violation of God's will (Kostić 1983: 44). Each rebellion must be ended as soon as it starts, and an individual is forced to be a screw in the machinery that grinds any attempts of self-fashioning. Naturally, this has its genesis.

“Stephen Greenblatt's study *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* [...] is written under the distinct influence of Foucault's writings *Discipline and Punish*, and *The History of Sexuality*⁹⁶. In his books he draws the genealogy of modern identity and claims that the idea of private and ghostual subjectivity is the effect of a new modus of monitoring and a new way to portray the power originated in Renaissance”⁹⁷ (Spremić 2011: 16–17).

The power is one of the phenomena intriguing Stephen Greenblatt, “[...] one of the main preoccupations of his research”⁹⁸ (Spremić 2011: 64). He is interested in,

“[...] all aspects: how it circulates, how to limit the subversion, how to create an illusion of individual freedom and freedom of choice and how even the power is formed by discourse tricks and power”⁹⁹ (*Ibid.*).

In her book, Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić argues the following:

“During the rule of the Tudor dynasty, the so-called 'Tudor's myth', according to which the reign of Henry VII, Henry III and Elizabeth is presented as a reward for the English people, previously punished a by

⁹⁶ Mišel Fuko, *Nadzirati i kažnjavati i Istorija seksualnosti*.

⁹⁷ „studija Stivena Grinblata *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* [...] pisana je pod izrazitim uticajem Fukoovih dela *Nadzirati i kažnjavati* i prvog toma *Istorije seksualnosti*. U njoj Grinblat iscertava genealogiju modernog identiteta i tvrdi da je ideja privatne i duhovne subjektivnosti efekat novog modusa nadziranja i novog načina iskazivanja moći nastale u renesansi” (Spremić 2011: 16–17).

⁹⁸ „[...] jedna od glavnih preokupacija Grinblatovih istraživanja” (*Ibid.* 64).

⁹⁹ „[...] svi njeni aspekti: kako cirkuliše, kako ograničava subverziju, kako stvara iluziju individualne slobode volje i slobode izbora i kako čak i onaj koji poseduje moć biva oblikovan pomoću diskurzivnih trikova te moći” (*Исцјуо*).

long civic wars due to the sin committed in 1399, when by overthrowing Richard II Plantagenet by his cousin Henry Bolinbrook, the founders of the Lankaster dynasty, was first endangered by the rule of the monarch to the throne should have been given based on the right of primogeniture. For a long time, the Shakespeare's two tetralogies and especially the first one portraying historical events closer to Shakespeare and his contemporaries, with the aforementioned ending celebrating Tudor dynasty, was interpreted in accordance with Tydor's myth, and Shakespeare was considered a spokesman of the official politics"¹⁰⁰ (Bečanović-Nikolic 2013: 67).

Apart from this, she points out the fact that the role of the law and the importance of it being followed by any member of the community, including the ruler, is underlined in *Hamlet*. This also portrays the play's political layer, however minor when compared to the mother-son relationship it may seem to be. The political dimension of the play is surely one of the play's crucial thematic hotspots.

In *Hamlet*, as well as in *Death and the Dervish*, Shakespeare, as well as Meša Salimović, "[...] strikingly raises the question of a ruler's responsibility and at least theoretically assumed ideal impartiality of the law"¹⁰¹ (*Ibid*: 71).

Devotion to the law implies a high level of development of moral passion and reason. In Elizabethan England until the 18th century, moral consciousness was believed to be determined by reason, which

¹⁰⁰ „За време владавине Тјудора, развијен је и такозвани 'тјудоровски мит', по којем је просперитетни период владавине Хенрија VII, Хенрија III и Елизабете I, представљен као награда за напаћени енглески народ, претходно кажњен дугорајним грађанским ратовима због греха почињеног 1399, када је свргавањем с престола Ричарда II Плантагенета од стране његовог брата од стрица Хенрија Болинбрука, оснивача династије Ланкастер, први пут угрожена владавина монарха који је престо наследио по неприкосновеном праву примогенитуре. Дуго су Шекспирове две тетралогije, а нарочито прва, која приказује историјске догађаје ближе Шекспиру и његовим савременицима, с већ помињаним крајем у којем се слави настанак династије Тјудор, тумачене у складу с тјудорским митом, а Шекспир схватан као гласноговорник званичне политике” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 67).

¹⁰¹ „[...] упечатљиво поставља питање одговорности владара и барем теоријски претпостављене идеалне непристрасности закона” (Исто: 71).

was thought to receive divine knowledge of truth, error, good, and evil. The main moral dilemma for individuals was seen as the conflict between passion and reason (Kostić 1983: 43).

Radovan Vučković discusses the governments attempts to control different facets of society through the lens of language explaining the role of language in the literary development of Serbian writers in his essay on Meša Selimović's narrative techniques. During the 1960s Selimović began his most significant work *Death and the Dervish* which marked a significant shift in his critical focus. This book was written in a distinctive way combining firsthand accounts with a larger historical framework. Surprisingly the topic of conversation has shifted to the function of language which skillfully turns historical occurrences and realities into literary fiction (Vučković in: Palavestra (ed.) 2010: 43).

Similar to how Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is based on important moments in the playwright's own life, *Death and the Dervish* also relies heavily on the author's own experience. The play itself contains the historical and biographical details that *Hamlet* alludes to. Vučković points out that Selimović had to turn historical material into a story in *Death and the Dervish*. This novel however is not regarded as a literary or artistic production that exists apart from its historical setting rather it is entwined with other literary and non-literary works of the era that offer a cultural framework for comprehending these stories. Many works of literature capture the political atmosphere of their era. The difficulty Selimović faced in incorporating historical details into *Death and the Dervish* serves as an example of this. Because new historicism views literary works as reflections of a past culture that is different from our own it can be used to analyze this Serbian text. The only way to comprehend the expressive codes of that time period is to look at them as existing texts rather than as distinct works of art (*Ibid.*).

Hamlet is greatly impacted by important moments in Shakespeare's life and reflects the historical setting he alludes to, much like *Death and the Dervish* which is based on the authors own life experiences.

As Vučković claims, Selimović had to deal with the difficulty of turning historical facts into a story in *Death and the Dervish*. In addition to being a work of literature detached from its historical context this work engages with other literary and non-literary works of its era offering a cultural viewpoint that deepens our comprehension. Literature often reflects the political atmosphere of the time in which it was written. *Death and the Dervish* was written with Selimović's task of turning historical facts into a narrative form as a primary focus. This Serbian novel can be analyzed using the New Historicist framework which holds that literary works represent a specific cultural past that is different from what we currently understand. These pieces are regarded as reflections of a particular historical setting rather than as standalone works of art and the only way to understand their meaning is to consult the texts that have survived (*Ibid.*).

As mentioned in Vladimir Kecmanović's essay "The Assets of Escaping to Allegory", *Death and the Dervish* examines the political and cultural norms of its era. Considered a modern story set in the Ottoman Empire-influenced Islamic landscape of Bosnia the tale of a dervish whose brothers misfortune forces Hamlet to struggle with the choice of awareness fully aware of the horror and inevitable defeat that such a choice brings. Nonetheless the work will be recognized as an allegory by those who are familiar with the authors personal struggles the historical setting and the environment in which it was written. A more candid examination of his situation is made possible by the author's transposition of the communist regime into a new ideological and temporal context (Kecmanović in Palavestra (ed.) 2010: 169).

Shakespeare also places *Hamlet* in the distant past of Denmark in order to examine the political climate of Renaissance England. Shakespeare undoubtedly made use of past readings of the play ranging from Thomas Kyd to Belforest. The novel and the play however both eloquently demonstrate the important role of literary creativity when analyzed. The chapter that tackles the evolution of this play and the theme of retribution within England's early Renaissance literary tradition will go into greater detail on this.

1.5 THE NEW HISTORICIST INTERPRETATION OF POWER IN *HAMLET* AND *DEATH AND THE DERVISH*

If we understand the kasaba authorities from the Serbian novel as the kings from the Shakespeare's (historical) plays, because that is who they are based on their importance in the political hierarchy in the community, a parallel can be drawn regarding that hierarchy in both writings. Namely, in *Hamlet*, the main conflict on the political level is the one between an usurper and the Prince. There are not many people between these two political figures except maybe Polonius prior to being killed by Hamlet. The king-usurper is on top of the political system instead of Hamlet. The system being the manner in which the state functions and, more importantly, the authority of the ruler who demands, requires, expects complete and utter subordination of members of the society based on his divine position.

In the light of Greenblatt's view on the process of self-fashioning, this can be translated as: "[...] there is only a situation of the king and the system" (Kott 1990: 30). Such an organization of the state means that "[...] there is no choice of freedom"¹⁰² (*Ibid.*). Both protagonists are pressed by ideological necessity in a situation of repression of a political system that killed an innocent man. Nedžad Dedović says that

"[...] New Historicism interpretation means emphasizing the effect of centers of power – the logic of forces managing society as well as the forms of resisting the power control – ideals of individual freedom, resistance to authority. One of the basic postulates of the New Historicism, is the claim that the texts reflect history. We believe that the principles of new historicism criticism correspond to the character of Selimović's novels and therefore can be seen and interpreted from the perspective of New Historicism"¹⁰³ (Dedović 2012).

¹⁰² „[...] nema u njoj slobode izbora” (Исто).

¹⁰³ „[...] novohistorijsko tumačenje podrazumijeva i naglašavanje djelovanja centara moći – logiku sila koje upravljaju društvom ali i oblike otimanja kontroli Moći – ideale individualne slobode, otpor autoritetu vlasti. Jedan je od

At its beginning, the Serbian novel portrays a man loyal to religion and its dogma, who becomes a political authority and the ideology-run state system clerk, which leads him to betraying his best friend and, eventually, his own death, while in *Hamlet*, the protagonist, who is a representative of the royal family, there is a conflict between him and Claudius, a self-proclaimed ruler, King, who reached the crown, by having committed fratricide and committing sin.

Tackling the political side of *Death and the Dervish*, Miroslav Egerić argues: “Of course, this is not a situation of – as in Shakespeare – grand fresco-strokes of history ruining and raising states, changing Kingdoms or obtaining crowns for (temporary) enjoying ruling power [...]”¹⁰⁴ (Egerić 2000: 53). That is, of course, right. However, it is precisely the word portrayed in *Hamlet*. Ahmed Nuruddin and the Danish Prince are put in the same situation in which unlawful and unhealthy proceedings of Machiavelistic heroes who are, “[...] unscrupulous, selfish manipulators, skilled rhetoric without morals [...]”¹⁰⁵ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 66). Both pieces of writing are founded on the same motif, which is a murder of an innocent man by those or the one in power, Harun and King Hamlet, for the sake of preservation of power. They are the threatening Other(s), about whom Greenblatt writes in his study *Renaissance Self-fashioning: from More to Shakespeare*, the Other, who is a threat that must be removed, either in the fortress or in England, better yet, in death.

King Hamlet killed his own flesh and blood, his brother, a new king, a man at the top of the political system, the new, next ruler, who

osnovnih postulata novog historizma tvrdnja da tekstovi reflektiraju historiju. Smatramo da navedeni principi novohistorijske kritike korespondiraju s karakterom Selimovićevih romana te se stoga mogu posmatrati i interpretirati iz perspektive novog historizma” (Dedović 2012).

¹⁰⁴ „Наравно, овде није реч – као код Шекспира – о великим „фреско – потезима” историје којима се руше и подижу државе, мењају краљевства или прибављају круне за (привремено) уживање у владарској моћи [...]” (Егерић 2000: 53).

¹⁰⁵ „[...] бескрупулозни, себични манипулатори, вешти реторичари без морала [...]” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 66).

is on the throne, a man who is not just an ordinary man, but, due to being a king, also is an institution, the most important piece of an overall political order. He killed him during peaceful times, without any other reason and but his own benefit, ambition and greed. What he did is an injustice, a crime, a sin for which Hamlet finds out when it is already late, after his father was killed. Soon enough, he will find out the identity of the killer. *The Grand Mechanism of History* Jan Kott writes about would stand in front of him on a mystical night in the form of his father's ghost, the victim of the moral corruption of his illegitimate successor, who surrendered to indulging his passions such as the desire to sleep with his former sister-in-law, for the royal status, for a throne, and, lastly, for the decadence embodied in allowing drinking parties.

When it comes to the crime that was committed, Ahmed Nuruddin, similarly, learns, "[...] that those in powers, the highest-ranking representatives of political order, "justice" (highhandedness, absurd, injustice) killed his brother"¹⁰⁶ (Egerić 2000: 54). Institutions and their representatives are responsible for Harun's murder. Ahmed Nuruddin tries to, representing humanity and blood kinship, kindly ask them to release his brother or, at least, that also ask them kindly what he did, why he is arrested in the first place. He is a dervish forced by the staged unfortunate circumstances raise the question asked by a man is, not (only) a dervish, who is also the part of the political order given his title and rank.

That question poses a man who, at that moment really does believe in in justice and fairness of the law, who is unaware of the cruelty of society that subordinates justice to its interests so that they benefit from ti, and to their personal gain. Spending time in tekke, Nuruddin is not aware of the arbitrariness of political representatives in kasaba. He is convinced that the system of government is not a cruel repressive apparatus, but an arranged set of rules, like the ones

¹⁰⁶ „[...] да су моћници власти, поретка, „правде” (самовоље, апсурда, неправде) убили његовог брата” (Егерић 2000: 54).

followed by him and his fellow colleagues, in accordance with which they live and behave.

Nuruddin addresses a few local political instances that, theoretically, could and should help him. Those are musellim, kadi and mufti, at first followed by the police and, finally, valia's deferdar. He is, however, not only roughly, inhumanely (mis)treated by all of them, but also humiliated with their arrogance, hypocrisy, disinterest. His cries for help face a strong resistance, the same as Hamlet's sorrow for the deceased, killed father is met with the disapproval of the new ruling couple. Humanism that Nuruddin expresses, be it only to soothe his desperate father, is opposed to the interests of the authorities. He threatens them as Hamlet endangers Claudius later in the play, and thus, and the state itself, with his insanity in which everyone believes, or, more precisely, the one he makes everyone believe but his friend Horatio to whom he admits his plan to pretend to be crazy.

“In *Death and the Dervish*, local powerful people are behaving repressively towards Ahmed Nuruddin because his words and seeking justice for his innocent brother point out to unjust decisions of the government system, especially kadi, the institution that should be among the first ones to symbolize and prove it by his acts the state based on justice. Nuruddin becomes a danger to the authorities because his behaviour “connects the system of dogmas with real relations” (Protić in: Lagumdžija, 1986: 223), indicates the going against on the dogma which is the most severe sin in the society that is ideologically marked”¹⁰⁷ (Dedović 2012).

¹⁰⁷ „U *Dervišu* lokalni moćnici represivno djeluju na Ahmeda Nurudina jer svojim riječima i traganjem za pravdom za nevinoga brata ukazuje na nepravedne odluke sistema vlasti, posebno kadije, institucije koja među prvim treba simbolizirati i svojim postupcima potvrđivati pravednu državu. Nuruddin postaje opasnost za moćnike jer svojim nastupima „dovodi u vezu sistem dogmi sa realnim odnosima” (Protić u: Lagumdžija, 1986: 223), ukazuje na ogriješenje o dogmu što je najteži grijeh u društvu koje je ideološki markirano” (Dedović 2012). <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/>

“Five” instances „of power are also bulletproof “fortresses”, a symbol present in all Selimović’s novels. Nuruddin’s humiliation caused by the authorities through five of its “instances” – musellim, who rejects him roughly and lets him know he is insignificant, while throwing his opposing to the Holy Book to his face; kadi, who mocks and sends him to “a stinking dungeon”; the police officer, who also ridicules and humiliates him, and sends him in the fortress while suffocating; mufti in front of whom he must act as a circus performer; and, lastly, Valia’s Defterdar who pushes him to sign a warrant for Hassan’s arrest, which, makes Nuruddin, become “garbage” (*Death and the Dervish*, p.400)¹⁰⁸ (*Ibid.*).

Ahmed Nuruddin’s initial premise is the system of government values his dervish vocation, but this is not the case. The government perceives him like any other individual in the kasaba. Musellim and kadi even use the law and the Koran against him with the intention of letting him know that in an ideologically-colored verbal duel against them chances are slim to none to fight for his brother Harun. Mufti, on the other hand, shows him that neither a different approach, an attempt to awaken his attention by acting crazy, as Hamlet, will not have a different effect. He finds this offensive not only as the dervish, but as a man, too. When fighting against institutions, an individual is defeated either way. When he confronts them and when he is trying to draw their attention, but also when he uses their means. Either his dignity or his morality and humanity in him will be suffocated.

¹⁰⁸ „Pet „instanci” moći predstavljaju i neprobojne „tvrđave”, simbol koji je prisutan u svim Selimovićevim romanima. Nuruddina vlast ponižava preko pet svojih „instanci” – muselima koji ga grubo odbija i stavlja mu do znanja da je beznačajan, te mu imputira suprotstavljanje *Svetoj knjizi*; kadije koji mu se ruga i šalje ga u „smrdljivu tamnicu”; policajaca koji ga također ismijavaju i ponižavaju, te urakljenog i zagušenog sprovode u tvrđavu; muftije pred kojim je prisiljen da glumi cirkusanta; i, na kraju, valijinog defterdara koji ga primorava da potpiše nalog za Hasanovo hapšenje čime, kako kaže Nuruddin, postaje „đubre” (*Derviš i smrt*: 400)” (Исцо). <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/>

Such an attitude of “the authority sends a message that an individual is completely insignificant in relation to the system. It also points out that everyone and at any time might become the victim of the totalitarian system”¹⁰⁹ (*Ibid.*), such as Harun, as Hamlet was supposed to be by falling in a trap Claudius prepared for him by sending him to England, like King Hamlet, who was killed in his garden, far from the battlefield..

“The death of a ruler is, by all means, a political issue, although, for Hamlet it primarily represents the loss of criminally killed father”¹¹⁰ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 98). On the other hand, “in the 1960s, by publishing the masterpiece of Yugoslav literature, the novel *Death and the Dervish*, Meša Selimović provides the synthesis of existential issues of his prose, through the key topic of the innocent brother’s execution [...]”¹¹¹ (Andrejević 1996: 7). His “[...] brother is guilty because as a young clerk, he revealed the documents that were written by the authorities in which the accused man was blamed without hearing so that he could be executed because he knew too much”¹¹² (Milošević 2005: 223). The culprit is also an enemy in relation to the order, the hostile Other, such as King Hamlet and Harun.

In both pieces of writing the guilty ones or, at least, those responsible for the death of King Hamlet and Harun should be sought in the ranks of the authorities, among Machiavellian authorities. The connection of the play and the novel and Shakespeare and Selimović

¹⁰⁹ „vlast šalje poruku da je pojedinac potpuno beznačajan u odnosu na sistem, ali se time ukazuje i na činjenicu da svako i u svakom trenutku može postati žrtvom totalitarnog sistema” (*Истито*),

¹¹⁰ „Смрт владара је, свакако, политичко питање, иако за Хамлета првенствено представља губитак злочиначки убијеног оца” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 98).

¹¹¹ „Шездесетих година, појавом ремек-дела југословенске књижевности *Дервиш и смрт*, Меша Селимовић у својој литерарној величини, даје синтезу егзистенцијалних питања своје прозе, кроз кључну тему смакнућа невиног брата [...]” (Андрејевић 1996: 7).

¹¹² „[...] brat je kriv zato što je kao mladi pisar otkrio dokumenta koja je vlast sastavila o krivcima bez saslušanja radi smaknuća zato što su mnogo znali” (Milošević 2005: 223).

lies in the fact that King Hamlet and Harun resonate with Shakespeare's and Selimović's deceased members of the close family: the son and the brother, respectively. King Hamlet, as we stated earlier, was killed. Selimović's brother, Ševkija, was shot. The minor violation is a motive transposed into the *Death and the Dervish*. It refers to the offense made by Harun, the dervish Ahmed Nuruddin's younger brother.

This motive corresponds to the lack of King Hamlet's guilt. His innocence is reflected in the innocence of Harun and Ševkija Selimović because they did not commit any crime. Furthermore, their actions reveal how the system uses fear to discipline its subjects. They were both killed for the crime that is not really a crime. The absence of guilt makes them sufferers who who died as victims of the Great Mechanism of power (Egerić 2000: 55). This mechanism is responsible for the death of Hamlet's father. The mechanism is Claudius, the usurper, himself.

Yugoslavia was a state in which the war was waged when Selimović's brother was murdered (1944). According to Selimović, "Yugoslavia where a civil war had already been waged, had become a scene of violence and hatred. People were divided in two groups, the group of victims and the group of butchers"¹¹³ (Selimović 2018b: 92). The revolution killed Selimović's brother.

Ševkija's death is evil of those who were in charge of pardoning the guilty and making a decision to take away a life. "Thus, our family commitment to revolution and our entourage turned our protoves and turned us into the victims"¹¹⁴ (*Ibid.*), Meša Selimović says in his *Memories*. Those responsible for the shooting of Selimović's brother in the Serbian novel are presented as and in the functions of the authorities.

Self-fashioning can be found in Meša Selimović's life.

¹¹³ „Jugoslavija, u kojoj je već postojao građanski rat, preko noći je postala poprište nasilja i mržnje a ljudi su se izdvajali u dva tabora, u žrtve i krvnike” (Selimović 2018b: 92).

¹¹⁴ „Tako se naša porodična privrženost revoluciji i naša zanesenost okrenula protiv nas i pretvorila nas u žrtve” (*Isto*: 160).

“Meša Selimović portrays the ratio between poetry and revolution extremely precisely. The communist ideal – the unity of poetry and revolution – required preservation of the belonging both himself and the dead brother to the revolution; it required revolutionary activity to be continued; some pointless propaganda lecture in the service of the revolution, previously announced on posters [...] should have been held”¹¹⁵ (Delić 2021: 22).

Namely, he subordinates the obligations towards the revolution to his family tragedy because he is loyal to the Revolution and, “[...] the active participant of the National Liberation War and Revolution of its first days”¹¹⁶ (Jirsak in: Selimović 1983: 289). His brother was killed in that whirl.

“When I heard that Ševkija was shoot, I experienced a shock. I was laying powerless to understand anything, and was constantly crying. After a few days, an UDBA chauffer came to me who drove my brother to the shooting, and pass on a message from a dead man. Ševkija was calm about shooting; He said; – Say hello to Meša, tell him I’m innocent. I knew he was innocent, neither of the judges did not argue differently. The driver was not allowed to tell me where he was buried, so even today I don’t know where his grave is. That amazing, blind, a small act was a turning point in the life of all members of my family; we all felt that we were seduced by things we could never expect. And it is not about death of any of us, we were ready, seven of us took part in a revolution, but about such a terrible injustice, without reason and without meaning ... [...]. Yes, I was shocked, I couldn’t understand anything, I was spending day and night sleep-deprived without food, crying, not knowing what I was going to ask. And the next day, the only

¹¹⁵ „Меша Селимовић изузетно прецизно изоштрава однос поезија–револуција. Комунистички идеал – јединство поезије и револуције – налагао је да се очува припадност револуцији и себе и мртвога брата; да се револуционарна активност настави; да се одржи неко бесмислено пропагандно предавање у служби револуције, раније најављено на плакатама [...]” (Делић 2021: 22).

¹¹⁶ „[...] активни судоник народноослободилачког рата и револуције од њених првих дана” (Jirsak u: Selimović 1983: 289).

day I heard about brother's death, five – six days after the shooting, I should have held a lecture already announced posters. I didn't cancel it. I don't know what I was saying and how I said it, but I was talking. And that's what I imposed on myself. In fact, my process is incomprehensible: that someone demanded it from me, everything would be simple, as a multiplication table. It was the nightmare. I suffered like never in my life, and I was trying to stay in the I considered only possible, only human. Even after that inhuman act! I wanted, I guess I separate those two spheres, the private and the general one [...]. I may have thought I did not have the right, since I was aware of so many deaths, to take my personal loss as a reason to leave the revolution that had become the meaning and essence of my existence"¹¹⁷ (Selimović in: Delić (ed.) 2014: 397).

¹¹⁷ „Кад сам чуо да је Шефкија стрељан, доживио сам шок. Лежао сам немоћан да ишта схватим, и непрестано плакао. Након неколико дана дошао ми је шофер УДБ-е који је мога брата одвезао на стријељање, и донио ми поруку од мртвог човјека. Шефкија је био миран пред стријељање; рекао је; – поздрави Мешу, реци му да сам невин. Ја сам знао да је невин, ни судије нису тврдили другачије. Шофер није смио да ми каже гдје је сахрањен, па ни данас не знам гдје му је гроб. Тај невјероватан, слијепи, малоумни чин био је прекретница у животу свих чланова моје породице; сви смо осјетили да су се десиле ствари које никад нисмо могли чекивати. И није ријеч о смрти неког од нас, на то смо били спремни, седморо нас је било у револуцији, већ о тако ужасној неправди, без разлога и без смисла... [...]. Да, био сам шокиран, ништа нисам могао да схватим, дан и ноћ сам провео без сна и без хране, плачући, не знајући шта ћу од себе, јер је све моје доведено у питање. А сутрадан, један једини дан како сам чуо за братовљеву погибију, пет – шест дана послје стријељања, требало је да одржим неко предавање., већ раније најављено плакатима. Нисам га отказао. Не знам шта сам и како сам говорио, али сам говорио. И ето, баш то сам себи наметнуо. Утолико је мој поступак несхватљивији: да је то неко захтијевао од мене, све би било једноставно, као таблица множења. Овако је кошмар. Патио сам као никад у животу, а покушавао сам да останем у колотечини коју сам сматрао једино могућом, једино људском. Чак и послје тог нељудског чина! Хтио сам, ваљда, да раздвојим те двије сфере, приватну и општу [...]. Можда сам мислио да немам права у толиким смртима свој губитак узимати као разлог да напустим револуцију која је постала смисао и суштина мог постојања” (Селимовић у: Делић (пр.) 2014: 397).

Selimović says no one demanded from him to do that, that it was his personal, entirely independent decision, and, insofar as heavier. However, the reason he made this decision is a loyalty to the revolution, as the token of that time and the Communist doctrine. Selimović demonstrated obedience to the ghost of the time in which he lived. Otherwise, he would have been punished for disobedience and insubordination in accordance with the method of the Communist authorities in Yugoslavia towards disobedience, and the disobedient ones that were, more often than not, sent to the Bare Island. The Communist mold is extremely rigid and everything had to be picture-perfect. The root of such point of view is subordination and accepting being molded accordingly.

He provides an in-depth explanation of the aforementioned situation and his behaviour and chain of thoughts the following in *Memories*¹¹⁸:

“I may have been afraid to break up with myself as I was created by the revolution, maybe I was dragged by inertia: How would I dig an entire me ? [...] I can't say anything specific, but I may have tried to settle myself wounded and him, lost, with a revolution that eats its children. So, I tried to go the same way, as if nothing had happened, I didn't leave the Party, I didn't turn my back to everything I was [...]”¹¹⁹ (Selimović 2018b: 162).

Prioritizing the revolution and interests of the state as opposed to his own sorrow can be considered self-fashioning because an individual becomes subordinated to the authority of the state and the significance the revolution had for him, and which is,

¹¹⁸ *Cjehaŕba*

¹¹⁹ „Možda sam se plašio da raskinem sa sobom onakvim kakvim me je stvorila revolucija, možda me vukla inercija: kako ću raskopati sebe cijelog? [...] Ne mogu ništa određeno da kažem, ali sam možda pokušavao da sebe ranjenog i njega izgubljenog izmirim sa revolucijom koja jede svoju djecu. I eto, pokušao sam da idem istim putem, kao da se ništa nije dogodilo, nisam izašao iz partije, nisam okrenuo leđa svemu što sam bio [...]” (Selimović 2018b: 162).

“[...] a great aim requires great sacrifices”¹²⁰ (Selimović 2018b: 163). His family filed that sacrifice and it was contributed to the ideology altar:

“The revolution is an exceptional event in the history of our people. It meant elevation, ecstasy, euphoric condition. Such moods may result in great deeds and exceptional endeavors. But the enthusiasm, which creates huge tension, cannot last long, that is a psychologically unbearable. The Revolution lasted four years. It entailed straying away, highhandedness, crossing boundaries, attempts to usurp the government [...]”¹²¹ (Selimović 1983: 289–290).

These are the links of Selimović’s life, its turning point – the murder of his brother with *Hamlet*, whose central political topics are the authority of those in power and government and the usurpation of the government. Similar political philosophies, political government based on dominant authorities and their strict reign requiring obedience and subordination, the importance of ideology and doctrines, the Christian one and the Islamic one, play crucial role in both writings as well as the position of an individual in such a hostile political system benefiting from killing the innocent every now and then and making people vanish into thin air without a trace are also what connects these two pieces of writing.

“According to the motif of searching for the truth about his brother’s death, [...], by revenge and rebellion against the authorities, Ahmed is the literary brother of the Danish Prince Hamlet”¹²² (Milosevic 2005:

¹²⁰ „[...] za veliki cilj potrebne su velike žrtve” (*Isṭūo*: 163).

¹²¹ „Revolucija je izuzetan događaj u istoriji naših naroda i značila je elevaciju, ushićenost, euforično stanje. Takva raspoloženja mogu da rezultiraju velikim djelima i izuztnim poduhvatima. Ali oduševljenje, koje stvara ogromnu napregnutost, ne može dugo da traje, to je psihološki neizdrživo. Revolucija je trajala četiri godine [...]. Ima zastranjivanja, samovolje, gubljenja mjere, pokušaja uzurpiranja vlasti [...]” (Selimović 1983: 289–290).

¹²² „Po motivu traganja za istinom o bratovljevoj smrti, [...], po osveti i pobuni protiv vlasti, Ahmed je literarni sabrat danskog kraljevića Hamleta” (Milosević 2005: 224).

224). The difference between them is that Hamlet prepares revenge, Ahmed both revenge and rebellion”¹²³ (Milošević 2005: 224).

It goes without saying that ideology is the vital phenomenon in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* analysis in the light of politics. In the book *Writers, Opinions and Conversations*,¹²⁴ Meša Selimović explains the phenomena of ideology and dogma:

“Dervish is every man who believes in a particular ideology, no matter which one. He can be either a believer and a communist, anyone who feels safe and rooted in general dogma. [...] I took the Koran as a symbol, like canon. People who do not have their own thought will reach for someone else’s. [...] If a man chooses the other path such as the revenge, power, hate, authorities – there is no salvation for that man. If Nuruddin didn’t choose that path, he would not have had to die. Salvation for man is his personal decision. And life makes sense only if love is found”¹²⁵ (Selimović 1983: 269-270).

When it comes to an individual man who does not have his own attitude, he thinks as follows:

“To be one of the many, doing the same things every time, always accept the general thought, and not having your own, to be a drop in the ocean, without your own attitude, means – not using the opportunities man has simply because he is a man. It is not a personal accident, because an underdeveloped personality does not feel it, but general, because it humiliates humanity”¹²⁶ (*Ibid*: 282).

¹²³ „Hamlet priprema osvetu, Ahmed i osvetu i pobunu” (Milošević 2005: 224).

¹²⁴ Selimović, Meša, *Pisci, mišljenja, razgovori*, 1983, BIGZ, Beograd.

¹²⁵ „Derviš je svaki čovek koji vjeruje u određenu ideologiju, bez obzira koju i kakvu. To je i vjernik i komunista, svako ko se učvršćuje u opštoj dogmi. [...] Kuran sam uzeo kao simbol, kao kanon. Ljudi koji nemaju svoju misao posežu za tuđom. [...] Ako čovek izabere onaj drugi put: osвете, moći, mržnje, vlasti – nema mu spasa. Da Nuruddin nije izabrao takav put, ne bi morao da strada. Spas za čovjeka to je njegova lična odluka. A život ima smisla jedino ako se pronade ljubavi” (Selimović 1983: 269–270).

¹²⁶ „Biti jedan od mnogih, neprestano ići kolotečinom, uvijek prihvatiti opštu misao, a nemati svoju, biti kap u moru, bez vlastitog puta i stava, to znači – ne is-

Selimovic concludes: "Not even Njegoš knows what a man is. But he knows something else: that man must be a man. He sets *čojstvo* as a request. It's hard to be that, and even harder not to be" (Selimović 1983: 271). Perhaps it can be found in Hamlet's hesitation to kill Claudius while he is praying. Maybe the final part of Nuruddin's speech in the mosque:

"Maybe I should hate them, but I can not. I do not have two hearts, one for hatred, other for love. The heart that I have knows only grief now. My prayer and my repenance, my life and my death – all of it belongs to God, creator of the world. But my sorrow belongs to me"¹²⁷ (Selimović 2018a: 180)

is an example of *čojstvo*, that is "humanity, manhood / being humane", according to *Comprehensive Serbian-English dictionary*¹²⁸ (Шипка 2014: 2147).

The process of self-fashioning is developed under the influence of external factors such as the environment through different institutions and authorities establishing the reality of the individual forcing him not just to believe in it, but also to contribute to it by means of his accepting to participate in the illusion created by the institutions for the purpose of obtaining absolute control over the members of society. In this way, people are passive recipients of different social influences. The goal is to prevent a man from thinking and turn him into a subject.

What else is similar in these two literary writings is the fact there is somebody outliving the victim (victims) who is to revenge the crime, who needs to tell their stories (Fortinbras and Hassan) and

koristiti mogućnosti koje čovjek kao čovjek, ima. To nije nesreća lična, jer je nerazvijena ličnost, ne osjeća, već opšta, jer unižava čovječanstvo" (Selimović 1983: 282).

¹²⁷ „Šta je čovjek ne zna ni Njegoš. Ali zna drugo: da čovjek mora biti čovek. Njegoš čojstvo postavlja kao zahtjev. Teško je to biti, a još teže ne biti" (Исто: 271).

„Можда би требало да их мрзим, али не могу. Ја немам два срца, једно за мржњу, друго за љубав. Ово што имам, сад зна само за тугу. Моја молитва и моја покора, мој живот и моја смрт, све то припада Богу, створитељу свијета. Али моја жалост припада мени" (Селимовић 2004: 181).

¹²⁸ Шипка, Данко, *Велики српско-енглески речник*, Прометеј, Нови Сад, 2014.

consequently, to inhale a new life into the play and the novel. In both pieces of writing the focal point is a crime. However, the literary shaping of this motive has given the universal dimension to both of them.

It is the very shaping of the novel avoiding trivia and speculation that elevates this Serbian novel to the artistic level. Aleksandar Jerkov writes about that in the text, "The Golden Book of Meša Selimović". He draws attention from the historicity of the text to its artistic quality:

"The drama *Death and the Dervish*, says the writer, came from a long-lasting desire to write a novel about the brother who was innocent yet shoot at the end of World War II. Selimović's brother, a prominent partisan, was shoot by the partisans because of a insignificant offense, which was not quite an offense. From this point of view, it could be immediately noticed that the fact that this is the novel without war and revolution, without socialist ideology and party dogmas – therefore to the extent that has not been transferred to the novel – presents a clear sign of artistic transcendence of time, ambience, circumstances, faith or ideology"¹²⁹ (Jerkov in: Selimović 2004: 418).

Additionally, Meša Selimović's novel *Death and the Dervish* provides something that transcends experience of the Other as a threat. What's more, it offers us understanding, "[...] of something foreign, and someone else's from the inside"¹³⁰ (*Ibid*: 416), a bridge towards the Other providing a reconciliation and a peak in "[...] a foreign, different culture, especially the world of Islam"¹³¹ (*Ibid*: 414).

¹²⁹ „Драма *Дервиш и смрт*, каже писац, проистекла је из вишедеценијске жеље да напише роман о брату који је невин стрељан поткрај Другог светског рата. Селимовићевог брата, истакнутог партизана, стрељали су партизани због безначајног прекршаја који и није био прекршај. Гледано из овог угла, могло би се одмах приметити да је управо то што је ово роман без рата и револуције, без социјалистичке идеологије и партијске догме – дакле у мери онога што није пренесено у роман – јасан знак уметничког превазлижења једног времена, амбијента, околности, вере или идеологије” (Јерков у: Селимовић 2004: 418).

¹³⁰ „[...] нечег страног, и туђег изнутра” (*Ibid*: 416).

¹³¹ „[...] страну, другачију културу, посебно свет ислама” (*Ibid*: 414).

That also happens by portraying a culture and, furthermore, the foreign culture within the literature of one nation or one relatively close geographical area. It is also the way in which it gets enriched with a new insight from something related to the abroad, that is not familiar or does not evoke the feeling of something we are accustomed to.

“The literary world of the two most successful Selimović’s novel, *Death and the Dervish* and *The Fortress*, is the most important artistic achievement in the shaping of the Islamic world in Serbian prose, although this is not the most important feature of these novels”¹³² (Jerkov in: Selimović 2004: 415).

It is an immeasurable Selimović’s contribution to our literature, culture and development of the spirit as “[...] his writing provides the opportunity to the free and intellectual people not to stress the differences, and not to forget similaritie” (*Ibid.*). It must be said that while New Historicism emphasizes conflicting relationships and contrasting practices, as well as the combat between the oppressors and victims, this novel offers a call for mutual acceptance and respect, as opposed to settlement. It is an identity and national, suprahistorical, supracultural significance of the novel.

¹³² „Књижевни свет два најуспелија Селимовићева романа, *Дервиша и смрти* и *Тврђаве*, најзначајнији је уметнички домет у обликовању исламског света у српској прози, иако то није и најважнија одлика ових романа” (Јерков у: Селимовић 2004: 415).

2. HAMLET AND DEATH AND THE DERVISH AS REVENGE TRAGEDIES: THE SITUATION AND THE ACT

The novel *Death and the Dervish* is similar to *Hamlet* in terms of the process, “[...] of the suspension between inactivity and actually acting”¹³³ (Bogićević in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1973: 49) as well as with respect to the motives such as crime and revenge. Therefore, the tragedy of revenge is imposed as a natural framework for their comparison.

The pattern used for writing revenge tragedies not only for Shakespeare's fellow contemporaries, but also for Shakespeare himself, may have been *The Spanish Tragedy* (dating back maybe from 1589 whose printed version was created in 1592). It is arguably a vindictive tragedy performed by all drama troops from Shakespeare's age [...]. It was written by Tomas Kyd. In Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, however, the influences from *The Spanish Tragedy*, among others, are noticeable, but *Titus Andronicus* with its procedures brutally portrayed on the stage by far closer to Kyd as opposed to being linked to *Hamlet* as far as their mutual similarities are concerned (Milanovic 2009: 380). In *The Book on Hamlet*¹³⁴, Rastko Kostić argues that:

“Elizabethan tragedy of revenge was created on the basis of Seneca's tragedy. Its character was moralistic. Tragedies tackling English or Roman history or, the legends, on the other hand, had to, despite any

¹³³ „[...] dvoumljenja između nemoći i odluke” (Bogićević u: Lagumdžija (pr.) 1973: 49).

¹³⁴ Rastko Kostić, *Knjiga o Hamletu*, Beograd: Atos: 2011.

unusual event on the scene, primarily educate people than to entertain them. A monstrous revenge will be opposed to a monstrous crime”¹³⁵ (Kostić 2011: 37).

The answer to the question how Seneca became a part of in the Elizabethan dramatic tradition legacy is rather simple.

“Under the influence of humanistic studies which spread from Italy throughout the XIV and XV centuries, English playwrights were exposed to Italian plays with Aristotelian elements such as those by Terence, Plautus and Seneca. This halted the commencement of the development of national drama (moralities miracles and interludes). Whereas the comedy in a domestic tradition was powerful and essential the influence of foreign elements is more noticeable in the tragedy that lacked domestic models. When English drama reached a dead end the external effects started to take effect on schedule. Fortunately playwrights in England were able to emulate the mistakes and models of drama that had been evolving in Italy and Spain for a century because the Renaissance influence was delayed there. English playwrights were given the opportunity to create new structures such as breaking the play up into acts and establishing dramatic unity as evidenced by the earliest adaptations of foreign dramas. Italian playwrights, however, heedlessly adopted the theory of drama from the recently unearthed Aristotle's Poetics and English theater would be at odds with this during the Renaissance. Its creators were open-minded regarding ideas coming from Italy created by the renewal of the ancient drama. Simultaneously, they wanted to nurture their own tradition and national identity. This explains the neoclassical theory of drama and anti-Aristotle's creation in England. Not wanting to leave the medieval drama rich tradition, the English playwrights merge the old and the new thus providing their own tradition with new creative impulses. They copy Seneca's tragedy full of horrors, Plaut's comic

¹³⁵ „Elizabethanska tragedija osвете nastala je po ugledu na Senekine tragedije i imala je moralistički karakter. Tragedije sa sižeima iz engleske ili rimske istorije ili pak, legende, morala je, uprkos svim neobičnim događajima na sceni, više da pouči puk nego da ga zabavi. Čudovišnom zločinu suprotstaviće se čudovišna osveta” (Kostić 2011: 37).

types a playful pastoral world, the ghost of the Italian “Comedia Dell’ Arte”, but, at the same time, they keep the form of the old moralitets, mixing tragic and comical elements in a play and the free use of the time and place in the fable (which is the opposite of the so-called Aristotel’s rules). For that reason, such special plays occur in England Renaissance”¹³⁶ (Andrejević 2010: 121).

Its creators were open-minded regarding ideas coming from Italy created by the renewal of the ancient drama. Simultaneously, they wanted to nurture their own tradition and national identity. This explains the neoclassical theory of drama and anti-Aristotle’s creation in England. Not wanting to leave the medieval drama rich tradition, the English playwrights merge the old and the new thus providing their own tradition with new creative impulses. They copy Seneca’s tragedy full of horrors, Plaut’s comic types a playful pastoral world, the ghost of the Italian “Comedia Dell’ Arte”, but, at the same time, they keep the form of the old moralitets, mixing tragic and comical elements in a play and the free use of the time and place in the fable (which is the opposite of the so-called Aristotel’s rules). For that reason, such special plays occur in England Renaissance (Andrejević 2010: 121).

¹³⁶ „Под утицајем хуманистичких студија, које су продирале из Италије кроз XIV и XV век, енглески драматичари су се упознали са драмама Теренција, Плаута, Сенеке и драмама из Италије пуне аристотеловских елемената што је зауставило започети правац развоја националне драме (моралитета, миракула, интерлуда). Утицај страних елемената очигледнији је у трагедији која није имала домаће моделе, док је комедија била у домаћој традицији јака и витална. Утицаји споља на енглеску драму дошли су ипак на време, баш у тренутку када је она дошла до мртве тачке. Како је ренесанса у Енглеску касно стигла, драматичари су на срећу могли да се поведу примерима и грешкама драме која се под античким утицајем већ сто година развијала у Италији и Шпанији. Прве адаптације страних драма указују енглеским драматичарима могућности нових структура, поделе на чинове и постојања драмског јединства. Међутим, теорија драме, коју су италијански драматичари слепо пратили из тек откривене Аристотелове Поетике, и сама драма у Енглеској биће у великом раскораку у доба ренесансе” (Andrejević 2010: 121).

While attempting to find the origin of *Hamlet*, the critics explored the Danish historian Saxo Grammaticus who lived in the second half of the 12th century, Brutus, the old Roman historian who came in handy as Hamlet's model, and the ancient myth on the year-round seasons, which was the foundation for numerous mythological topics as well as for common narrative topics from the European literature previous periods. As old as the human literature, there is a story about a woman who killed her husband, followed by marrying her lover who helped her commit the crime. Simrok had already stated that *Hamlet* was a distorted version of Orest; his tragic form Klitemnestera should be remembered, Orest, to conclude that the morality in that already extremely artistic subject was preceded by much more rough and older forms. Regarding Hamlet's act of madness, similar cunning deeds were presented, which, according to the legend, were used Hamlet and Brutus, a person who conducted blood revenge (Stefanović in: Shakespeare, trans. Stefanović, 2013: 5-7).

Upon Gervendill's death, Rorik, the King of Denmark, appointed his sons, Horvendill and Feng, for Jutland governors. Shortly afterwards, Horvendill stands out as one of the most famous maritime heroes, and the Norwegian king targets him as a rival. After the conditions were placed and verified by the Horvendill, he beat the Norwegian king in the personal duel. Consequently, the Danish king fell in love with him and offered him his daughter to be his wife. He had a son with her named Amleth. Horvendill's success encourage his brother Feng's jealous and hatred, resulting in fratricide. Later, Feng committed the blasphemy by lying and marrying his brother's murdered woman, hardly managing to erase the scars of fraternity. Upon watching everything, Amleth started plotting a conspiracy aiming to appear foolish. He began thinking about a revenge under the pretext of madness due to fear for his life. He often sat next to the hearth and split the wooden hooks he had collected, them into fire and stored them. His behavior looked suspicious to Feng, so she tried to detect what Hamlet's real mental state was. Amleth is now faced with a plethora of tests, from which always manages to get out of owing to apparently

naive, but always astute answers and deeds. He is being tested, among other things, with the little help from the girl Hamlet used to love. She stands by him in this cruel and unpleasant attempt. After these failures, one of the Fang's friends recommended Fang should hit the road and test Amlet in a private conversation with his mother, whereas he – that friend – would secretly eavesdrop. Unaware of the reaction to be obtained from the population, he is hiding in the beginning. Next, he gradually gathers his father's acquaintances and other supporters, persuading them by means of a long sermon. They elected him their king, portraying their appreciation in that way respecting that act of great boldness that involves stunning determination and covert cunningness (*Ibid.*).

This story seems to have suffered many changes during previous dramatization attempts before it was given the shape we are familiar with from Shakespeare tragedy. Given that the earliest known version of *Hamlet* dates back 1587 or 1589 and that Shakespeare's tragedy cannot date before 1600 years, it would be extremely worthy to have the original version of *Hamlet*. Thomas Kyd is believed to be its author. He is one of the most significant playwrights among Shakespeare's literary ancestors. It is most likely that all the main elements of Shakespeare's later *Hamlet* had already existed in this early version of the play. However, the primary motivation behind this great-Hamlet campaign seems to have been the motivation of a saint. Despite the popularity of the topic, the play does not seem to have been a great hit. Small income, it produced supports this statement as well as a series of mocking references to the ghost that the actor mentions in the theater and weeps miserably when he hears that line: "Hamlet, the revenge!" and to the several tragic Hamlet-style speeches (*Ibid.*: 8).

Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was printed in 1603. In what is known as the first Quarto edition, and was first recorded in the Association of Book Sellers on July 26, 1602. In 1604 another Quarto edition, which was largely altered and expanded, was published. There were more Quarto editions published in 1605, 1611 and 1637, as well as the release without a date that appeared as a reprint of the one published in 1611

together with several more so-called Quarto editions. There was another independent text for the First Folio edition of Shakespeare, published in 1623 after the poet passed, next to his two friends actors Heming and Condell. This was necessary because numerous locations mentioned in the quarto edition were omitted in the edition of the Folio. However, the Folio edition and the second-fourth edition are mainly corresponding, while Shakespeare scholars continue to find problems, obstacles and disagreements with the first Quarto edition (1603). Some argue that this is the text of the previous, older *Hamlet*, which Shakespeare began to improve in his pieces of writinghop, as was his way of working; others claim that this is the text of Shakespeare's original *Hamlet* that was discovered during the theater play and sold to one of the pirate publishers, as that was common practice at the time. They claim that this is the first original Shakespeare sketch of *Hamlet*, he adapted and expanded the character several times [...]. The shot of the English acting troop performing *Hamlet* in *Dresden* in 1626 was made (*Ibid*: 7-8).

The piece of writing that most likely influenced Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to the greatest extent is *Ur-Hamlet*, a piece of Thomas Kyd. Based on *The Spanish tragedy*, (since there are not many preserved textological traces about *Ur-Hamlet*), we can assume the basic plot: a young Spanish nobleman was killed by the Portuguese Prince Balthazar. Shortly afterwards, Balthazar gets captivated by two young Spaniards. There are six killings and three suicides in this tragedy; The characters were swallowed by pain, jealousy and revengeful anger. The convict was joking with his executioner as he was dying, unaware of the fact that a pardon that was promised to him was an illusion. The grieving mother and four fathers are devastated due to the loss of sons, crying from moans and sorrow. The element of evil, portrayed in the character of Lorenzo, acts through quiet machinations and a perfidious agreement involving the interest of conspirators only for betrayal. The main character of the tragedy, the old man Hieronimo, is forced to avenge the murder of his son Horatio. He goes through deep phases of grotesque sadness and agony, decisive optimism to cause revenge, stages of uncertainty

craving divine revenge and a final decision to seek revenge alone although even though in a smart way that has to conceal his real motives. Revenge is a divine thing and must culminate with pleasure. Evil was punished, even at the cost of the destruction of the very avenger (*Ibid*: 36-37).

According to the existing evidence, there is a very high possibility that Hamlet was created in 1600. The first sketch we are familiar with, which originates from the note from July 26, 1602 in the bookstarch Registry, must have occurred earlier because the corrected version had to occur between two quarto publications, but shortly after that, as that note refers to “Hamlet recently portrayed”, whereas in the first quarto edition from 1603 it is stated that this play had already been played and displayed multiple times. In support of 1601, the scene in which Hamlet talks to the actors, in which it was explicitly said the actors from the capital were forced to travel to the province, which is the implication referred to the acting groups, known as “the children” – that is, the youthful vocals from Two churches, one of which is the royal, whereas the other is the Church of St. Paul, who started acting crafts; it is also known that the acting troupe Shakespeare belonged to at that period were in the intensive rivalry with the so-called children and that it was actually forced to travel all over the province. This timeline positions *Hamlet* in the period of Shakespeare’s life in which he produced *Macbeth* and *Julius Caesar*, with which Hamlet shares numerous signs of close relation, especially with the latter. Setting up the historical background of the play prior to 1600 is not based on evidence. Namely, Francis Meres, a prominent Shakespeare’s admirer and the leading researcher of Shakespeare’s earlier period of creativity in his work of *Palladis Tamia* dating from 1598 mentions other Shakespeare’s plays of that time, but not Hamlet. The former play *Ur-Hamlet* seems to have enrolled in the perception of the people as a poorly composed tragedy of revenge (*Ibid*: 16).

When it comes to Greenblatt, we find the template in which he entails parallels between the original version and Shakespeare’s

Hamlet given in a more specific way. This contextualizes the original story by positioning it in the coordinates of Shakespeare's tragedy. He argues that even in the oldest preserved medieval legends, the story of Hamlet was a story focusing on the expanded time interval between the initial thought regarding the terrible part and the moment of its execution. In the version written by Saxo Grammaticus, king Horvendill (older King Hamlet in Shakespeare's version of *Hamlet*) was killed by his jealous brother Feng (Claudius), but publicly instead of the closed door. In the pre-Christian world that abounded in treasons and revenges, the son's unquestionable duty is to revenge his father's murder, Horvendill's minor son Amleth is the only thing that can prevent Fang from fulfilling his intention. As long as he is a minor, Amleth is no obstacle, but that changes when he turns 18 because he will then have a socially imposed responsibility (Greenblatt 2006: 303).

The young man must, of course, come up with short-term strategy because his life is threatened, and the killer of Feng is well aware of this social code. Hamlet pretends to be crazy to deceive his uncle to make him feel safe, as his plan is that the uncle is alive long enough so that he could revenge to him. The careful Phang, however, continued to put traps to find any hidden signs of reason below his nephew's apparent nonsense. Amleth, on the other hand, skillfully avoids being discovered. He's not in a hurry but already planning his next acts. He is ridiculed by everyone, derogatorily called a fool, but eventually manages to carry out the revenge by igniting Fang's escort and killing him. After addressing the noble parlor and justifying his actions, they joyfully and proudly crowned him (*Ibid.*)

Apart from *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Ur-Hamlet*, there is another closely related to today's *Hamlet*. That piece of writing is *The Histoire of Hamblet*. "The only famous copy of *The Histoire of Hamblet* in the English language was published in 1608. The book was printed by Richard Bradocke for Thomas Pavier and his bookstore in Cornhill. It is a rough translation from the French, anonymous translator. François de Belleforest's *Tragic story* began to appear in France about 1560.

Initially, it was a series of translation of the Matteo Bandello Italian novellas”¹³⁷ (Kostić 2011: 29).

What is the connection between it and Hamlet?

“Editor Charles Dickens published the comparison between Shakespeare’s and Belleforest writings in his magazine at the end of the 19th century. [...] According to author of the experiment, there are characteristic similarities causing curiosity between these two achievements, in addition to one’s author annoying prose and the other author’s magnificent poetry. We notice prototypes of Hamlet, Gertrude, Claudius, Fortinbras, Polonius, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern in the novella, while Ophelia, Laert, Horatio, Othello and other less prominent characters are not mentioned. The novella is – in the article author’s opinion – without a mystery or any literary sophistication. It is poorly simple mediocre in terms of its literary quality. It does not tackle the complex Hamlet’s mental state at all; on the contrary, it is defined clearly and completely unchangeable until the end. On the one hand, Hamlet simulates madness so as not to be revealed by his evil uncle Fengon, and on the other, in order to be able to prepare revenge more successfully due to being protected. The Hamlet in Belleforest’s novella does not doubt in his all; he does not need a non-Earthly visitor, his father’s ghost to convince him in the crime that had been committed. Neither does he need an acting group or a portrayal to tempt the king. Belleforest’s Hamlet is still levelled with mythical heroes, demigods just like Saxo’s Amleth. In the episode with the English king Belleforest portrays his ability to see the past: he knows meat and food on the table are not clean and that they originate from the land poisoned with corpses and rusted armors and swords; he knows the English king is a slave’s son, etc. Hamlet is so, clairvoyant, and that episode is taken from Saxo. But this episode causes problems to the moralists and the orthodox Christian such as Belleforest with its connotations; he is challenged to justify himself for a

¹³⁷ „Jedini poznat primerak *Povesti o Hamletu* na engleskom jeziku objavljen je 1608. godine; knjigu je štampao Ričard Bredok (Richard Bradocke) za Tomasa Peviera (Thomas Pavier) i njegovu knjižaru u Kornhilu (Cornhill). To je grubi prevod sa francuskog, anonimnog prevodioca. Belleforeove *Tragične priče* počele su da se u Francuskoj pojavljuju oko 1560. godine; to je u početku bila serija prevoda italijanskih novela Matea Bandela” (Kostić 2011: 29).

long time so that he would not be accused of promoting false doctrine and witchcraft. He concludes that demons and evil souls cannot see in the future, which is what some foolish people think. They can only see into the past. And the Hamlet is, according to the customs of the north and his Viking Age, introduced the secret science of seeing things in the past. Also, the novella leaves characters and destinations of other major heroes unfinished, what happens to the English king's righteous daughter in love for whom we could expect to die in the general retaliating over the enemies of the Danish prince? Isn't she in bed with Feng at that time when Hamlet comes in front of his uncle with a swinging sword? [...] Summarizing the view of Belfarest's literary creation and its relationship with Shakespeare's drama, we will emphasize key differences. Belleforest's hero, as well as Saxo's, falling under the category of mythical heroes, demigods, characterized by the features typical for supernatural beings. In this way, his superhuman force, his unusually thoughtful and cunning revenge, both Saxo's and Belleforest's heroes carry out consistently, can be interpreted. [...] Shakespeare's *Hamlet* cannot end his revenge alive. Furthermore, he does not hesitate at any time in his revenge, but uses madness to cover his intentions and escape Feng's attempts to kill him who is ready to destroy him at any time. Its insanity is of a special kind: he actually always tells the truth – but since his interlocutors do not know what he is talking about, his words act crazy. And, in the end, Hamlet's death is somewhat a typical end of a mythical hero. He conducted the revenge successfully and it was not only after many other adventures, that he, as well as Samson, get killed by a women's fraudulent nature and the betrayal by his wife Hermetrud, which gives a motif for Vigler to kill him"¹³⁸ (*Ibid.* : 33-34).

¹³⁸ „Poređenje između Šekspirove i Belforeove tvorevine objavio je u svom časopisu krajem XIX veka urednik Čarls Dikens. [...] Postoje veli autor ogleda, karakteristične sličnosti koje izazivaju radoznalost, između ova dva ostvarenja, pored dosadne proze jednog i božanstvene poezije drugog autora. U noveli zapažamo prototipove Hamleta, Gertrude, Klaudija, Fortinbrasa, Polonija, Rozenkranca i Gildensterna, dok nema ni traga likovima Ofelije, Laerta, Horacija, Ozrika i drugih manje istaknutih likova. Novela je – ističe autor priloga – bez misterije ili književnog rafinmana bilo koje vrste. Ona je šturo jednostavna, osrednja po svom književnom kvalitetu. U njoj se uopšte ne dotiče složeno Hamletovo duševno stanje; naprotiv, ono je zadato jasno i do kraja nepromenljivo. Hamlet simulira ludilo kako ga, s jedne strane, ne bi otkrio zli

The idea to write *Hamlet* around 1600 may not be originally Seskepir's. There was at least the play about the Danish Prince who should have taken revenge on his father's killer, but it has been lost ever since. The play was either still played (which would be extremely long lasting for the Elizabethan theater), or has acquired some popularity thanks to a certain folk scene of the theater. Shakespeare had

stric Fengon, i s druge, tako zaštićen on može da bolje priprema osvetu. Hamblet u Belforeovoj noveli ne sumnja ni jednog trenutka u svoj naum; on nema potrebe za nezemaljskim posetiocem, duhom svoga oca, da ga uveri u zločin koji se odigrao. Niti je potrebna glumačka družina i predstava da bi se iskušao kralj. S druge strane, Belforeov Hamlet je još uvek u ravni mitskih heroja, polubogova, kao i Saksov Amlet. Belfore u epizodi sa engleskim kraljem pokazuje njegovu sposobnost viđenja prošlosti: on zna da su meso i hrana na stolu nečisti i da dolaze sa zemlje zatrovane leševima i zardalim oklopima i mačevima; zna da je engleski kralj sin roba i dr. Hamblet je, dakle, vidovit i da se ta epizoda preuzima od Saksa. Ali ta epizoda svojim konotacijama donosi probleme moralisti i pravovernom hrišćaninu Belforeu; on je izazvan na dugačko samoopravljanje da ne bi bio optužen da promoviše lažnu doktrinu i veštičarenje, pa zaključuje kako demoni i zli dusi ne mogu da vide u budućnost, kako neki budlasi ljudi misle, nego samo u prošlost. A Hamblet je, po običajima severa i svog vikinškog doba, upoznao tajnu nauku gledanja u prošlost. Novela, isto tako, ostavlja nedovršenim likove i sudbine drugih glavnih junaka: šta se dešava sa pravednom i zaljubljeom kćeri engleskog kralja, šta sa Gerut, Hambletovom majkom, za koju bismo mogli da očekujemo da pogine u sveopštoj odmazdi nad neprijateljima danskog princa? Zar ona nije u krevetu sa Fengom onda kada Hamblet dolazi pred svog strica sa isukanim mačem? [...] Rezimirajući pogled na Belforeovu književnu tvorevinu i njen odnos sa Šekspirovom dramom istaći ćemo ključne razlike. Belforeov junak je, kao i Saksov, iz reda mitskih heroja, polubogova, koje karakterišu osobine nadnaravnih bića. Na taj način, svojom nadljudskom snagama, može se tumačiti i njegova neobično promišljena i lukava osveta, koju i Saksov i Belforeov junak dosledno sprovode. [...] Šekspirov Hamlet iz svoje osvete ne može izaći živ. Dalje, on u svojoj osveti ne okleva ni trenutka nego se služi ludilom da bi prikrrio svoje namere i sačuvao glavu od Fengona, spremnog da ga uništi u svakom trenutku. Njegovo je ludilo naročite vrste: on, zapravo, kazuje uvek neuvijenu istinu – ali budući da njegovim sagovornicima nije poznato to o čemu on govori, njegove reči deluju sumanuto. I, na kraju, Hambletova smrt je na neki način tipičan kraj mitskog heroja. On je uspešno izvršio osvetu i tek posle još mnogo drugih pustolovina njemu, kao i Samsonu, dolazi glave ženska prevarena priroda i izdaja njegove supruge Hermetrude, koja daje motiv Vigleru da ga ubije" (Ис्रो: 33–34).

to be familiar with that earlier play. He probably even watched it at least several times. He had most likely known the previous *Hamlet* play by heart before he started writing his own *Hamlet*. In this case, it is impossible to say whether he was sitting with open books in front of him, but it is certain that he had read one or more versions of the classical Danish story about murder and retaliation. He most certainly read Francois de Belforest's piece written in French. Belforest adapted the story of Hamlet, written by Saxo Grammaticus, a Danish, at the end of the twelve-century, edited by Saks Grammar, who changed oral and written legends that had originated from many centuries ago (Grinblat 2006: 294–296).

Shakespeare came up with a way to portray a psychologically established reality of this way of thinking, which neither Saxo nor those who came after him could even anticipate. He realized that Hamlet's story, ready to be revised to be subsequently published, enable him to write a piece about the internal turmoil a man experiences in the last moments prior to deciding to kill someone. The problem is that the theater does not have enough understanding for long developmental periods. It would be extremely challenging to create a striking dramatic sequence if we described Hamlet's long-lasting acting from his madness to the point in which he was ready to act. The conclusion that is drawn – that is most likely also made in the lost piece – is that the fable begins as soon as Hamlet becomes an adult thus ready to carry out a revengful murder (*Ibid.*)

The ghost of the killed Hamlet's father was one of the main characters presented even in a piece that was not preserved, indicated by Thomas Lodge's reference on the ghost crying condescendingly: "Hamlete, revenge me!" Kyd may have used the ghost only to frighten the audience in his greatest hit, *The Spanish Tragedy* or whoever wrote a lost *Hamlet*, before Shakespeare introduced a key twist that gave the purpose to the ghost, drifting the dramatic figure away from the function of decoration. In earlier versions of *Hamlet* such as the Saxo Grammaticus' one, there is no ghost. He is unnecessary because both the murder and the son's duty to take on revenge are the usual

phenomena. However, Shakespeare kept the murder a secret until he started writing his own version of *Hamlet*, either in response to Kyd's version, or, based on his own initiative. The whole Denmark believes that Hamlet's death is caused by the bite of a snake. The terrible truth was revealed by the ghost [...] (*Ibid*: 303-304) about its own murder.

Hamlet is not the original Shakespeare creation but mostly adapted it to transfer what was happening at that time in his head and soul. It is clear that his primary goal was to illustrate what was happening inside the protagonist, concentrating on the psychological profile and the mindset of a young, innocent individual facing a different, uglier reality from the one he was used to, the one he was experiencing and living in at that time. All of a sudden, due to combination of life circumstances, he was transferred from the virtue-filled reality in the world ruled by the hunger for power, and human greed, the world he cannot and does not want to get used to it, the one that is deeply unknown, and which, in his opinion, is unworthy of further existence (Marić 2015: 36).

“Thomas Kyd invented a brand-new kind of tragedy called a revenge tragedy which is also sometimes referred to as the tragedy of horror due to its intensity. The revenge play is always morally instructive and even if it is not didactic in intent it is in effect. This is where Kyd deviates from Marlow and adheres to traditional morality. It is unquestionable that Seneca taught Kyd a lot and drained him of moral wisdom which led to an increase in the number of terrifying scenes that would drive Seneca insane. He taught Kyd the key elements of play that Marlow had overlooked. He was familiar with and utilized every option the stage offered. He wrote an external fable-style tragedy with a very intricate plot numerous horrifying scenes and a cast of ghosts and lunatics. His focus was on the unity of the fable and the unity of the motif – revenge – rather than the unity of place and time¹³⁹” (Brkić 1959: 19–20).

¹³⁹ „Tomas Kid (Thomas Kyd, 1558–1594) stvorio je drukčiji i novi tip tragedije – tragediju osvete, za koju se može istovremeno reći i da je tragedija užasa jer ih je puna. [...] Drama osvete uvek uključuje izvestan moral, i ako nije didaktična po svojim intencijama, ona je didaktična po svome dejstvu. Tu

This is the shared motif in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*.

From Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* to the first English tragedy (about King Gorboduc based on domestic legendary history 1567) dramatic literature has developed at a rapid pace. In the tragedy about Gorboduc, the bloody events are only mentioned on stage everything else takes place behind the scenes. In *The Spanish Tragedy* which takes place no more than 20 years later the events occur one after the other and roll across the stage leaving nearly all of the piece's major heroes – or those who committed suicide – violently on it¹⁴⁰ (Kostić 2011: 35–36).

Ana Andrejević tackles the topic of horror elements within the genre of revenge tragedies:

“Thomas Kyd's play *The Spanish Tragedy*, starts the period of tragedy of revenge and horror, the type of tragedy originating from Sence that impressed Elizabethan audience and authors. Kyd determined its main elements that would continue to be enhanced as they further developed. However, its historical importance for the English drama actually lies in the progress of construction, successful use of plotes and effective situations. Kyd was the first to have given the opportunity

se Kid nadovezuje na tradicionalan moral i u tome se razlikuje od Marloa. [...] Kid je nesumnjivo mnogo naučio od Seneke, crpao je od njega i moralnu mudrost i uvećavao scene užasa „pred kojima bi i sam Seneka pobledo”. Naučio je od Seneke dramske zakonitosti koje je prenebregao Marlo. Poznao je i koristio sve mogućnosti koje pruža pozornica. Stvorio je tragediju punu spoljne radnje sa veoma složenim zapletom, uneo mnoštvo potresnih prizora užasa i izveo na scenu duhove i ludake. O jedinstvu mesta i vremena nije vodio mnogo računa, ali je zadržao jedinstvo radnje i jedinstvo motiva – osvete” (Brkić 1959: 19–20).

¹⁴⁰ „Od prve engleske tragedije (o kralju Gorbodaku, zasnovanoj na domaćoj legendarnoj istoriji, 1567) do *Španske tragedije* Tomasa Kida, dramska književnost prolazi ubrzani razvoj. O krvavim događajima se u tragediji o Gorbodaku na sceni samo govori, a svi se događaji dešavaju iza scene; u Španskoj tragediji, nastaloj ne više od dve decenije kasnije, događaji se, u kovitlacu, smenjuju jedan za drugim i valjaju preko scene, ostavljajući na njoj nasilno ubijene ili one koji su se sami ubili, maltene sve glavne junake komada” (Kostić 2011: 35–36).

to the audience to understand characters' development through their interaction"¹⁴¹ (Andrejević 2010: 122–123).

In the chapter "Before Shakespeare – Thomas Kyd" of her doctoral dissertation *The Motif of Madness of the Characters in Four Great Tragedies by William Shakespeare – Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello and King Lear*¹⁴², Nataša Šofranac deals with the revenge tragedy and its traits originating from Seneca based on Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish tragedy*. She tackles the elements Shakespeare took over from Seneca, as well as the Renaissance dramatic tradition ancient roots. The question why Kyd is connected with Seneca arises. *The Spanish Tragedy* is an example of a classic Senecan vindictive tragedy, performed for the first time around 1590. This piece includes numerous elements that can easily be identified in Hamlet's topic; however, apart from characters and the motive layer, these two pieces differ significantly. Researchers examining Shakespeare's oeuvre and the temporal context in which he lived suggest that the missing piece, *Ur-Hamlet*, is more similar to Kyd's piece. As far as this subject is concerned, the researchers' opinions on who is its author, one or the other aforementioned playwright, are divided (Šofranac 2013a: 102).

Nataša Šofranac argues that another questions arise regarding which influences can be tracked from Seneca to Shakespeare such as

"formal, structural and thematic elements, figures such as the ghost, nanny, servant, messenger, tyrant; the preoccupation with thinking

¹⁴¹ „Томас Кид, са драмом *Шпанска трагедија*, започиње еру трагедије освете и ужаса, сенекине трагедије која је импресионирала елизабетинску публику и ауторе. Кид јој је одредио главне елементе који ће наставити да се надграђују у даљем развоју. Међутим, њена историјска важност за енглеску драму заправо лежи у напредовању конструкције, успешном коришћењу заплета и ефективних ситуација. Кид је први публици дао могућност да схвати развој карактера кроз њихову интеракцију” (Andrejević 2010: 122–123).

¹⁴² *Motiv ludila kod junaka četiri velike tragedije Vilijama Šekspira – Hamlet, Magbet, Otelo i Krlj Lir*, Beograd, Filološki fakultet, Univerzitet u Beogradu: 2013a. <https://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf>

and soliloquius, rapid replica (stihomitija); bare violence; hazards and traps of power and wealth, the benefits of poverty and life in nature; madness, passion, revenge and supernatural phenomena. This legacy is significantly based on the Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides' writings"¹⁴³ (*Ibid*).

She quotes the author Robert Miola:

"It's important to mention Medea, which, related to Lady Magbet. She turns to the dark forces and takes a tragic step of eliminating her own offspring. In his famous discussion about anger (*De IRA*), Seneca offers guidelines for its management. As an advocate of stoicism, he argued meditation as a means of combating anxiety. Miola notes that negative dramatic heroes often advocated stoic virtues such as cognition and practicing not overreacting, politeness, patience tolerance, and stability. It resulted in the viewers' empathy towards the protagonists that did not have these virtues (*Ibid*: 156). [...]. While Hamlet strives to stoicism, he deviates from it when mourning for his father and Ophelia. [...]. The superficial comparison of *The Spanish tragedy* and *Hamlet* reveals there are figures such as the ghost and the avenger in both plays and that both of them highlight the relevance of court intrigues"¹⁴⁴ (*Ibid*: 103).

¹⁴³ „Formalne, strukturne i tematske elemente. Tu su likovi poput Duha, dadilje, slugu, glasonoš, tiranina; obuzetost razmišljanjem i solilokvijumi, brza razmena replika (stihomitija); ogoljeno nasilje; opasnosti i zamke moći i bogatstva, prednosti siromaštva i života u prirodi; ludilo, strast, osveta i natprirodne pojave. U tom nasleđu naći ćemo, u znatnoj meri, i Eshila, Sofokla i Euripida” (Šofranac 2013: 102). Ova zaostavština je u značajnoj meri zasnovana na delima Eshila, Sofokla i Euripida (Isto).

¹⁴⁴ “Važno je pomenuti Medeju, koja je srodna leđi Magbet. Ona se obraća mračnim silama i preduzima tragičan korak likvidacije sopstvenog potomstva. Seneka, u svojoj poznatoj raspravi O gnevu (*De Ira*), nudi smer-nice za upravljanje besom. Kao zagovornik stoicizma, zalagao se za medi-taciju kao sredstvo za borbu protiv anksioznosti. Miola primećuje da su negativni dramski junaci često pozivali na stoičke vrline spoznavanja i prak-tikovanja mere, takta, odmerenosti i trpeljivost, tolerantnost i postojanost. To je za posledicu imalo empatičnost gledalaca prema protagonistima koje ove vrline nisu krasile (Isto: 156). [...]. Dok Hamlet teži stoicizmu, on odstus-

Hieronimo fell into madness due to unbearable delay? Delay of what? This reminds of the classic tragedy in which revenge is implied. This is in a completely opposite position with Hamlet's moral fluctuation, serving as a basis for the intricate layers of Shakespeare's tragedy. Thomas Kyd's ghost is Don Andrea, a Spanish aristocrat who died in war with Portugal. His killer is Prince Balthazar. His heart had previously been conquered by the enchanting Bel-Imperia he entered the secret romance with. Judges were supposed to determine his destiny after his death, however, it does not happen. He is despatched to Pluton and Proserpini. Their ruling is that Don Andrea should return among the living together with Revenge, which swears that she will help him seek retaliation. When he returned to the battlefield, he reveals the Prince is in prison. He was captured by his close friend Horatio, Hieronimo's son who was highly positioned in the Spanish army. However, he confronts Bel-Imperia's brother, Lorenzo, who rules the Castile dukedom. The subject of their dispute whose prisoner the prince actually is. The king proposes the Solomonic solution resulting in him giving the Horatio the money for the captured Prince, while Lorenzo keeps the prisoners (*Ibid*: 103).

On the other hand, the ruler succumbed to madness and Vilup in Portugal, mourning what he believes is his son's death, and what made him arrest innocent Alexandar, blaming him for his son's death. Diplomatic talks take place. They result in Balthazar being allowed to return home, and peace being established between the two nations and their states. When he returned to Spain, Balthazar fell in love with Bel-Imperia. He learned from a servant that she was in love with Horatio and that their affection was mutual. In addition, Lorenzo becomes Horatio's opponent due to the circumstances regarding Balthazar's capture and the fact that Horatio, despite his modest origin given being the son of a clerk, gained Lorenzo's sister affection. The

pa od njega kada tuguje za ocem i Ofelijom. [...]. Površno poređenje Španske tragedije i Hamleta otkriva da i u jednoj i u drugoj drami postoje figure kao što su duh i osvjetnik i da i obema važno mesto zauzimaju dvorske intrige" (Šofranac 2013a: 103).

two aristocrats made the plan to eliminate Horatio, seeking help from Balthazar's servant to implement it during a meeting between lovers. Belimpery was taken away, and Hieronimo reveals his son's corpse (Šofranac 2013a: 103-104).

This was accompanied by a huge sadness Hieronimo and his wife Isabel felt. In Portugal, Alexandar pulled out of the death caliper after the Ambassador's return from Spain with information that Balthazar was not dead; after that, the death a death sentence was made for Vilup. Meanwhile, in Spain, Hieronimo is on the verge of madness to the absence of justice regarding the murder of his son. The letter is coming, written by Bel-Imperia's blood, in which the identities of the killer, Lorenzo and Balthazar are revealed. However, he struggles with doubts in his authenticity. Concerned about such Hieronimo's behavior, Lorenzo decides to eliminate everyone familiar with his dishonorable act. He convinces one of his two accomplices to kill another for the sum of gold, but the assassin was arrested immediately after the act (*Ibid*: 104).

So that the killer would not reveal his identity before his own death, Lorenzo told him that the courier brought the order to spare his life, a pardon, and that the courier gave that document to the person who is supposed to murder him. After much diplomacy, Balthazar and Bel-Imperia agree to enter marriage that would bring two royal houses closer. Paradoxically, they find the letter handed accomplice that confirms Hieronimo's doubt regarding Lorenzo and Balthazar, but Lorenzo prevents Hieronimo to go to the king, which enables him to avoid the penalty once again. In the turn of the fate, they discover the letter of the murdered accomplice confirming Hieronimo's the doubts about Lorenzo and Balthazar; However, Lorenzo once again avoided the penalty by denying the opportunity to address the king. In his torture, the grieving father swore that he would take on revenge to the killers and began to behave kindly in an attempt to alleviate Lorenzo's anxiety (Šofranac 2013a: 104).

He was given the task to monitor the celebration on the occasion of the Bel-Imperia and Balthazar's wedding. During that mission, he com-

poses a play, the Turkish tragedy, and persuade Lorenzo and Balthazar to perform in it Bel-Imperia also participates in this production as his accomplice in revenge. Just before the performance, sorrow-devastated Isabella takes her life. The play serves as a touching performance of real events: sultan is forced to kill its noble friend out of jealousy for female affection. Hieronimo portrays the killer. During the play, his character had killed Balthazar, who was connected to Lorenzo and Bel-Imperia, before he eventually took her life. After the play, Hieronimo reveals to those present on the wedding, standing above his late son, that the daggers used in the play were real and that three young men were now dead. He then tries to end his life, which is an act prevented by the Spanish and Portuguese monarch. In desperate desire for silence, he bites his tongue. He deceived the Duke to grab his knife, and then killed him, and then himself. The themes of revenge and Andrea eventually conclude the narrative. Andrea allocates each “positive” hero a place in paradise, while others face eternal penalty in hell (*Ibid*: 104–105).

Šofranac also tackles Thomas Kyd and William Shakespeare’s dramatic similarities. She ponders what elements Shakespeare could have taken from Kyd, except the name Horatio. These elements include topics such as the ghost, revenge (more as a motive rather than a character), masking, deaths of the innocent, play-inside-the play and numerous victims. Additionally, the prayer scene is attributed to Kyd, as noticed by Robertson, J.M. Hamlet, *Once more*, p. 77), together with the Hamlet’s speech. According to him, Shakespeare did not imagine that a rational Hamlet executed Claudius during prayer; he portrayed Hamlet, managed by his “unconscious” which is why he was hesitant to kill. Shakespeare allowed his creativity to blossom, experimenting with the text, especially regarding Hamlet’s character. Moreover, the correctness of revenge was questioned neither by the characters in a piece, nor its creator; a father takes revenge on behalf of the son. In contrast, Shakespeare represents a young man lacking Hieronimo’s proactivity. The ghost was not the deceased one, but his friend, who was present at that time and returned from “the other”, afterlife side, from the world of the dead. The letter is

received by Hieronimo, but he does not take it seriously, which is not the case with Edmund's letter that was a trap for Gloster [...] (Šofranac 2013a: 105).

The letter as a trap is skillfully used in *Hamlet* as an instrument of subversion used by Hamlet in England, in order to preserve his own life. Namely, he forges the letter in which Claudius orders his elimination and thus sends Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, to make that happen. However, Hamlet manages to survive.

The written word has a prominent role in the novel of *Death and the Dervish* as well. It is why Harun was murdered. However, it is a court record, who would, in the light of New Historicism, be classified as a non-literary text.

In Nataša Šofranac's opinion, contrary to Othello, who does not have a reason nor the will to accept the charges incriminating Desdemona, he, however, has enough justification to accept the founding claims presented in the letter. But, he seeks confirmation and will accept them as the truth when he discovers the evidence of a deceased assistant killer, similar to those found in Edmund. He opts for acting as a means, and he himself is already affected by deep sorrow; still, he does not draw attention with his acting, as Hamlet, who thus creates turmoil eventually leading to his exile. Nuttall, A.D. (*Shakespeare The Thinker*, p. 399) thinks that early *Hamlet* performances are characterized by theatricality and violence. Based on Hamlet's directives to actors who come to the court, it is reasonable to assume that Shakespeare did not approve the acting style that was necessary in Kyd's pieces. He identified the "emptiness" in the Kyd's piece – and it is the protagonist's inactivity. Shakespeare expanded this gap into a psychological enigma, resulting in a hero tortured by his own not acting. Its madness is indisputably true, similar to Isabel's, in a sharp contrast to Hamlet's "calculated" acting, which is, although sometimes honest, largely invented. In that piece, a woman is subjected to despair, leading to her suicide, and she is the mother of a killed person. When suspects turn out to be true, hesitation or disposal becomes superfluous (Šofranac 2013a: 106).

What connects *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* basically is the plot that involves violent death, a crime that protagonists, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, have to avenge. The similarity lies in the fact that in both pieces crimes are executed by powerful figures in power, which is why the analysis through the prism of political crime justified. The murder in question happens prior to the main part of the plot, which is revenge, as a means of punishing such a misdeed. The motivation for punishment is different in both pieces of writing.

Since crime and revenge are the focal points of revenge tragedy, Selimović's novel can be analysed in the key of this Renaissance tragedy sub-genre. They involve a crime, a murder of an innocent man and a penalty (revenge). There is a murder of helpless man in *Hamlet* and there is revenge that the ghost imposes as a moral imperative on his son. The committed crime is the backbone of the fable, and the source of themes and motifs in the light of which these writings can be analyzed.

In the *Shakespeare's Dramaturgy*¹⁴⁵ book, Veselin Kostić elaborates on the dramaturgy of a revenge making comments on its form, the action cores, structure, and positions *Hamlet* in coordinates noticing Shakespeare's dramaturgical progress in relation to his first tragedy of revenge. Being focused on *Hamlet*, he notes that:

"Same as Shakespeare's first tragedy *Titus Andronicus*, that play falls into the so-called tragedies of revenge (revenge tragedies). According to the established pattern, the tragedy of revenge had two action cores – a crime committed by a negative hero and revenge, i.e. punishing that crime. That cause and effect relationship, however, imposes significant dramatic difficulties. Between the initial event, i.e. the crime requiring revenge, and the last scene, as the plot is coming to an end, there is a gap difficult to bridge in a satisfactory way. [...] In the earlier plays of this type, the gap is filled by the accumulation of sensational scenes. That's what Kyd did, and that's what Shakespeare himself did in case of his *Titus Andronicus*. In Shakespeare's tragedy, Titus's daughter Lavinia comes on stage a few moments after she was raped, her tongue was

¹⁴⁵ Kostić, Veselin, *Šekspirova dramaturgija*, Stubovi kulture, Beograd, 2010.

ripped and both hands cut off. And that happens pretty early in the play – in the fourth stage of the second act. Horrors are still piling up”¹⁴⁶ (Kostić 2010: 39).

“The scenes of the horror he mentioned also exist in the *Death and the Dervish* novel. One of them is the scene portraying the seeds on horseback. Nedžad Dedović writes about these horror sequences as an institutionalized form of violence:

“An institutionalized form of violence, but also the ethatistic terror after which Nuruddin gave a speech in the mosque in which the feeling of sadness and injustice due to the crime (thus threatening the positions of the rule) – the classic lynch of the messengers of the authorities, in fact, legalized violence. The scene of power will be further intensified by the choice of the way in which Nuruddin will be attacked which is while he is on the street, completely exposed and unprotected, attacked the people above him – on strong and powerful horses with claws. [...]”¹⁴⁷ (Dedović 2012).

¹⁴⁶ „Ta drama spada, kao i prva Šekspirova tragedija *Tit Androik*, u takozvane tragedije osвете. Po ustaljenom obrascu, tragedija osвете je imala dva akciona jezgra – zločin negativnog junaka i osvetu, odnosno kažnjavanje tog zločina. Ta uzročno-posledična struktura, nameće, međutim, znatne dramske teškoće. Između početnog događaja, odnosno zločina koji zahteva osvetu, i poslednje scene, kada se izvršenjem osвете zaplet privodi kraju, postoji jaz koji je u drami teško premostiti na zadovoljavajući način. [...] U ranijim dramama tog tipa jaz je popunjavan nagomilavanjem senzacionalnih scena. Tako je učinio Kid, a tako je postupio i sam Šekspir u svom Titu Androniku. U Šekspirovoj tragediji Titova ćerka Lavinija izlazi na pozornicu nekoliko trenutaka pošto su je silovali, iščupali joj jezik i odsekli obe ruke. A to se dešava prilično rano u drami – u četvrtoj sceni II čina. Užasi se i dalje gomilaju” (Kostić 2010: 39).

¹⁴⁷ „Institucionalizovan ioblik nasilja, ali i etatistički teror, primenjuju se nakon što je Nurudin održao govor u džamiji u kojem je na narod prenio osjećaj tuge i nepravde zbog učinjenog zločina (čime ugrožava pozicije vlastodržaca) – kazna je klasični linč „izaslanika” vlasti što je, ustvari, legalizovano nasilje. Prizor moći se dodatno intenzivira odabirom načina napada na Nurudina: Nurudina, koji je pješak na ulici, potpuno izložen i nezaštićen, napadaju ljudi koji su iznad njega – na snažnim i moćnim konjima, s kandžijama” (Dedović 2012). <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/>

At the very beginning, the red color symbolizes the foreboding of the horrors that will befall Nuruddin. It indicates pain, blood, terror and horror Nuruddin will suffer from. It is a revenge of the authorities because of Nuruddin's speech about the bestiality of the innocent man being killed and the horror it entails and leaves inside any man:

"Sons of Adem! I will not give a sermon, I could not, even if I wanted to. But I believe that you would hold it against me if I did not speak about myself now, at this moment, the darkest in my life. What I have to say has never been more important to me, but I am not trying to gain anything. Nothing, except to see compassion in your eyes. I did not call you my brothers, although you are that now more than ever, but rather the sons of Adem, invoking that which we all have in common. We are men, and think in the same way, especially when we are in distress. You have waited, and wanted for us to be together, to look one another in the eye, sorrowful about the death of an innocent man, and troubled by a crime. And that crime concerns you as well, since you know: whenever someone kills an innocent man, it is as if he has killed all men. They have killed all of us countless times, my murdered brothers, but we are horrified when they strike our most beloved"¹⁴⁸ (Selimović 2018a: 17–180).

The speech was held in the atmosphere of brotherly and human mourning in the mosque, the place where believers gather, thus representing a possible spark for rebellion of people. Nuruddin is aware of that:

¹⁴⁸ „Синови Адемови! Нећу држати проповјед, не бих могао и кад бих хтио. А вјерујем да бисте ми замјерили ако не бих сад, у овом часу, тежи не памтим у животу, говорио баш о себи. Никад ми није било важније оно што ћу да кажем, а не желим ништа да постигнем. Ништа, осим да видим саучешће у вајим очима. Нисам вас назвао браћом, иако сте ми то више него икад, већ синовима Адемовим, позивајући се на оно што је у свима нама заједничко. Људи смо, и мислимо исто, нарочито кад нам је тешко. Чекали сте, хтјели сте да останемо заједно, да се погледамо очи у очи, туужни због смрти недужна човјека, и узнемирани због злочина. И вас се тиче тај злочин, јер знате: ко убије недужна човјека, као да је све људе побио. Све су нас убили небројано пута, браћо моја убијена, а ужаснути смо кад погоди неког ко нам је најдражи” (Селимовић 2004: 181).

“What I had said in the mosque was sorrow, astonishment, stifled sobs, and maybe even a stifled howl. But all of it had been mine. A sorrowful attempt at retaliation and defense. But when I had said it, it suddenly became something else. No matter how it had begun, no matter what it had been, it turned into a common burden and condemnation”¹⁴⁹ (Selimović 2018a: 184).

It was a public protest initiated by the murder of an innocent man uttered by the dervish, to whom people believe, who was the brother of the killed man. That condemnation could be a potential response to terror. Ahmed Nuruddin as a religious authority could be its leader owing to his influence among the believers. Hence, he should be eliminated or at least intimidated. That attack is a threat to his life. Threats are instruments which those in power is use to keep the people in fear. The attack on the dervish, who performs confessions for people before death, who is the last person dying people entrust what is happening in their souls, carries a strong symbolic message.

“The most significant threat features are increasing power (since it produces fear) and maintaining constant psychological pressure required for strengthening the power – the one to the threat should be treated by the threat. Of course, intimidation has a control function; In this case, local powerful people, through its media [...]. The threat, producing fear, should state others to behave the way a threat referral, ie how it wants authority to bring Nuruddin to behavior in accordance with its interests. However, the effectiveness of the threat was made only if the desired result is obtained, ie. Behavior in accordance with the objectives of the referral”¹⁵⁰ (Dedović 2012).

¹⁴⁹ „Оно што сам рекао у џамији била је туга, запрепаштеност, уздржан плач и уздржан урлик можда. Али све моје. Тужан обрачун и тужна одбрана. А кад сам то рекао, одједном је постало нешто друго. Ма од чега да је почело, ма шта да је било, претворило се у заједничку тежину, и осу-ду” (Исто: 186).

¹⁵⁰ „Најзначајније функције пријетње су повећавање моћи (будући да производи страх) и одржавање константног психолошког притиска потребног за учвршћивање моћи – онај коме је упућена пријетња треба да због страха поступа

When it comes to Ahmed Nuruddin, more intensive emotion than fears of power is his hatred. She will be a flywheel of his revenge. In contrast, Hamlet resigns revenge. And at one and at the second hero, we follow their course of thought all the time. The turning of attention to the internal plan instead of an external is one of the Shakespeare's dramaturgical improvements. In the novel *Death and the Dervish* of the internal plan is dominated by part. It will be Ahmed Nuruddin and its reflection are an important instrument of finding the motivation of the protagonist and the dominant way of its characterization.

In relation to the older pattern of revenge tragedy he used in *Titus Andronicus*, William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is undoubtedly better at many dramaturgical fields, especially in that segment of the play which is moving focus from the external towards the internal, which results in cause-and-effect ties between delaying revenge and the protagonists' character. In *Hamlet*, it is about *Hamletism* (Klein 1964: 63), and in *Death and the Dervish*, revenge is Nuruddin's personal decision, the product of his hatred-soaked mind. The gap that used to exist between the initial and ultimate main moment, crimes and its revenge, now is inebriated by internal turmoil of the hero (Kostić 2010: 39).

Only when, almost a decade later, Shakespeare began his second revenge tragedy, *Hamlet*, the complete development of his dramaturgy during those years was obvious. This evolution can be seen in all aspects: style is no longer intrusive with aggressive rhetoric; characterization is much deeper; themes are more numerous and more diverse; and there is a lot of wider emotional, moral and

prema želji upućivača prijetnje. Naravno, zastrašivanje ima funkciju kontrole; u ovom slučaju lokalni moćnici, preko svog medija [...]. Prijetnja, proizvedeći strah, treba navesti druge da se ponašaju onako kako želi upućivač prijetnje, odnosno kako želi vlast čiji je cilj dovesti Nuruddina u ponašanje sukladno njenim interesima. Međutim, djelotvornost prijetnje je ostvarena jedino ako poluči željeni rezultat, tj. ponašanje u skladu s ciljevim upućivača" (Dedović 2012). <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/>

philosophical range. Moreover, Shakespeare has quite effectively solved the central structural problem of a revenge tragedy – her delayed revenge – turning it inside and explicitly connecting with the character of the protagonist. This gap between two main lines of action is not filled with a series of sensational physical events or bombastic speech, but internal agonies of central character. This change in the outside of the inner drama helps to explain another innovation that Shakespeare involved in the conventional tragedy of revenge, which changes its structure (Kostić 2010: 39-40).

“[...] the problem of setting a key event solved in a way that is conditioned by Shakespeare’s concept of that tragedy in *Hamlet* as well. Since in that play the emphasis is not on external events, but on the inner survival of the avenger, the revenge tragedy structure has been changed, so the physical act of the murder the main hero should avenge is transferred in the time prior to the start of the play”¹⁵¹ (*Ibid*: 70).

The tragedy of revenge rests on the crime revenge motive (Kostić 1982: 64). “The main elements of tragedy revenge are well studied and familiar. Some criminal commits a great crime. The main hero is trying to avenge that crime”¹⁵² (*Ibid.*). In *Hamlet* and in *Death and the Dervish*, it is a political crime. In both pieces of writing, the criminal is the Machiavellian type of a hero or a Machiavellian hero.

“The tragedy of revenge is interested in what causes the need for revenge, crime, revenge that, [...] does not follow immediately

¹⁵¹ „I u Hamletu je [...] problem postavljanja ključnog događaja rešen na način koji je uslovljen Šekspirovom koncepcijom te tragedije. Pošto u toj drami naglasak nije na spoljašnjim događajima, nego na unutrašnjim preživljavanjima osvetnika, struktura tragedije osvete je izmenjena, pa je fizički akt ubistva koje glavni junak treba da osveti izmešten u vreme pre početka drame” (Ucro: 70).

¹⁵² „Glavni elementi tragedije osvete su dobro proučeni i poznati. Neki zločinac počinio veliki zločin. Glavni junak pokušava da osveti taj zločin” (Kostić 1982: 64).

after identifying the killer”¹⁵³ (*Ibid*: 66) and what connects these two moments. Revenge connects two parts, but, the motivation of revenge in them is completely different in two protagonists.

Both pieces of writing, *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* are writings tackling the inner depths of their protagonists. These two literary pieces of writing are engaged in their contradiction, a disagreement of the rules inside them.

“The essential solution of the play is a disposal of revenge by bringing into an immediate and firm connection with the protagonist’s character [...], inner conflicts in the soul of the main character without the possibility of a real solution. [...] When the problem is observed on the level on one set of values, one solution is imposed; immediately, however, the solution is overthrown when the problem is considered according to the another set of values. In that case, the original solution is annulled and the other, contrary to the first is imposed”¹⁵⁴ (*Ibid*: 67).

What the revenge tragedy does not deal with are the situations causing the crime in question as well as those following it since “[...] tragedy of revenge neither investigates the path leading to to the crime, as in the case of Othello, nor the one ensuing after it had happened, as in the case of Macbeth¹⁵⁵ (*Ibid*: 65). The focus of the revenge tragedy is pointed on two crucial moments in the play. The first one is its beginning in which hero is burdened with the task of taking on the revenge and its end in which revenge happens.

One of the main aspects to be considered when analysing this Shakespeare’s tragedy is the position of the main character.” *Hamlet*

¹⁵³ „[...] ne sledi odmah nakon identifikovanja ubice” (*Исцјо*: 66).

¹⁵⁴ „suštinsko rešenje drame je odlaganje osvete dovođenjem u neposrednu i čvrstu vezu s karakterom glavnog junaka [...], unutrašnjim sukobima u duši glavnog junaka bez mogućnosti stvarnog rešenja. [...] Kada se problem posmatra na jednom planu vrednosti, nameće se jedno rešenje; odmah zatim, međutim, nad to rešenje nadnosi se drugi sistem vrednosti, koji prvobitno rešenje poništava i nameće drugo, suprotno od prvog” (*Исцјо*: 67).

¹⁵⁵ „[...] tragedija osvete ne istražuje ni put do zločina, kao Otelo, ni posle zločina, kao Magbet” (*Исцо*: 65).

belongs to the Elizabethan tradition of revenge. And in such a tragedy”, Gardner says – “it’s basic that the main hero did not create a situation in which he was, from which tragedy happens”¹⁵⁶ (Gardner in: Koljevic 1981: 79). What makes Elizabethan tragedy revenge is psychologically interesting is its character because it is derives from morality (Kostić 2011: 37).

“Morality play is an allegorical drama whose shop portrays the fighting forces of the fellow man’s soul. [...] The morality also entered the notion of a dramatic action portraying man’s life as a problem of choice between significantly contradicting behavioralities, ie as permanent moral self-determination”¹⁵⁷ (Kostić 1983: 65).

It is the most striking element of *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* especially when it comes to two possible choices that are in complete opposition to each other, as those between whom Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are located.

“The morality possessed a germ of tragic ideas, but the religious dogma did not allow evil ever to triumph, at least temporarily. That is why the Renaissance tragedy in England was under the greater influence of the classic tragedy, especially the tragedy of the Roman drama of Seneca. Seneca was interested in human character in her dramas and was trying to establish what makes him a tragic creature” (Andrejevic 2010: 122).

Na taj način unutrašnje preispitivanje postaje težište drame *Hamlet*, a uporedo sa tim engleski dramatičari preuzimaju i druge odlike od Seneke.

¹⁵⁶ „Хамлет припада елизабетанској традиције освете. А у таквој врсти трагедије – каже Гарднерова – основно је „да главни јунак није створио ситуацију у којој се налази и из које трагедија постаје” (Гарднер у: Кољевић 1981: 79).

¹⁵⁷ „Moralitet je alegorijska drama čija radnja prikazuje borbu suparničkih sila o čovekovu dušu. [...] Moraliteti su takođe uneli pojam dramske radnje koja prikazuje čovekov život kao problem izbora između bitno protivrečnih mogućnosti ponašanja, odnosno kao stalnog moralnog samoodređivanja” (Kostić 1983: 65).

His main heroes meditate on the destiny and want to know the reason for their behavior and justify it. This self-examination of man, his search for a solution located between passion and reason is the main element of this Elizabethan tragedy. This will take advantage of the dramatists who belong to the circle of university minds (Thomas Kyd, Christopher Marlowe and Others). They also follow Seneca's model of an explicit way of describing the killings and massacre that caused horror, with that difference that such images in Seneca did not portray themselves on the scene. So, English dramatists take over the worst, theatrical, commercially, frightening – spirits, violent images, revenge (all in tragedy *Gorboduc*, Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton), but also the best – magnificent hope in the magical power of language with the help of drama, whatever the subject to speak, rejects logic. By the unfortunate and exclusive influence of Seneca formula horror and fear, Chapman and Shakespeare¹⁵⁸ (*Ibid.*).

In Shakespeare's drama, the task of revenge was imposed in the throne in introductory scenes by the avetics for which he was not sure,

¹⁵⁸ „Моралитети су поседовали клицу трагичне идеје, али религиозна догма није дозвољавала да зло икада тријумфује, макар привремено. Зато је ренесансна трагедија у Енглеској била под већим утицајем класичне трагедије и то посебно трагедија римског драматичара Сенеке. Сенека се у својим драмама интересовао за људски карактер и покушавао је да установи шта га чини трагичним бићем. Његови главни јунаци медитирају о својој судбини и желе да сазнају разлог свог понашања и да га оправдају. Ово самоиспитивање човека, његова потрага за решењем које се налази између страсти и разума главни је елемент и елизабетинске трагедије. То ће прво и у пуном смислу искористити драматичари који припадају кругу Универзитетских умова (Томас Кид, Кристофер Марло и други). Они прате и Сенекин модел експлицитног начина описа убистава и масакра који су изазивали хорор, с том разликом да се такве слике код Сенеке нису приказивале на сцени. Дакле, енглески драматичари преузимају од Сенеке оно најгоре, театрално, комерцијално, застрашујуће – духове, насилне слике, освету (све присутно у трагедији Горбодак, Томаса Саквила и Томаса Нортон), али и оно најбоље – величанствену наду у магијску моћ језика уз помоћ којег драма, било о ком предмету да говори, одбацује логику. Несрећном и искључивом утицају Сенекине формуле хорора и страха побегли су Чапман и Шекспир” (Андрејевић 2010: 122).

whether he was only Mefistophelic temptation. requiring revenge, which implies the killing of the negative hero, his “unnatural father”¹⁵⁹ by his Uncle, usurpator, a murderer, criminal. The old King Hamlet reveals the truth to Hamlet:

“Thus was I, sleeping, by a brother’s hand
Of life, of crown, of queen at once dispatched,
Cut off even in the blossoms of my sin,
Unhouseled, disappointed, unaneled.
No reckoning made, but sent to my account
With all my imperfections on my head”¹⁶⁰ (I. 5. 74–79).

In the *Death and the Dervish*, we are initially introduced to the fact that Ahmed Nuruddin’s younger brother Harun was arrested and imprisoned in the fortress. Later in the piece, He would not only be arrested but imprisoned as well. Dervish believes it must be due to something harmless since, his brother is not a criminal. Hence, he could not have done anything against the law. However, the authorities thought it was serious enough to get him killed. The content of the tragedy of revenge lies in the space between the two moments.

The part of that space is used by the hero, that is the avenger aiming to find out the truth about the crime and to be able to fulfill his task and execute revenge. Ahmed Nuruddin was not the one who started anything remotely leading to the circumstances he found himself to be in. So, he fits the description provided by Nikola Koljević. In his book, he argues there were external circumstances creating the

¹⁵⁹ Хамлет мрмљајући себи у браду каже да је Клаудије његов „неприродни отац” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, 2022: 17).

¹⁶⁰ „Руком братовљевом, у сну,
Лишен живота, круне, краљице,
У цвету својих грехова истргнут,
Без припреме, причешћа, помазања,
Без обрачуна на страшни послат суд,
Са свим својим гресима на глави”
(*Ibid.*: 34)

overall atmosphere of necessity for revenge. On the other hand, the hero in such a situation has to act on the basis on his inner principles.

This is very important when it comes to Ahmed Nuruddin because he is only an ordinary member of the society, but a priest, a dervish whose behaviour must be entirely restricted by imperatives of religion and his inner religion-oriented guidelines around which he (re)invented his life upon returnig from the war and finding out the women he loved had married another man. That is how Ahmed Nuruddin fits the description of a Shakespeare's hero. According to Koljević

“the avenger is a man in a situation that is imposed on his outside. He cannot choose the frame of his existence, but only to determine who he is within it. And Shakespeare created such a hero whose deepest impulse is the creation of life out of himself, to suit him and in line with his numerous and complex spiritual imperatives”¹⁶¹ (Koljevic 1981: 80).

Ahmed Nuruddin, however, is divided between two conflicting systems simultaneously existing within himself. The first one is his dervishness in which he loses himself and to which he is completely subordinated thus identifying himself absolutely with the Islamic dogma postulates. His personal identity was completely annulled by his socially constructed identity. His internal conflict takes place between not opting for superstructural and human ideals by not doing everything he can as a brother and the son. It is a conflict between its identity as a member of the Order and *biological imperative* (Ivanov 2017: 384).

Harun and what happens to him, how, why, on what grounds become a focal point of disagreement of Ahmed Nuruddin with the situation caused by the decision-making authorities and disobeying the rules in the name of which, paradoxically, he does everything he

¹⁶¹ „осветник је човек у ситуацији која му је извана наметнута. Он не може да бира оквир свог постојања, већ само да се одређује унутар њега. А Шекспир је створио таквог јунака чији је најдубљи импулс стварање живота из себе, по својој мери и у складу са својим бројним и сложеним духовним императивима” (Кољевић 1981: 80).

does after becoming aware of having lost his brother, and what's more, an innocent man having been killed basically for no reason but the authorities benefiting from it. This also goes for the murder of the father and taking the throne over from Hamlet by Claudius.

Time flies between the dervish knowing that his brother was first arrested then killed and his revenge. Within that timeline, tectonic earthquakes in the inner, emotional and spiritual being of the two protagonists, resulting in Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin we met at the beginning of these two writings are not the same people at the end of the two literary pieces of writing they once were, but only look the same and carry the same name. However, their behavior change leading to the fatal, tragic end. During the novel development, nothing remains the same and unchanged in them. Between those moments, Nuruddin tempts Mullah-Yusuf, as Hamlet tempts Claudius aiming to provide evidence of the guilt to make taking up the revenge easier. (Kostić 1982: 66). Although Hamlet already has it in the form of the "[...], half-evidence, if it can be said so, obtained from the afterlife and brought by a ghost, and the final evidence is obtained in the "Mouse Trap" scene" [...]"¹⁶² (Kostic 1982: 66).

It is a vital element of the revenge tragedy because both us and Hamlet learn about the crime committed by Claudius, a self-imposed ruler to whom the throne belonged owing to having married the old King Hamlet's widow, from the Ghost. Such marriage was considered at least problematic when it comes to law, legitimacy and morality of that time. Namely, "[...] marriage between a widow and her brother-in-law endangers the son's heritage right. The son is the first in the line of the inheritance but his mother marrying the father's brother threatens to annul the law of the legitimate successor"¹⁶³ (Spremić

¹⁶² „[...] „полудоказ”, ако се тако може рећи, стиже из загробног света и доноси га један дух, а коначни доказ прибавља се у „сцени мишоловке” [...]” (Kostić 1982: 66).

¹⁶³ „[...] brak udovice i devera ugrožava nasledno pravo njenog sina. Sin je prvi u liniji nasleđivanja a očev brat drugi, ali majčina udaja za očevog brata preti da poništi sinovljevo pravo legitimnog naslednika” (Spremić 2011: 47–48).

2011: 47-48). Claudius, the main gear of the repressive mechanism killed an innocent man for the sake of acquiring the royal crown, authority and Gertruda's body (despite the love the play implies), that is achieving his own interests. The aforementioned resulted in Hamlet becoming furiously estranged from Claudius and his mother, Ophelia, from the entire court, basically, subsequently including those he considered his friends.

The same kind of estrangement is Ahmed Nuruddin's, owing to the emotional injuries he suffered. The real word for this kind of the relationship between the protagonists and everyone else is alienation. Except for several of his spiritual relatives, the members of his religious family, the one he found behind the tekke door, the dervish was alienated from people in general, his biological family, and, finally, from women in general because of an particular one, until meeting the kadi's wife that reminds him of the love from his youth who betrayed him by marrying someone else (despite the fact it was a choice imposed on her rather than the one she made) became the dervish. Her body belongs to another man. Although, at the end of the novel, we learn that her body may have previously belonged to him. This is implied by the arrival of a young man who is the dervish's potential biological son (Selimović 2018b: 373).

We can conclude that *Hamlet* and *Death and Dervish* tackle the themes and motives such as death, sons and crimes of machiavelian heroes conducted by the authorities. The authorities in *Death and the Dervish* killed an innocent man for providing their staying in power thus protecting their interests which is to conceal their wrongdoings such as fabricating a trial that never happened and to prevent the one who happens to know about it and witnesses about it with his very eyes, by reading the document confirming that, from sharing the classified information with the rest of the community. That person is Nuruddin's brother, Harun. Upon knowing about it, Nuruddin is obliged to avenge his brother in order to protect justice and values thus punishing the felons. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin share the same problem, which is the "[...] contradictory

ideas paralyzing crossroads [...]”¹⁶⁴ (Kostić 1982: 67). In this way, the inner conflict arises.

An important feature of tragedy of revenge is moving the focus from the outside to the what is happening inside the characters. This means the accent in the tragedy of revenge is not on the fable and situations derived from it, which are recognized as problems, but on the echo of these situations within the heroes (*Ibid.*). Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are in that way true heroes of tragedy of revenge because the focus of both pieces of writing is their inner conflict between how they are, or, better yet, how they should be perceived by the society. At the same time, this lack of what is real on the inside as opposed to what is fake on the outside is an essential characteristic of the Nietzsche’s subject. The mask is the gap between the internal and external in the hero, what we see and what really happens inside themselves.

What differentiates Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin and, consequently, these two literary pieces, is the protagonist’s attitude towards revenge. When it comes to a typical tragedy of revenge, „[...] the avenger blames himself because he fails to punish the criminal”¹⁶⁵ (*Ibid.*: 64). In the first part of the novel, Ahmed Nuruddin is safe in his reasons for not acting. His reason is his utter service to religion. He is convinced of the correctness of his attitude

In addition, one of the characteristics of tragedy of revenge is that in it “[...] the avenger’s initiative does not lead to the final denouement, but the criminal finally provides him with the opportunity he had to wait until then”¹⁶⁶ (*Ibid.*: 65). That is where this novel also deviates from a tragedy of revenge.

And when he becomes kadi, Ahmed Nuruddin does not give up his conscience as the main generator of his decisions. Hamlet,

¹⁶⁴ „[...] paralizujuće ukrštanje protivrečnih ideja [...]” (Kostić 1982: 67).

¹⁶⁵ „[...] osvetnik krivi samog sebe što ne uspeva da kazni zločinca” (Kostić 1982: 64).

¹⁶⁶ „[...] do konačnog raspleta ne dolazi na inicijativu osvetnika, nego mu zločinac najzad pruža priliku koju je do tada morao da čeka” (Исход: 65).

on the other hand, is a typical hero of a tragedy revenge because his self-indulgence in all drama knows that acts should be repeated in his monologues. One of the most striking is as follows:

“Why, what an ass am I! This is most brave,
That I, the son of a dear father murder’d,
Prompted to my revenge by heaven and hell,
Must, like a whore, unpack my heart with words,
And fall a-cursing, like a very drab,
A scullion!
Fie upon’t! foh!”¹⁶⁷
(2,2, 67–68)

Disgust is a motif that connects the Dionysiac man (Nietzsche 2003: 39), which prevents him from acting. Hamlet bitterly resents himself the inaction, while Ahmed Nuruddin insists on his belief in God’s plan, which involves a big picture that only God will change, and therefore any action does not make sense. That is why Nuruddin hesitates. His consciousness is ideologized to the extreme. He is blinded by ideology. Hamlet, on the other hand, is afraid.

In this play, the Prince returns from England with his task of Claudius’ murder after he received proof that Claudius had wanted to murder him. The Prince will fulfill his duty to take up the revenge aware that he did not get into it driven (just) by his personal hatred but as a ruler obliged to free his country and its people from the morally rotten usurper and his harmful influence that can be fatal for the entire Danish country.

¹⁶⁷ „Ах. Какав сам магарац! Јест „храбро”
Да ја убијеног, драгог оца син,
Небом и паклом на освету гоњен,
Морам ко курва да срцу олакшам
Речима, па сам дао се у псовке,
Ко права рита, ко судопера.
Гадим се на то, пфуј”!
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 60)

2.1 THE MACHIAVELLIAN HERO IN *HAMLET* AND *DEATH AND THE DERVISH*

The political discourse of the Shakespeare's tragedy relies heavily on a Machiavellian doctrine. It shook severely the foundations of the system of values that was current prior to this occurrence, and the state, social, political structure that had had its own pattern by which society as a political totality, and thus the political life within this entirety, was organized. The controversy of this doctrine lies in the fact that it makes a clear and ambiguous distinction between two phenomena, which will be incessantly used by Shakespeare to build his (historical) tragedies with major success owing to very convincingly portraying this gap represented in the characters of rulers.

“Namely, Machiavelli's piece *The Governor* shattered the traditional understandings of political life. Prior to that book being published, the state was considered a sphere of a general „chain of beings” in which the same system of values as inside of a human being as well in the cosmos was reflected. And now all of a sudden, Machiavelli starts talking about the state as the authority and the technique of ruling, thus separating politics and morals as two different things”¹⁶⁸ (Koljević 1981: 102).

The most significant challenge directed towards the doctrines on the ruler's divine right originated from Machiavelli's piece *The Governor* (printed in 1532). This book faced a wide condemnation and censorship across Europe; however, its basic ideas were well known among educated English, despite the absence of its English translation. Moreover, no European monarch remained was indifferent-

¹⁶⁸ „Наиме, Макијавелијев *Владалац* је нанео тежак ударац традиционалним схватањима политичког живота. Пре те књиге држава је посматрана као једна сфера општег „ланца бића” у којој се огледао исти систем вредности као у човеку и космосу. А сада је Макијавели (Niccolò Machiavelli) одједном почео да говори о држави као власти и техници владања, раздвајајући тиме политику и морал као две различите ствари” (Кољевић 1981: 102).

ent regarding the repulsion of the author's advice to rulers, many of whom implemented these strategies. It is obvious that not only was Shakespeare familiar with this writing, but he was also thoroughly engaged in its content. This piece was the most common criticism of the ruler's divine right (Milanović 2009: 8).

Apart from the Machiavellian heroes, "the second connection, or analogy with Machiavelli, however, is more important for reflection of the politics arising from historical plays"¹⁶⁹ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 66). Namely,

"understanding the state organization, in all European countries, without exception, was monarchistic, and the monarch, was, without exception, understood as the anointed God's representative on Earth. In addition, at least nominally, Christian moral principles were used as a superior community ideological framework. The radical innovation, which Machiavelli clearly articulated, and for which in Europe it was also severely difficult to be accepted by the churches, both Catholic, and Protestant, as well as by the secular authorities, introduced Machiavelli's demystifying and clearly defined separation of religion and politics. He has portrayed that monarchs do not necessarily have to behave in accordance with Christian moral principles, and that, moreover, it is not even desirable. for a successful rule. Religion is, in conjunction with the state ruling, considered a means enabling the subjects' ruling and manipulation at best. His political theory implied that ruling the state, and therefore, the course of events the history arises from, do not depend on the Predestination but the person's will, intelligence, political insight, his/her art of war and art of ruling during peaceful times"¹⁷⁰ (*Ibid.*).

¹⁶⁹ „За промишљање политике које произилази из историјских драма важнија је, међутим, друга веза, или аналогија, са Макијавелијем” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 66).

¹⁷⁰ „схватање државног устројства је у свим европским државама, без изузетка, било монархистичко, а монарх је, без изузетка, био схватан као миропомазани божји представник на земљи. Уз то су, барем номинално, ишла и хришћанска морална начела, као претпостављени идеолошки оквир заједнице. Радикалну новину, коју је Макијавели јасно артикулисао, а

He was introduced in the tradition of English Renaissance drama by Christopher Marlowe. A literary character portraying Machiavellist's traits, and whom, based on them, we can call a Machiavellist, whom we can also describe as „[...] a resourceful manipulator playing with the lives of others [...]”¹⁷¹ (Šofranac 2013a: 349), as Claudius, and, especially, Aini-effendi.

Jan Kott tackles the Shakespeare's work's political aspect with regard to history and the time in which he wrote. He focuses not only on the figure of the ruler and the historical relevance of his title, but also on the benefits accompanying power in the chapter “Kings” of the book *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*. In this book, he emphasizes what is considered and how important the royal insignia was for Shakespeare to write about and mentioning, for example, a gold coin as a metaphor of power and wealth. This book is fraught with the parallels connecting history, the Middle Ages Renaissance England political philosophy and the ruler's position within it.

When it comes to the cruelty of a ruler and his superior authority Jan Kott argues that: “Kings do not entrust the secret murder, they just allow it to be committed”¹⁷² (*Ibid*: 29). It is a link with the *Death and the Dervish*. We do not know who Harun's killers are per se, we do

koju su u Evropi teško prihvatile i crkve, kako katolička, tako i protestantska, i svetovne vlasti, unelo je Mačijavelijevo demistifikujuće i jasno definisano razdvajanje religije i politike. Pokazao je da se monarsi ne moraju nužno ponašati u skladu sa hrišćanskim moralnim načelima, te da to, štaviše, za uspešnu vladavinu čak nije ni poželjno. Religiju je, u sprezi sa umećem vođenja države, u najboljem slučaju video kao sredstvo pomoću kojeg se može upravljati i manipulisati podanicima. Iz njegove političke teorije proizilazilo je, naizgled, da upravljanje državom, pa samim tim i tokom događaja od kojih nastaje istorija, ne zavisi od Božjeg proviđenja, već od ljudske vladarske vođe, inteligencije, političke pronicljivosti, umeća ratovanja i umeća vladanja u miru” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 66).

¹⁷¹ „[...] snalažljivog manipulatora koji se igra životima drugih ljudi [...]” (Šofranac 2013a: 349).

¹⁷² „Kraljevi ne poveravaju tajno ubistvo. Kraljevi samo dopuštaju da se ono izvrši” (Kot 1990: 29).

not know their names but we know whose signature is on his death verdict at first masked as arrest. What matters is what, in addition to signifying a *public figure* (Hristić in: *The Scene* 1967: 372), he has a name. He is Aini-effendi. In *Hamlet*, the secret murder is executed by Claudius himself.

Jan Kott dissolves the ruling/ruler figure on two components: “The personality of the king and ruler [...] connects two opposites: a member of society and the one who is outside society: a man like everyone else and the sacral personality”¹⁷³ (Kott in: *The Scene* 1967: 319). Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are an example of this identity division. The essence of Jan Kott’s Great Mechanism is closely related to the ruler violent overthrow and the fight for power between the exponents of the authority generating crime in order to obtain the power in question. Since any ruler wants to be powerful, he must remove competitors at the throne (Kott 1990: 24) and get the crown. This violent authority is a ruler’s regime.

In this sense, Greenblatt says in his book *The Tyrant*¹⁷⁴: “Tyrant’s triumph is based on lies, empty promises and violent removal of rivals”¹⁷⁵ (Greenblatt, trans. Stojanović, 2020: 94). In his opinion, “tyranny turns the entire structure of power upside down: legitimacy is no longer in the center of the state, but in the victims of violence”¹⁷⁶ (*Ibid*: 142).

As Stephen Greenblatt says, Shakespeare tried to portray the reality of the age in which he lived under the cloak of history. “However, Elizabethan theater was also ruled by censorship. Admittedly, the censors sometimes knew how to be sloppy, but they would never allow the dramatization of conspiracies against the Queen’s regime”

¹⁷³ „Ličnost kralja i vladaoča [...] spaja u sebi dve suprotnosti: člana društva i koji je van društva: čoveka kao i svi drugi i ličnosti sakrane (Kot u: *Scena* 1967: 319).

¹⁷⁴ Grinblat, Stiven, *Tiranin: Šeksir o politici*, preveo Vladan Stojanović, Beograd: Vulkan, 2020.

¹⁷⁵ „Tiraninov trijumf zasnovan je na lažima, ispraznim obećanjima i nasilnom uklanjanju rivala” (Grinblat, prev. Stojanović, 2020: 94).

¹⁷⁶ „tiranija okreće čitavu strukturu lasti naopačke: legitimnost više nije u središtu države, već u žrtvama nasilja” (*Исцо*: 142).

(Greenblatt 2020: 19). Therefore, “[...] it is possible to perform it by moving events to distant places or by describing events from the distant past” (*Ibid.*), and “Shakespeare was a master of displacement and strategic circumvention” (*Ibid.*: 20). His mastery lies in the following: “[...] he kept a safe distance from current events”¹⁷⁷ (*Ibid.*).

Both pieces of writing, the play *Hamlet* and the novel *Death and the Dervish* deal with “[...] who has the right to kill a man without a trial and without the right to a trial”¹⁷⁸ (Egerić 2010: 94), not only in the context of a fake confession on which Harun came across while working as a scribe, an official in the government system, who did not have any authority or participated in her schemes, but suffered from them, but also in the context of his and the murder of King Hamlet who was killed sinful. Claudius killed his brother by poisoning him during his afternoon break. He married his brother’s wife as soon as he entered into consanguineous marriage. And, he dethroned his stepson Hamlet by usurping the Danish throne, which was made possible by his marriage to Gertrude.

Nikola Koljević claims in *Shakespeare the Tragedian: Andrić’s Masterpiece*¹⁷⁹ that Claudius is at the top of the political hierarchy. He plays the parts of a flawed monarch and a crafty criminal in Shakespeare’s play. In order to steal his wife and his kingdom he surreptitiously poisoned his brother while he was asleep. Claudius deceit is based on this interplay between personal desire and royal power.

¹⁷⁷ „Međutim, elizabetanskim pozorištem vladala je i cenzura. Cenzo-ri su, doduše, ponekad znali da budu aljkavi, ali dramatizaciju zavera protiv kraljičinog režima nikad ne bi dozvolili” (Grinblat, prev. Stojanović, 2020: 19). Збор тора „[...] je to moguće izvesti izmeštanjem zbivanja na daleka mesta ili opisivanjem događaja iz daleke prošlosti” (Исто), а „Шекспир је био мајстор измештања и стратешког заобилажења” (Исто: 20).

Његово мајсторство крије се у следећем:

„[...] održavao je bezbedno rastojanje od tekućih događaja” (Исто).

¹⁷⁸ „[...] ко има право да убије човека без суда и без права на суђење” (Егерић 2010: 94), [...].

¹⁷⁹ Кољевић, Никола, *Шекспир, трагичар: Андрићево ремек-дело*, Београд: Службени гласник; Бања Лука: Академија наука и умјетности Републике српске, 2012.

When he exhibits obvious signs of distress in Hamlet's presence his true nature becomes apparent revealing his fear and his incapacity to confront the gravity of his actions. Even though he is somewhat conscious of his transgressions he is immune to Polonius's false assumptions regarding Hamlet's purported insanity. Claudius even comes up with a seemingly clever scheme to kill Hamlet while disguising his self-serving intentions as concern (Koljević 2012: 195–197). He unintentionally admits his own moral decline though when he says this during a prayer session.

This confession highlights the futility of his attempts at redemption. Thus Claudius, as a political figure, appears as an essentially petty criminal. Unlike Shakespeare's more terrifying villains, his crimes stem from a base emotion – envy. He is unable to bear the thought of his brother's kingship overshadowing his own ambitions. This deep sense of inadequacy is further illustrated by his desire to have his transgressions quickly forgotten, wanting to return to a semblance of fairness. The character of Claudius reveals a deep moral inconsistency, as well as his inherent pettiness even in his criminal endeavors. His character reveals a childish moral inconsistency (*Ibid*).

The depiction of such an evolutionary archetype in homo politicus in Hamlet is not accidental. For a protagonist who is his own worst adversary, the most terrifying challenges often come from those who pose no real threat. Shakespeare, with his extraordinary insight, recognized the triviality of such individuals. He understood that they do not represent a subject but a relationship, which is always one-sided and which does not proceed from oneself to the other but vice versa. Moreover, he seemed to realize that the obsession with power is inherently questionable, as it ultimately dehumanizes the individual, reducing him to a mere relational dynamic. This leads to a state in which one ceases to exist as an individual whose integrity is stable and independent of others, but instead relies on others to construct one's identity, in order to give it the support that the inherent does not have (*Ibid*).

Therefore, he made Hamlet unhappy on a personal and political level by taking away his father and the right to rule, but also his mother, which raises the question of Hamlet's psychosexual functioning. By his apparently kind behavior towards Hamlet at the beginning of the play, which begins

"[...] to the sad laments of Hamlet, who mourns the death of his father and the inappropriate behavior of his mother, the Ghost of the late king suddenly appears. At night, on the ramparts of the castle, he reveals to his son the terrible" crime of which he is the victim and invites his son to take revenge on Claudius. [...] faced with this revenge as a duty, Hamlet retreats beyond expectations. Over the course of four acts, we will see him pretending, taking advice, blaming himself and despairing in order to admit to himself as openly as possible that he is not capable of killing his uncle. He is only able to prepare a performance of the comedy *Mousetrap* in his moments of forced leisure in order to expose the criminal [...]"¹⁸⁰ (Parry in: *The Scene* 1967: 387),

after he killed his father and took away both his mother and the state, we conclude that Claudius is a hypocrite, and hypocrisy is one of the most prevalent levers of Machiavellian behavior.

Aini-effendi, on the other hand, is responsible for the murder of Nuruddin's brother Harun. He is a hypocritical ruler who twists Nuruddin's humane and brotherly behavior into behavior that undermines the law. Although he is not the one who killed Harun, he is responsible for his murder. Together with the musellim and the mufti, he stands not only behind this crime, but behind crime as a

¹⁸⁰ „[...] tuobnim žalopojkama Hamleta koji tuguje zbog smrti svoga oca i nedoličnog ponašanja svoje majke, iznenada se javlja Duh pokojnog kralja. Noću, na bedemima zamka, on otkriva svom sijnu „užasan“ zločin čija je on žrtva i poziva sina da izvrši osvetu nad Klaudijem. [...] suočen sa tom osvetom kao s dužnošću, Hamlet mimo očekivanja, uzmiče. Tokom četiri čina videćemo ga kako se pretvara, prima savete, okrivljuje sebe i očajava kako bi što otvorenije priznao sebi da nije sposoban da ubije svog strica. Jedino je u stanju da u trenucima svoje prinudne dokolice pripremi izvođenje komedije „Mišolovka“ kako bi razotkrio zločinca [...]" (Pari y: *Scena* 1967: 387).

means to an end, which, like Claudius, unequivocally links him to Machiavellianism.

Describing Iago as Shakespeare's greatest Machiavellian (Koljević, 1981: 102), remarkable similarities between him and the Machiavellian heroes in *Death and the Dervish* and *Hamlet* are noted.

"Everything, [...], for Iago is simple and boils down to personal interest. That is the goal, and nature has armed us with various means to reach that goal as efficiently as possible. All means are Machiavellian acceptable if they serve such an end. And the most useful, according to Iago, are lies, deception and fraud"¹⁸¹ (Koljević 1981: 104–105).

Both murders are evidence of a criminal government under which "there is no legal process; there is no respect for the rules of civilization [...]"¹⁸² (Greenblatt, trans. Stojanović, 2020: 143). Aini-efendi is responsible for the murder of Nuruddin's brother Harun. He is a hypocritical ruler who twists Nuruddin's humane and brotherly behavior into behavior that subverts the law by selectively using the *Holy Book*. Although he is not the one who killed Harun, he is responsible for his murder.

A Machiavellian hero is one who sacrifices an innocent person in order to achieve his own goal, and who does not even do it in the name of higher values, or in the name of some kind of transcendental meaning, but for the sake of his own benefit, in order to realize some kind of his interest or to achieve a goal that will to bring the queen, the throne, when it comes to Claudius, or to ensure that he stays in power, when it comes to about muslim, mufti and kadi in *Death and the Dervish*.

¹⁸¹ „Све је, [...], за Јага једноставно и своди се на лични интерес. То је циљ, а природа нас је наоружала разним средствима да бисмо што ефикасније могли доспети до тог циља. Сва средства су макијевелистички прихватљива ако служе таквом циљу. А најкориснији су, по Јагу, лаж, обмана и превара” (Кољевић 1981: 104–105).

¹⁸² „nema zakonskog procesa; nema poštovanja civilizacijskih pravila [...]" (Grinblat, prev. Stojanović, 2020: 143).

“The Machiavellian hero is a villain who recklessly and ferociously uses all means to reach his goal, a man extremely determined, very cunning, and strong-willed, who does not know about any social, moral or religious considerations. He is talkative, pretends to wish his victim well, and often uses other people to carry out his criminal ideas, whom he then destroys to cover his tracks”¹⁸³ (Kostić 1983: 78).

The Machiavellian hero is defined by a utilitarian approach to power, unscrupulousness, hypocrisy and political pragmatism that necessarily eliminates humane, human and emotional elements such as mourning for the deceased in Hamlet’s case, or an attempt to find out the reason for the imprisonment of a brother who is already dead in Nuruddin’s case. For Shakespeare, “the ruler is [...] always Machiavelli’s Ruler, who lives in a world where big fish eat small ones”. It devours or gets devoured”¹⁸⁴ (Kott 1990: 317).

Such pragmatism does not shy away from murder as a way of political struggle, even if it is the murder of an innocent man. It is a violent death behind which the interests of the killers are hidden, which indicates the Machiavellianism of the hero and the absolutism of the totalitarian political society of Denmark, Renaissance England and the Bosnian kasaba in the Serbian novel. The favorite means of such societies and their rulers are violence, repression, coercion and force by which they exercise their power.

Examples of such heroes in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* are holders of public titles, positions, those who make decisions and exercise power: Claudius, fratricide, regicide and nothing less – a king and a husband, namely the husband of his deceased brother’s

¹⁸³ „Makijavelistički junak je zlikovac koji bezobzirno i svirepo koristi svo sredstva da bi se dokopao svog cilja, čovek krajnje odlučan, veoma lukav, i snažne volje, koji ne zna ni za kakve društvene, moralne ili verske obzire. On je rečit, pretvarase se da svojoj žrtvi želi dobro, a za sprovođenje svojih zločinačkih zamisli često koristi druge ljude, koje zatim uništava da bi prikrio tragove” (Kostić 1983: 78).

¹⁸⁴ „vladalac je [...] uvek Makijavelijev Vladalac, koji živi u svetu u kome velike ribe prožduru male. Proždire ili biva proždran” (Kot 1990: 317).

wife, whom he poisoned and muslim, mufti and kadi in Selimović's novel. They are the bearers of the ugly reality with which Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin had personal, direct experience after the boundary situations that symbolize the beginning of their transformation. The boundary situation in the drama Hamlet is the murder of Hamlet's father, the king, which is why we can read that drama as a personal, intimate drama of a family, but also as a political drama of the royal family, as a drama of the ruler of the state.

The boundary situation in *Death and the Dervish* is the murder of Nuruddin's brother Harun, which is why we can also read that novel as a personal confession of an unfortunate brother and son, but also as a personal drama of a bearer of spiritual authority, a bearer of a title, a public title whose life, like Hamlet's, determined by ideology. In this novel, the ideology in question is the "Islamist dogma"¹⁸⁵ (Petrović 1981: 42) to which Ahmed Nuruddin is loyal and serves as a dervish and sheikh of the tekke.

Deception, lying, pretense or masking is a phenomenon that is used in both pieces of writing because in them masks serve as an illusion or a trick, to hide what is true in order to achieve the goals of the one who is masking himself.

"The cunning of the fox", which Machiavelli advises his ruler, is revealed here as the virtue of lying, lying and deceiving another person. And Machiavelli's combination of different political means is manifested in Iago as a willingness to use every means"¹⁸⁶ (Koljević 1981: 105).

Those goals are interests, and such behavior is behavior behind which hides political pragmatism, a Machiavellian-type doctrine implemented in the pieces of writing by Machiavellian heroes, but also by the protagonists themselves, which is why they are negative heroes in the moral sense, that is, morally negative literary heroes.

¹⁸⁵ „islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

¹⁸⁶ „Лукавост лисице”, коју Макијавели саветује своме владоцу, овде се открива као ваштина лагања лагања и обмањивања другог човека. А Макијавелијево комбиновање различитих политичких средстава, код Јага се читајуће као спремност коришћења сваког средства” (Кољевић 1981: 105).

The difference between these two types of heroes is that in the case of Machiavellian heroes, there is no multidimensionality in their behavior that could somewhat justify their misdeeds, and in the case of negative heroes in the moral sense, multidimensionality is present, primarily in their idealistic, humane and ethical tendencies that can partially to justify their negative dimension (Milošević 1965: 6).

It is hidden in the context, in the reasons why the heroes commit a misdeed or crime, some kind of extenuating circumstances, a dimension of humanity that to a certain extent cancels out the dark side of their inaction and illuminates their reasons, which most often appeal to the emotions of viewers and/or readers. For these reasons, we can sympathize with the hero because we can identify with him and understand his reasons. With the Machiavellian hero, there is no justification for evil (*Ibid*).

The Machiavellian type of hero is one whose nature is dominantly determined by evil. He tramples all norms and considerations, social, moral, spiritual, and political, on the way to the realization of the set goal by the realization of which he gains benefit for himself. His arrogance and ability to rule the situation he created by his crime ensures his control, and it ensures his personal gain, such as coming to power in the case of Claudius, when it comes to the play *Hamlet*, staying in power when it comes to the Kasabalian authorities in Selimović's novel (Kostić 1983: 78).

Such a hero is a good actor who tries to trap his victim by feigning kindness and intimacy in order to hide, mask his true intentions and inactions and thus push the victim's potential suspicion away from him because that suspicion could lead to rebellion. The Machiavellian hero is no stranger to manipulation, using people as resources until he fulfills his goal. His motives are selfish, he wants to secure a boon for himself and reap its fruits without caring what the price of those fruits is. He spreads the evil within himself to the social community, thereby endangering both orders, both moral and political.

The Machiavellian hero does not hesitate to eliminate people so that his misdeeds will not be known. That's his *modus operandi*. It is often about people whom he previously manipulated in order to secure a benefit for himself. This type of hero is Christopher Marlowe's influence on late Renaissance English drama. Namely, this type of hero represents his stamp when it comes to the characterization of dramatic characters in Elizabethan drama. Machiavellian characters are characterized by a moral inadequacy that causes disgust in the audience.

Machiavelli is the surname of a writer who lived and created in Italy (Kostić 1983: 78). Some of his understandings concerning politics and political pragmatism, "[...] were presented so distortedly and with so much moral abhorrence that a special type of criminal, the so-called Machiavellian [...]"¹⁸⁷ (*Ibid.*) was created. In this way, Christopher Marlowe, by introducing the Machiavellian type of hero into the English dramatic tradition, into the tradition of Elizabethan drama, paved the way for the question of political pragmatism in Shakespeare's plays.

In his book *Shakespeare's Life and World* (1983)¹⁸⁸, Veselin Kostić gives the genesis of the dramatic character who embodies evil in English drama, whom he associates with Machiavelli. Moralities developed in the years after the first half of the 14th century. Their basic pattern – with dramatized scenes teaching religious morality – is borrowed from liturgical dramas and miracles. In addition, some features of the medieval genre of "disputes" – usually consisting of a collision of views and arguments, in conjunction with the themes of the Game of Death – contribute to the origin and development of morality, but it would be reasonable to assume that moralities arose from church services (Kostić 1983: 64–66).

Dramatized sermons, or morals, taught how to live a life that pleases God and those about the salvation of the soul. In order to achieve eternal salvation, people are called to lead a life that involves

¹⁸⁷ „[...] su prikazana toliko iskrivljeno i sa toliko morlanog gnušanja da je nastao poseban tip zločinca, takozvanog makijaveliste [...]" (*Исџо*).

¹⁸⁸ Kostić Veselin, *Šekspirov život i delo*, Beograd : Naučna knjiga, 1983.

constantly confronting sins and resisting numerous temptations. By leading such a life, they invite the help of a positive force, i.e. virtue. This battle ends only when one dies, and when the deeds and soul are judged for eternity. Moralities present the struggle between good and evil for supremacy over the human soul. Characters who are personified virtues, vices, etc. appear in them (*Ibid.*).

This spiritual struggle is often called “psychomachy” and forms the basic theme of all morals. There is usually a pattern that implies the turning points of human life such as the age of innocence, the fall, remorse and redemption. The protagonist represents an ordinary person, and names such as Everyone, Soul, The Human Race serve to underline the universality of his experience. When it comes to their origin, moralities with miracles share a basis in church teaching, but as a form of drama it has always been more independent. As for their subject matter, morality plays were not traditionally tied to a particular holiday, nor were their content subject to strict restrictions unlike biblical dramas. Consequently, since their inception, moralities have portrayed greater openness to being shaped by external influences, leading to their increasingly secular character (*Ibid.*).

Although they retained their original purpose as a dramatic device to explore human behavior and to ensure spiritual prosperity, from the late 15th century, the focus of morality shifted. Their focus shifts from theological-ethical to purely ethical or political-ethical pathos. As they were not limited to a particular text, it enabled the transmission of moral and religious lessons through a plot that did not have any pre-set limitations. The characters in these plays personified specific vices and virtues, prompting writers to imbue them with different traits and behaviors, thus laying the foundation for characterization through dramatic techniques. The narrative about the conflict between good and evil for the human soul, along with the themes of fall and redemption, enhanced the dramatic engagement of the characters and contributed to the establishment of a stronger structure (*Ibid.*: 64–66).

Moralities enriched English literature with interest in the psychology of character and behavioral motivation, while the vivid externalization of internal struggles enabled the emergence of situations in which characters, closer to ordinary people, under the influence of conflicting impulses, are put into tragic or comic confrontations. It was the phenomenon of morality that gave the impetus for the emergence of a dramatic form that depicts the life of an individual as a dilemma of choosing between two fundamentally opposed behavioral options, thus signifying a continuous process of moral self-determination. One such character imbued with morality became extremely popular and remains an immortal legacy of Elizabethan drama. He has many forms and different names, but is perhaps most commonly called Vice (*Ibid*).

He is first seen as a kind of general evil concept, but it soon became clear that the audience reacted very favorably to his machinations and activities. Because of this, in some morality plays, he became a comic character that the audience greatly enjoyed. This is why his characterization was split in later dramatic forms. In some of them he still exists as a materialization of pure, primeval, unadulterated evil, a kind of insidious presence capable of corrupting men's souls, as Shakespeare's Iago or Richard III was; in others, he takes the form of an amiable, comic hero with a tragic flaw, like Falstaff in the play *Henry IV* (*Ibid.*).

Much of Shakespeare's theatrical skill was learned from morality. This knowledge allowed him to make the psychological, moral and spiritual reality of his characters – as much as their physical actions – the center of theatrical attention. This helped him to physically manifest the inner experience in stage images such as the withered hand and coat of arms that express the decay of Richard III. Furthermore, he taught him how to construct stories around the protagonist's inner conflict: prince Henry, torn between his serious, nervous and cautious father and the wanton, sanctimonious Falstaff; Angelo, the prince's representative in *Measure for Measure*, who comes to power and encounters obstacles created by his master; and Othello, torn between his trust in the good Desdemona and the evil machinations of Iago.

Most importantly, these elements gave him a compelling and subversive portrait of evil. The figure of Vice, that powerful subversive moral agent, never failed to influence Shakespeare's artistic imagination. For example, Hamlet describes his treacherous uncle as "the king's freak" [...]. There is no need to mention the word "vice" to understand the impact; the trickster Iago depicted, along with his good-natured attitude, sarcasm and directness regarding his criminal activities, well explains the impact of the concept of vice (Greenblatt 2006: 33) since "[...] the qualities of the Prophet from morality – shameless irreverence, excessive and incessant seeking of pleasure and the seductive charm by which the naive youth are led astray from the true and valid path of virtue"¹⁸⁹ (*Ibid*: 220), as Claudius does by sending Hamlet to England, in the castle of death, or at the beginning of the play dominated by Hamlet's indignation against the atmosphere of excessive drinking in a moment of mourning for the death of the monarch.

When it comes to Claudius, he is a significant hero because the Machiavellian hero is given a name, which establishes a closer relationship of the audience to him, because he does not represent only a certain type of hero or a certain metaphor in the drama, some kind of dramatic effect, as is the case with the appearance of the Ghost in Hamlet, rather, he represents a real man who can be hated, who is the embodiment of moral ruthlessness and who, on that basis, can be disgusted like any criminal whose crime is one-dimensional, and for whom there is no justification or cover.

The counterpart of the Ghost of Hamlet's father in the play of the same name in the novel *Death and the Dervish* is a fugitive whom Nuruddin names Is-haq. Since it is the name of a beloved uncle from his early childhood, it also establishes an emotional relationship between these two characters, as is the case with Ghost. Both Ghost and Isaac pose a moral challenge to the protagonists, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, which forces both characters to make an ethical decision.

¹⁸⁹ „[...] osobine Proroka iz moraliteta – besramno nepoštovanje, preterano i neprestano traženje zadovoljstva i zavodnički šarm kojim naivnu omladinu sa prave i valjane staze čestitosti odvlači na stranpoticu” (*Исцѐло*: 220).

The position of the protagonists, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, in the socio-historical context in which they find themselves is largely determined by religious coordinates and the dominance of external authorities such as the institution of the court, the state, God and religion, Christianity and Islam as canonical, rigidly-dogmatic social phenomena that in themselves they embody power and ideology as the most useful political instrument for maintaining authority, authoritarianism and preventing subversion and rebellion such as that carried out by Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin after learning of the crime that obliges them to act.

One of the basic motifs in these two pieces of writing is the motif of a corrupt political and moral order that collide at a focal point. That point is public functions, exponents of political power. The decadent state structure is embodied in leading political figures, who are both criminals and representatives of an absolutist government that demands obedience and subordination from its subjects and it forbids any kind of potential subversive action such as Nuruddin's questioning about his brother whom he thinks is still alive at that moment, or it is read as a potential threat to be eliminated as is the case with Hamlet's (feigned) madness.

In the play *Hamlet*, Claudius, who committed fratricide and thus came to the Danish throne, married Gertrude, and harmed Hamlet on two levels – psychologically, as a man next to Gertrude, instead of his late father, and as a ruler who, as a man, the legitimate, biological heir of the murdered king first in line for succession to the throne. In Selimović's novel, the Machiavellian heroes are the kasabalian authorities, representatives of the repressive political apparatus of the Ottoman Empire, musellim, mufti and kadi, who are political exponents, bearers of the executive power that makes decisions and thus maintains order in that part of the country.

In Shakespeare's play, it is Claudius on the throne of Denmark, the king whose power and authority, although illegal and illegitimate, because they were acquired by crime, are unquestionable, and the rulers of the kasaba in which *Death and the Dervish* takes place represent the power generators of a totalitarian, absolutist society,

which is every society in which political power is in the hands of a monarch or chosen pawns, obedient individuals who are in charge of implementing the supreme power and its ideology. Ideology in both pieces of writing is actually power, the power of the one who is stronger in the binary opposition – weaker, stronger, and the one who is in the relationship of subordinate – superior, superior.

In such societies, categories such as justice or injustice, truth or falsification of documents, the record of the trial of the “guilty” in the novel *Death and the Dervish*, and the letter in the play *Hamlet*, are not categories that exist by themselves, but are determined by the generator of power. That is why those categories are arbitrary and depend on the will of the one who judges, makes decisions, regardless of the universality of truth and fairness, which should be objective, easily proven and grounded in themselves.

The issue of human feelings in such organized social communities is also irrelevant and represents a senseless, excessively emotional act that questions the will of the law, thus endangering the order and portraying disobedience and disrespect for it. We find such an attitude in Selimović’s novel in the scene of the meeting between Ahmed Nuruddin and the kadi. In it, the kadi accuses the dervish of siding with his brother when the choice is between his brother and the law, which is inadmissible. In *Hamlet*, on the other hand, this is the attitude of Claudius and Gertrude at the beginning of the piece when they tell Hamlet that his regret is exaggerated and not befitting a man.

Since they represent the rulers in the area of the kasaba, the three political officials behave that way – like rulers. This is important because it influences and determines their behavior, and their (moral) worldview. Namely, rulers, while they are rulers, are deprived of the right to personal identity. Their function, their vocation is their main determinant, and their main tool is repression. Human behavior is controlled by repression, so that the authorities determine and direct people’s actions with the aim of gaining complete control over the individual. In this way, the system “tends to determine and direct people’s actions in every way” (Kovač in: *Novi Izraz*, 1999: no. 6).

The mixture of violence, ideology, coercion, repression, and subversiveness as a response are the characteristics of both pieces of writing that we will deal with in this thesis. The universal constant of the novel *Death and the Dervish* as well as the play *Hamlet* is that both pieces of writing depict the struggle of man against the government against an inhuman, anti-human, monstrous repressive, violent system in which heads are lost for a much lesser reason than to expose a crime committed against an innocent man or a disobedient man, who can easily have the same fate.

The dervish also faced this. "The world of violence in which he lived until then, which he himself served and without knowing that it served him, like an evil wind, carried away the human being [...]"¹⁹⁰ (Egerić 2000: 54). But not just any human being.

"[...] his brother Harun broke the secret. The great mechanism of power in the kasaba, the iron net whose nodes are muslim, kadi, mufti, which was held by an invisible hand even in Istanbul, due to the recklessness of the young scribe, Nuruddin's brother, could lose what is from the point of view of power – the most precious in it: the secret. To prevent this from happening, an unknown young man was executed; one life was destroyed, like so many before it, but the secret is still in the owner's chest"¹⁹¹ (*Ibid*: 56).

That is why Harun had to be killed. To be silenced. Not to reveal the secret of what the government uses. By condemning such an act, the government is protected because the rejection of any dialogue

¹⁹⁰ „Свет насиља у којем је дотле живео, којем је и сам служио и не знајући да му служи, попут злог ветра, однео је људско биће [...]" (Егерић 2000: 54).

¹⁹¹ „[...] његов брат Харун провалио је тајну. Велики механизам моћи у касабџи, гвоздена мрежа чији су чворови: муселим, кадија, муфтија, коју је држала невидљива рука чак у Стамбулу, због несмотрености младог писара, Нурудиновог брата, могао је изгубити оно што је са становишта моћи – најдрагоценије у њему: тајна. Да се то не би догодило смакнут је непознати младић; уништен је један живот, као толики пре њега, али је тајна и даље у шкрипњи власника" (*Исти*: 56).

eliminates the potential examination of the way its structures function, and this results in a single outcome, which is subordination (Petrović 1981: 33).

The doctrine and political power are intrinsically linked; one cannot exist without the other. Power is inherently tied to its doctrine, as every doctrine tends to manifest as rule (Petrović 1981: 38). It removes personal expression, providing a sense of detachment and the essential illusion of neutrality in one's attitude. The impersonal nature of the doctrine is consistent with the impersonal role from which the kadi articulates his words and his behavior. For Nuruddin, this is a worrying indication, since the generality of the doctrine overlooks the specific topic of discussion. Because of this, the dervish's meeting and attempt to talk with the kadi as a representative of the government becomes only an exercise in passing judgment (*Ibid*).

Being a government that implements the political practice of totalitarianism entails amorality, rigidity in approach, and (mis)use of law as a shield and cover for its actions. "They are representatives of the political function they perform, in the service of their calling to the limits of bestiality. Their authoritarian position completely overshadows their human dimension"¹⁹² (Terzić 2022a: 180).

The government is unquestionable and the supreme law, and the code is in the hands of those who implement it. The law in the hands of Machiavellians is an opportunistic and utilitarian means of achieving personal interests regardless of the price that must be paid for it. Because that's how totalitarian regimes work, using retaliation against dissenters, elimination of opponents or those who are a threat to the system, and a dead letter as justification for their inaction and Claudius is in power the same way as the muslim, mufti and kadi.

In *Death and the Dervish*, "[...]; the order of actions needs power dedicated to the illusion of justice, the existence of laws, judicial

¹⁹² „Они су репрезенти политичке функције коју обављају, у служби свог звања до граница бестијалности. Њихова властодржачка позиција у потпуности засењује њихову људску димензију” (Terzić 2022a: 180).

institutions; in short, that order needs citizens' conviction that the government is fair and reasonable"¹⁹³ (Egerić 2000: 56). Ahmed Nuruddin made sure that it was not true, not once, but twice. The first time was on the occasion of inquiring about his brother's (non-existent) guilt, and the second time when an unknown man broke into his room looking for and finding the complaint that Nuruddin had written to the vallia after the seimen's attack, for which he himself was imprisoned.

Nowhere in the play *Hamlet* do we have evidence that Hamlet's mother, Gertrude, was in any way involved in her new husband's misdeeds or that she participated in them in any way. Apart from the claim of a Ghost who may or may not be a truly supernatural force, until Hamlet hears the confession of Claudius and confesses his crimes to God, the other characters in the play do not know that he is the king's murderer. The closest to knowing is Horatio, with whom Hamlet talks about the circumstances surrounding the murder of his father by the one who, having committed that murder, took power because "[...] was ready for a crime precisely planned and cunningly executed"¹⁹⁴ (Koljević 1981: 81). It's premeditated.

In *Hamlet* and *Death and Dervish*, violence is highly expressed as a result of human brutality in the struggle for power. These are acts in which man is inhuman to man. In them, there are usually two polarities: the criminal, who embodies the Machiavellian approach to rule, and the victim of such rule, against whom the crime is carried out, motivated by Machiavellian self-interest. It is about an innocent individual who "[...] is only an object on which the greater or lesser effectiveness of the technique of violence is expressed"¹⁹⁵ (Egerić

¹⁹³ „[...] ; поретку делања потребна је моћ посвећена илузијом правде, постојањем закона, судских установа; укратко, том поретку потребна је увереност грађана да је власт правична и разложна” (Егерић 2000: 56).

¹⁹⁴ „[...] је био спреман на прецизно смишљен и лукаво остварен злочин” (Кољевић 1981: 81).

¹⁹⁵ „[...] је само објекат над којим се изражава мања или већа ефикасност технике насиља” (Егерић 2000: 57).

2000: 57). Both pieces of writing portray the man who is inside the system himself while struggling against the system aiming to defend the ideological concept of its religious part.

Kasim Prohić in his book *To Do and To Be: the Novel of Meša Selimović* (1972)¹⁹⁶ says: "The system has become [...] a modality of spiritual behavior" (Prohić 1972: 73). Miodrag Petrović adds: "The mechanism of repressive coercion, shaped into a system, is a phenomenon of the modern era"¹⁹⁷ (Petrović 1981: 89). In *Hamlet*, that system is embodied in one man, as well as *Death and the Dervish* and at the moment when Nuruddin performs the kadi's duty after causing the death of the previous kadi by conducting his revenge:

"And other charges had been made by the most respected men, embittered by Ahmed Nuruddin's self-will and desire to seize all power, whereby he had sinned against the sharia* and against the high imperial wish that authority, which is given to the Padishah* by God and which he transfers to his servants, should nowhere be in the hands of a single man, because that is the path to oppression and injustice"¹⁹⁸ (Selimović 2018a: 363).

The two protagonists enter the fight against the system when the system wrongs them personally and when they feel the injustice on their own skin, through boundary situations, situations of death of close family members, father and brother, by which they are personally affected. The aforementioned boundary situations

¹⁹⁶ Kasim Prohić, *Činiti i biti: Roman Meše Selimovića*, „Svjetlost", Izdavačko preduzeće, Sarjevo, 1972.

¹⁹⁷ „Sistem je postao [...] modalitet duhovnog ponašanja" (Prohić 1972: 73). „Mehanizam represivnih prinuda, uobličen u sistem, pojava je modernog doba" (Petrović 1981: 89).

¹⁹⁸ „[...] postoje i tужbe најугледнијих људи, огорчених због Ахмед Нурудинове самовоље и тежње да сву власт узме у своје руке, чиме се огријешо и о шеријат и о високу царску жељу да власт, која је Падишаху од Бога дата и коју он преноси на своје службенике, нигдје не може држати један човјек, јер је то пут до зулума и неправде" (Селимовић 2004: 375).

symbolize the end of their ethical indeterminacy and the beginning of the germination of the seeds of determination, the conflict against the dominant order and its levers such as repression, violence, coercion and force. In both parts, the evidence of the rottenness of the system is the killing of innocent people by the authorities. The crime itself is, as previously mentioned, one of the basic elements of revenge tragedy.

In Hamlet's case, the rulers, those who represent the feathers of the system, in one word of Claudius, threatened his hereditary right, but also more than that. His masculine discourse is threatened by Claudius on the one hand and Polonius and Laertes on the other. Claudius won Gertrude, yes, really won, as if she were a thing, because she is partly that, as a function and as a body (Spremić 2011: 40).

In both pieces of writing, the protagonists were placed before the *fait accompli*. Hamlet's father was killed, poisoned prior to the play beginning, his mother got remarried to her brother-in-law, who turned out to be King Hamlet's killer, and Hamlet is expected to accept it and show the reconciliation and reconcilability regarding the new situation he experiences as an injustice. Harun was also killed before the revengful plot took place. It is only afterwards that Nuruddin finds it out, which makes his inquiry about an already dead man meaningless and barren. In the context of his choice between loyalty to his brother, family and *biological imperative* (Ivanov 2017: 384), from one and loyalty, "Islamist dogma" (Petrović 1981: 42), on the other hand, this fact represents absurd. Dervish, like Hamlet, was personally affected by an injustice, the murder of a brother who was not guilty. Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are in pain, hurt by, "[...] the tragic evil ("Thus bad begins, and worse remains behind" says Hamlet) [...] that does not care for human concepts of "justice" and "injustice"¹⁹⁹ (Marić 2015: 18).

¹⁹⁹ „[...] tragično zlo („kada zlo je počelo, a gore još čeka” – kaže Hamlet) [...] koje ne mari za ljudske koncepte „pravde” i „nepravde” (Marić 2015: 18).

That injustice was inflicted on them by individuals: Claudius, Aini-effendi, who signed the order on the basis of which Harun was imprisoned and then killed in the fortress, the mass grave, the cradle of bones without a name. The muslim and the mufti had to participate in this. Future exponents of power, they are the ones who decide on life and death. They are the supporting pillars of the world of repression, force and violence in which the government, the individuals who make it, are responsible for death. Even if they did not directly participate in it, like Aini-effendi, they must have known about it.

The kasaba's authorities killed Harun to protect the injustices of the system they maintain in order to remain in power and reap the fruits of the rule that protects them. In both cases, because it is about the murders of innocent people committed for personal gain, committing a sin against God and causing pain and insult to the honor of the one left behind by the murdered.

“[...] the mechanism of repression is not the result of a misunderstood ideological concept, i.e. principles of the mind, rather it is the consequence of a completely conscious rejection of that principle. In the mechanism of repression, the principle of mind is crushed to the point of destruction, so that an ideological conception appears in its place as a ritual act of a formalization devoid of any meaning. [...]. Between the individual and the force of repression, it is not possible to establish a form of cooperation unless this is expressed as complete submission. There can be no dialogue, because repression does not recognize any principle that would go beyond it and that it would be ready to recognize. [...] The force of repression does not recognize dignity in death. She denies dignity to everything and everyone. She has lost every connection with the human individual, except the connection of coercion”²⁰⁰ (Petrović 1981: 88–89).

²⁰⁰ „[...] mehanizam represije nije posledica pogrešno shvaćene ideološke koncepcije, tj. naela uma nego je posledica potpuno svesnog odbacivanja tog načela. U mehanizmu represije načelo uma zatrto je do uništenja, da bi se na njegovom mestu pojavila ideološka koncepcija kao ritualan čin jedne formalizacije lišene svakog smisla. [...]. Između pojedinca i sile represije nije moguće uspostaviti vid saradnje sem ako se ova ne iskaže kao potpuna pokornost. Dijaloga tu ne može biti, jer represija ne priznaje nijedno načelo koje bi je na-

The repressive mechanism is immersed in the world of political pragmatism and the practice of governance that rests on the corpses of the innocent, who will eliminate anyone they deem a threat.

“The repressive system continues its operation, not allowing Nuruddin any opportunity to defend himself, because the system of terror does not recognize appeal and defense. Having learned (from Mullah Yusuf, the kadi’s spy) that Nuruddin is preparing a lawsuit against the Wali mullah, which means a potential danger to the ruling structure, the local government in the form of the musellim again sends its “envoys” to Nuruddin. The goal is to imprison Nuruddin, prevent his subversive activities, influence among the people, and ultimately to frighten him, humiliate him, and take revenge on him for his resistance to the ruling structure. Nuruddin “must” be the culprit because, as Kovač states, “in order to free itself from guilt, the regime finds a ‘culprit’ outside its ranks” (Kovač 2005: 222).

Also, that act serves as a kind of justification for the existence of the government itself:

“Government can only exist if it has its own justification”. It has its own justification when it acts. In order to be able to act, she must have her own reasons. She finds reasons to be able to act, she acts so that she can have her justifications, she has her justification to be able to exist and the circle is completely closed. Then when she cannot find reasons for acting, she invents them” (Protić in: Lagumdžija 1986: 222).

It is a world in which interpersonal relationships do not exist, but rather interpersonal relations between human beings conditioned by social norms. These are relations between subordinates and superiors, or equals, but divided by worldview, steeped too much in the empirical, on the one hand, or in the world of transcendent ideals, on the other. The relationship between these two worlds is an empty set.

dilazilo i koje bi ona bila spremna da prizna. [...] Sila represije ne priznaje dostojanstvo u smrti. Ona svemu i svakome odriče dignitet. Sa ljudskim individuumom ona je izgubila svaku vezu, sem veze prinude” (Petrović 1981: 88–89).

They have no points of contact. Until the moment of murder, when these two worlds become intertwined.

”Acting on Nuruddin – the justification is Nuruddin’s speech in the mosque, which, according to the rulers, undermines order; the landlord and Harun are being blamed so that the authorities can justify their actions. Centers of power establish the legalization of coercion by framing opposition actions as attacks on the law. These are the ways of functioning of the reign of terror system that exists and exists thanks to the imposition of power, violence and fear, as well as rigging the process and inventing guilt and culprits in order to have a foothold in the law. Violence and fear are, in fact, the basic methods for keeping the subjects of a totalitarian regime in submission. Effective governance is not possible without those two elements”²⁰¹ (Dedović 2012).

²⁰¹ „Represivni sistem nastavlja svoje djelovanje ne dozvoljavajući Nurudinu nikakvu mogućnost da se brani jer sistem strahovlade ne poznaje žalbu i odbranu. Saznavši (od Mula Jusufa, kadijinog špijuna) da Nurudin sprema tužbu valijskom muli, što znači potencijalna opasnost za vladajuću strukturu, lokalna vlast u liku muselima ponovo šalje svoje „izaslanike” na Nurudina. Cilj je zatočiti Nurudina, spriječiti njegovo subverzivno djelovanje, utjecaj u narodu i na kraju ga prestrašiti, poniziti i revanširati mu se za otpor vladajućoj strukturi. Nurudin „mora” biti krivac jer, kako navodi Kovač, „režim da bi se oslobodio krivice, pronalazi ‘krivca’ van svojih redova” (Kovač 2005: 222).

Također, taj čin služi i kao svojevrsno opravdanje postojanja same vlasti: „Vlast može da postoji jedino ako ima svoje opravdanje. Ona ima svoje opravdanje onda kada deluje. Da bi mogla da deluje ona mora za to da ima svoje razloge. Ona pronalazi razloge da bi mogla da deluje, deluje da bi mogla da ima svoja opravdanja, ima svoje opravdanje da bi mogla da postoji i krug je potpuno zatvoren. Onda kada ne može da pronade razloge za delovanje ona ih izmišlja.” (Protić u: Lagumdžija, 1986: 222).

„Djelovanje na Nurudina – opravdanje je Nurudinov govor u džamiji koji, prema mišljenju vlastodržaca, podriva poredak; posjedniku i Harunu se izmišlja krivica da bi vlast mogla opravdati svoj postupak. Centri moći uspostavljaju legalizaciju prinude uokvirivajući opoziciona djelovanja u atake na zakon. To su načini funkcioniranja sistema strahovlade koji postoji i opstoji zahvaljujući nametanju moći, nasilja i straha, te montiranju procesa i izmišljanju krivice i krivaca kako bi imali uporište u zakonu. Nasilje i strah su, zapravo, osnovne metode za držanje u pokornosti podanika totalitarnog režima. Efikasnost vladanja nije moguća bez ta dva elementa” (Dedović 2012).

Empathy is a hindrance to the utilitarian worldview according to which the motivation for every action lies in the benefit it brings. The benefit in these two literary works is power. The Kasabalian rulers killed Harun so that he would not expose their Machiavellianism, and in Shakespeare's play so that he could get his hands on power and what it implies. Therefore, the rulers are amoral. The categories of morality, humanity, and emotions are categories unknown to Machiavellian heroes. They only know political pragmatism and goals that need to be achieved. The kings, monarchs or even rulers that Meša Selimović shows us in his novel are just cogs in a mechanism that wants to stay in power. "By the crimes committed for the sake of conquest or staying in power, by meanness, greed and hypocrisy, by the overwhelming power of power, Ajni-effendi is a distant echo of Claudius"²⁰² (Milošević 2005: 224).

Hence Claudius' immorality. Hence the immorality of the muselim, mufti and the kadi in the novel *Death and the Dervish*. In the Elizabethan era, the ruler was untouchable. He was the embodiment of God himself, whose power on earth was analogous to God's power in heaven (Kostić 1983: 44). Since the existence of God is unquestionable, since his will is absolute, any questioning of the king's power, any attempt to attack it, is equated with sinful behavior against God. Like God and the king, the monarch desires absolute obedience (*Ibid.*). As Jan Kott says in his book *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*:

"The sun revolves around the earth, and with it, arranged in a hierarchical order, are the spheres, planets and stars. The universe is ruled by the order of the elements, the order of the angelic choirs and the corresponding order of the classes on Earth. There are seniors and vassals of vassals. Royal power comes from God, and every power on earth is only a reflection of royal power"²⁰³ (Kott 1990: 52).

²⁰² „Po izvršenom zločinu radi osvajanja ili ostanka na vlasti, po podlaštvu, koristoljublju i licemerstvu, po osionoj moći vlasti Ajni-efendija je Klaudijev daleki odjek” (Milošević 2005: 224).

²⁰³ „Sunce kruži oko zemlje, a zajedno s njim raspoređene u hijerarhijskom redu, sfere, planete i zvezde. U svemiru vlada poredak stihija, poredak

The society is organized in such a way that it is at the head of the community, divided into several classes, among which there are clear, rigid, unchangeable boundaries, which prohibit members of the classes from moving on this ladder of social hierarchy. Everyone should stick to their place, their position, their calling. A place on the class pyramid of the social hierarchy is given by birth, and "hierarchy is a natural law, its violation is a natural law, its violation would be a victory over law, anarchy over order"²⁰⁴ (*Ibid*: 80). Material status is also determined, and with it a position of non-confrontation, subordination. Because the monarch is protected by a divine halo, his rule, and even its manner, must not be questioned, and even less attacked in any way (Kostić 1983:44).

The ruler is a social title, a position, a public office, a social identity to which personal identity is subordinate. Polonius and Laertes warn Ophelia about this. The same is true in the novel *Death and the Dervish*. Ahmed Nuruddin has annulled his personal identity as a son, a brother, as well as the masculine identity of a lover and completely subordinated it to his calling, his title as a dervish, sheikh of the Mevlevi tekke, defender of Islamic exegesis, in peace with words, and in war with a knife. Blind submission is the dream of every despot, including the town authorities in Meša Selimović's novel. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin behave like a man trying to make another man understand their suffering. The mistake is that the people in question are not people. They are functions. They are a system.

However, what somewhat justifies their rebellion and makes the two of them multidimensional characters are the reasons why they decide to take that step, why they leave the comfort of the "nutshell"²⁰⁵

anđeoskih horova i odgovarajući mu poredak staleža na Zemlji. Postoje seniori i vazali vazala. Kraljevska vlast potiče od Boga, a svaka vlast na zemlji samo je odblesak kraljevske vlasti" (Kot 1990: 52).

²⁰⁴ „hijerarhija je prirodni zakon, njeno narušavanje je prirodni zakon, njeno narušavanje bilo bi pobjeda nad pravom, anarhije nad redom" (Исто: 80).

²⁰⁵ „орахове љуске" (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 51)

in which they have lived until then. The moral, ethical reasons for their behavior, which involve observing and understanding the context, provide a broader picture, based on which the act is not just an act, but the consequence of thinking about the moral implications of the act. Hamlet does not want to carry out personal revenge by killing the king, for it to be his revenge by which one death would be avenged by another, and Nuruddin's revenge is a personal revenge by which he settles (Selimović 2018a: 240) for his brother's death. In Hamlet's and Nuruddin's reasons and in the behavior that results from those reasons, we find the motivation for the actions of any person who would find themselves in that situation and those circumstances, in that social context, and in that, but not only that, time.

“[...] Our sometime sister, now our Queen,
Th'imperial jointress to this warlike state [...]”²⁰⁶
(*Hamlet*, I. 2. 8–9)

In *Hamlet*, the prototype of the Machiavellian hero is Claudius, who kills his brother, the King of Denmark, by poisoning him during an afternoon nap in the garden with the intention of appropriating the prerogatives of royal power: the throne and the queen, thereby denying his nephew the hereditary right to occupy the throne on the basis of being a biological descendant, the son of the deceased king. The moral hallmark of the usurper king is the decadence of the person indulging in vices, such as drunkenness and lust. However, what is striking about his immoral, and, in the context of the public function he performs, amoral character, is hypocrisy. The queen is also, in a way, a symbol of royal power because Claudius sees her as a function.

In this way, she also loses her personal identity, her human dimension, her femininity. Hamlet seems to be excessively concerned with the issue of her femininity. As for Claudius, she is reduced to

²⁰⁶ „Јуначке земље наше наследницу” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 15).

her function in history. Gertrude is, first and foremost, an heiress. The usurper king, who imposed himself through crime, has seized the state, Denmark, as well as Gertrude. In the Elizabethan era, “the characteristics of the queen’s natural body were components of a political figure [...]”²⁰⁷ (Spremić 2011: 40).

These two pieces of writing are fraught with the Machiavellian heroes prone to both violence, despite it representing an act of injustice aimed at the innocent man, as well as hypocrisy, lies and intrigues for the sake of achieving their goals. This type of self-centered behavior dehumanizes and discredits them on the ethical level. In the *Hamlet* play, the protagonist the play was named after kills Polonius, although by mistake, sacrifices Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, whereas Nuruddin sacrifices Hadji-Sinanuddin, Hassan and Mullah-Yusuf. The root cause of their vengeful behavior is the fact that they both, “[...] *have truly seen to the essence of things* [...]” (Nietzsche 2003: 39) upon having been faced with the boundary situation. The shared motif of both the play and the novel is a crime against an innocent man that starts an avalanche of events ending tragically. In both *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, the executors benefit from him. This insight, that is the awareness of the existence of pure, unreasonable and unjustifiable evil indicates the beginning of their inner change and initiates a violent inner conflict in them. It is a psychological and deeply emotional, moral-based turmoil within the protagonists.

By laying his eyes on the document, Harun becomes the witness of illegal, dishonorable and immoral methods used by the government the same way Claudius wants to keep Hamlet in Elsinor to have control over him under the coat of kind words about his inheriting the throne. It is an irrefutable proof of corrupted government that convinced the dervish’s brother in the regime being guilty of murder as Hamlet was convinced of Claudius being guilty of his father’s murder during the “Mousetrap” scene.

²⁰⁷ „karakteristike kraljičinog prirodnog tela bile su komponente političke figure [...]” (Spremić 2011: 40).

The intention of the authorities, as was Claudius' intention, is to remain in power for the sake of remaining on the ruling position so as to take advantages of its benefits. Musellim, mufti and kadi wanted to continue ruling and maintain the high position providing them with control and the power to make decisions. On the other hand, Claudius wants to gain the power at first and then to keep it to maintain the existing order, even though decadent and rotting on the inside, but the current political order represented in the political aspect of his royal authority figure nevertheless.

The political mechanism embodied in the individual when it comes to the *Hamlet* play or more of them in the case of the Serbian novel showed the ultimate degree of their repression purposefully targeting King Hamlet and Harun. The murder of a dervish's innocent brother's is undoubtedly the crime committed by those in power. These are musellim, mufti and kadija, Ainn-effendi as well as Claudius. This is the backbone of *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* comparative parallel. The kadi Aini-efendi himself signed the order for his imprisonment, and thus the execution without the possibility of pardoning him, which is exactly what Claudius denied to his brother. Maybe he was not the direct executor of Harun's murder, but he sure was his killer. "Innocent, but killed nonetheless, Harun is the echo of the of the Danish King Hamlet's tragic destiny"²⁰⁸ (Milosevic 2005: 224).

In *Hamlet*, Aini-effendi is Claudius' counterpart, unprecedented utilitarian, the offender, the one who commits not only fratricide, but also regicide, and the usurpation of the Danish throne, the new king of Denmark benefitting from and indulging in his public function, monarch title. He is also a villain depriving Hamlet of the right and possibility to be inherit the throne, the second husband of an adulteress Gertrude who quickly jumped at the opportunity for the misconduct such as marrying a cunning Claudius after he had poisoned his innocent brother and tied the knots with his not so long ago sister-in-law.


²⁰⁸ „Nevin, a ubijen, Harun je eho tragične sudbine danskog kralja Hamleta" (Milošević 2005: 224).

We cannot read *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* without wondering, “[...] how it is possible to survive in the world in which the decision on life and death is [...] the privilege and monopoly of individuals”²⁰⁹ (Kovač 1988: 171). It is the world where Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin live. It is the one they are forced to fight against. By doing so, they become the gears of a large mechanism of government (Egerić 2000: 52). In addition to repression, Machiavelianism, the dominance of ideology, force and power are phenomena that are the common motives of *Hamlet* and the *Death and the Dervish*. In both pieces of writing,

“the mechanism of force and power is aware of neither sevap nor merhamet. The spirit that this mechanism imposes and through which it is maintained in the world does not suffer from consideration, from distinguishing what is low and what is high, what is ugly and what is beautiful. The only, definitely measure that it accepts and feeds is usefulness”²¹⁰ (*Ibid*: 57).

²⁰⁹ „[...] како је могуће опстати у свијету у коме је право на одлуку о животу и смрти [...], привилегија и монопол појединаца” (Kovač 1988: 171).

²¹⁰ „механизам силе, моћи, не зна за *севај*, ни за *мерхамеј*; дух којим се тај механизам намеће и одржава у свету не пати од обзирности, од разликовња ниског и високог, ружног и лепог. Једино, дефинитивно мерило које прихвата и којим се храни: *корисносћ*” (Исто: 57).



3. *THE MASK AS HAMLET AND AHMED NURUDDIN'S WAY OF SOCIAL REPRESENTATION*

The social context is the essential dimension of Nietzsche's masking/disguising principle as the subject needs to be distancing himself from the outer world thus improving his position from those surrounding him by employing the masking-disguising principle to protect himself in and from the environment to swallow him (Vattimo 2011: 19). The purpose of the mask is to help him realize what he had intended by, as part of his tactics, putting it on, the same as the Dervish does by becoming a priest in the first place and when he becomes the kadi, as well. Hamlet's goal is to provide himself with a valid moral justification for the execution of the duty imposed on him by his father's spirit. His masking is related to the court, which is the institution of political power. It is the means of combating the corrupted ruling authority by mocking which singles him out in their eyes as a dangerous lunatic who needs to be eliminated. But the truth is he uses masking as a means to eventually strike his uncle thus revenging his father.

On the other hand, Dervish is bitterly disappointed and hurt. For those reasons, he becomes the fiery defender of dogma justifying his behavior with its principles. He occupies the elevated position within the society on the basis of his rank. Him being a priest and subsequently a kadi provides him with an opportunity to judge people hiding behind the religious and governing principles. The mask is a means of singling him out in the social context as part of the authority. As a priest, he is also in charge of the community spiritual guidance,

their advisor and hence superior to them. He uses his position to eventually strike the authorities in the kasaba by insisting on the religious principles their community should be run. His cunning plan is based on an intrigue that is actually a trap for the innocent man, such is his borthor.

Tekke is the physical space representing the social context in the *Death and the Dervish*. That is where Ahmed Nuruddin's masking takes place. He is its sheikh, trapped under a veil of illusion of the Islamist exegege and religious doctrine. Owing to being a dervish, he is simultaneously a political element of the system in which he turns the blind eye to what happens in the real world existing in front of the tekke's heavily locked gate.

Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin rebel against those with whom they share a political stage and become the avenger. Both in case of Hamlet and at Ahmed Nuruddin, there is a gap between the original, authentic creature, their self, the protagonists' personal identity and their representation in social context, which is the mask. For that reason, the masking/disguising is a Nietzschean means, that is the self-protection construct.

The protagonists of both pieces of writing, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, are the bearers of the title, public functions, but, at the same time, they are both personal identity bearers. The dimension of masking is in conjunction with an attempt to exercise the right to personal identity. These attempts are severely limited by the dominant institutions such as the court or the set of strict religious rules that are the bearers of ideology and doctrine. In addition, both are men and, thus, the representatives of the masculin discourse, which significantly determines the patriarchal society in both literary works.

Their shared feature is their identity multiplicity: both are the bearers of social identity, given that Hamlet is the prince, and Ahmed Nuruddin is the dervish, sheikh, the spiritual authority in the nameless Bosnian kasaba. The conflict of social, masculin and personal identity that implies loyalty to *biological imperative* (Ivanov 2017: 384) in the beings of the two heroes, a multitude was born

in them. That is the foundation of Nietzsche's understanding of the subject. It is rooted in multiplicity of inner aspirations. In the light of these two literary works, those aspirations are mutually exclusive requirements of each of the identities simultaneously existing in Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. Their core identity is torn apart by these fiercely opposing requests.

The irony is that Hamlet is a member of that milieu himself. His social identity is based on the title of Prince. But his hereditary right is roughly usurped by his uncle, who killed his father and married his mother. Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are the bearers of a title and public functions. Additionally, they are sons, men, unsuccessful lovers, and the avengers. Nuruddin is also a brother. All these identities are based on the principles that are contrary one to another. Hence the inner conflict. They burst into flames due to the crime the victims of which are their next of kin.

The scene in which the inner splitting in Ahmed Nuruddin is obvious is the one in which he meets the fugitive for the first time, where we receive the confirmation by the dervish himself who is torn apart between his official and his personal identity. This duality is also caused by his relationship to his brother who had been incarcerated in the fortress at first, and then killed. In the night of the meeting with Ishak, the fugitive, Ahmed Nuruddin thinks his brother is still alive and that there is still a possibility for him to be released. But Ahmed didn't fight for Harun enough because he felt more like dervish Nuruddin than Harun's sibling who, like King Hamlet, was killed by the system representatives.

In the case of Ahmed Nuruddin, both his functions, the dervish and the kadi one, both titles are in strong contradictions with the human dimension. As the dervish, Ahmed Nuruddin is forbidden to fight for the brother, while being the kadi imposes the duty to betray his best friend, Hassan, on him. His commits to the title in the situation in which *biological imperative* should be imperative (Ivanov 2017: 384). This is particularly noticeable in one of the introductory scenes of the novel. It is the scene with the kadi's wife. She offers

Nuruddin a deal, an exchange of brothers in a way. However, her offer is bluntly rejected by him owing to Nuruddin's dedication to his social position.

The gap between humanity as the essence of Ahmed Nuruddin and his images in a distorted mirror. He believes the reflection he sees in the mirror is real. But it is not the case. It is the Nietzsche's figure of the mask. He is a true believer. He is just a priest. As long as Nuruddin believes that the appearance, his priesthood, to be the only truth, his mask is (anti) mask. It is only after he had found about his brother being killed that he made the conscious choice of recognising the mask as an illusion when compared to the real world happening outside of the tekke. This is also the case with Hamlet's madness, for which he, and us know it is not the real madness but a deception. We also know there is a reason why it is faked.

It is to get convinced in his uncle's guilt with respect to his father's murder. That is why it is the Nietzschean mask. Since Hamlet's acting insane is the core motiv, together with Nuruddin's being the Dervish and his hatred, in the context of the crime and criminal relationship, "to examine madness in Hamlet means to explore the political implications in the play [...]"²¹¹ (Šofranac 2013a: 143). Those are the crimes, taking away an innocent person's life for the sake of benefits this act provides and the usurpation.

In case of the dervish, both titles, the dervish and the kadi one, are based on Nuruddin's need of having superior social reputation to protect him. For that reason, he wants to marry the late kadi's wife upon his death to which Nuruddin himself contributed. Dervish needed to fight for social status on a battle field against the infidel ones and subsequently as a priest and then a kadi. He identifies with it. But the mask is the core of both of them. Hamlet, on the other hand, obtained social reputation by birth due to being the biological son of the royal, Denmark-ruling couple.

²¹¹ „ispitati ludilo u Hamletu znači istražiti političke implikacije u drami [...]” (Šofranac 2013a: 143).

What is behind Hamlet's rebellion is the order of the external authority, the ghost of his father, who reveals the truth about his death, that its cause is not the officially announced one – a snake bite – but murder. Nuruddin's rebellion is powered by him being personally offended masked in him feeling hurt because of the brother who was innocent, yet killed by the authorities. As the kadi's scrivener, he learned about the despotism by reading the record from a trial that had never been held. According to it, a man was found guilty. "As a scrivener, he does not have to have any attitude towards the text, as a man he cannot pass by it"²¹² (Jerkov 2003: 323).

Both *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* tackle a gap between the personal and social identity of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, which is revealed due to the border situation, which introduces the importance of *the biological imperative* (Ivanov 2017: 384). It is the foundation of revenge that both should perform as a token of moral debt towards the father, King Hamlet, and Ahmed's brother, Harun, its human "justification" and ethical "cover". It is a gap between their personal and social identity.

The simultaneous co-existence of (these) two identities introduces the category of duality, which is, by definition, a multitude. The phenomenon of many identities in a single person is extremely important because it is the cornerstone of Nietzsche's understanding of the subject. Relying on this perspective, the difference between their intimately, authentic voice, and what, as ideologically shaped subjects, they ought to be, how they are presented in the social context guided by different, yet, similar goals – to achieve their interests leading them to revenge. It is a gap between two polarities, the personal and the socially conditioned one, a contradiction between their empirical and "transcendental apperception" (Milić 2000: 35-36):

"The empirical apperception is the awareness of one's own "I" during the so-called inner observation, when, for example, my "I" connects and

²¹² „Као писар, он не мора имати никакв однос према том тексту, као човек он не може проћи мимо њега" (Jerkov 2003: 323).

synchronizes all my observations and experiences in the whole that is my life [...]. Each of us is at the very least one empirical “I” – but not only in relation to others, but as a way of attitude toward oneself, as self-consciousness. At least one “I”, because there can also be more than one “I”²¹³ (Milić 2000: 35). On the other hand, there is the transcendental aperception (*Ibid*:36).

The transcendental aperceptions of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are Christianity and “the Islamist dogma” (Petrovic 1981: 42), while the empirical aperception is their self-awareness of the moral imperative of revenge. The mask is the space of the discrepancy between these two aperceptions. If we consider empirical aperception the occurrence, and transcendental the being, then the mask would be the contrasting position of two aforementioned aperceptions.

What is important to note here is the the Althusser’s understanding of the concept of a subject that insists on an ideologically shaped man in whom ideological acquires absolute superiority over the human dimension. He loses his human essence and becomes an ideologically conditioned subject (Bećanović-Nikolić 2007: 312). Such a subject is subordinated to power generators and institutions, which, in their name, implement ideology. In Hamlet’s case, these are the court and the state, and when it comes to Nuruddin, it is “the Islamist dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

“Kant primarily defines aperception as “the awareness of oneself”, as a self-consciousness, “the presentation about I” as subjectivity. There is, says Kant, one idea of the “I” common to everyone, necessary and universal, deeper and more basic, original compared to all the empirical plural “I” that are his derivations. That primordial “I” is the condition of possibilities for the aperceptive synthesis. Such “I”, since independent of the specific experience, is the basis of “the transcendental apercep-

²¹³ „Empirijska aperpcija je svest o sopstvenom „ja” pri tzv. unutrašnjem zapažanju, onda kad na primer moje „ja” povezuje i sinhronizuje sva moja opažanja i iskustva u celinu koja je moj život. [...] Svako od nas je barem po jedno empirijsko „ja” – ali ne samo u odnosu na druge, već kao način odnosa prema sebi, kao samosvest. Barem po jedno „ja”, jer tih „ja” može biti i više” (Milić 2000: 35).

tion", it is its a priori. It is also the basis of "pure apperceptions" because a priori and transcendently always mean a clean idea independent of anything empirical"²¹⁴ (Milić 2000: 36).

Hamlet is under a strong influence of religion, the Christian dogma prohibiting the murder, and Nuruddin is influenced by "the Islamist dogma" (same) abolishing the right to independence, being a person and everything personality-related, such as personal decisions and opinion, individual will. Any dogma insists on common, general, superior, transcendental and collective. Their soldiers are always nameless and unimportant parts of the collectivity, and never an individual with the name and surname, which is a point of view Ahmed Nuruddin internalizes in the *Death and the Dervish*.

The need of the subject for liberation generates a rebellion in the name of revenge, which is the central motive of both pieces of writing. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin's goal is revenge. Such a rebellion against the systems to which they belong themselves, Hamlet being Prince, an heir to the throne and Nuruddin being the Dervish, sheikh, a member of the Order, and the holder of the spiritual government, implies personal ethical determination and abandonment of the comfortable position of ethical neutrality. This means very specific acting instead of limitless contemplativity about eternal crucifixion between two potential choices, two options, two possibilities, constantly between these two, instead of opting for one or another, the principle or a human being. "In order to exist, a relationship to another must be based. Regardless of the sense and character in which this occurs:

²¹⁴ „Kant najpre definiše apercepciju kao „svest samoga sebe“, kao samosvest, „predstavu o Ja“ kao subjektivnost. Postoji, kaže Kant, jedna ideja o „ja“ koja je svima zajednička, nužna i univerzalna. To „ja“ dublje je i osnovnije, izvornije od svih empirijskih „ja“ koje su njegove derivacije. To praispravno „ja“ uslov je mogućnosti aperceptivnih sinteza. Takvo „ja“, budući da je nezavisno od konkretnog iskustva, jeste osnova „transcedentalne apercepcije“, ono je njen a priori. Takođe je ono osnova „čiste apercepcije“ jer a priori i transcedentalno znači uvek čistu ideju nezavisnu od svega empirijskog” (*Міліћ*: 36).

as a world, someone else's personal experience, the state, ideology, affectionate of love"²¹⁵ (Prohić 1972: 63).

However, although existence implies having relationships with others, each being should strive to establish relationships with themselves. Both Ahmed Nuruddin and Hamlet get to know themselves in two parts of the play and the novel in which they appear as a transformed person. What is striking in the process of their introspection is that the accent is not on who they are, but on what they are instead. This suggests that they perceive themselves through their titles, the dervish and the monarch, which is closely linked to the superiority of their social identity in relation to personal identity.

In this context, Hamlet's mask of madness as well as Nuruddin's revenge are expressions of subversion, the revolt against the authority, the Machiavellian political practices of a totalitarian society exercising power through repression and violence, relying on intrigue and hypocrisy, sacrificing innocent people for the sake of achieving its own agenda. One of the most dominant features of the regime is hypocrisy. It is present in Claudius's supposedly kind behavior towards Hamlet at the beginning of the play.

Dervish is hypocritical towards Mullah-Yusuf in the scene we called "The Mousetrap", thereby betraying the Holy Book and its principles. (As for the role of hypocrisy in the *Death and the Dervish* novel, it is important to point out that hypocrisy is contrary to the Koran (Tanasković 2018: 235)). Since in this scene he consciously puts on the mask of a friend in order to deceive MullaYusuf and make him give himself away with body language, which Hamlet expects from Claudius, thereby showing guilt.

Owing to the violent deaths of their loved ones caused by the system representatives, as is the case in the *Death and the Dervish* novel and, or the peaks of the same as is the case in Shakespeare's play, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin find themselves in the midst of what

²¹⁵ „Da bi se egzistiralo, mora se zasnovati odnos prema Drugom. Bez obzira u kojem smislu i liku se to Drugo javljalo: kao svijet, tuđe, personalno iskustvo, država, ideologija, izvjesnost ljubavi" (Prohić 1972: 63).

Jan Kot calls „[...] *The Grand Mechanism*”²¹⁶ (Kott 1990: 52). In the name of the totalitarian political creation that is the state, Claudius and Ayni-effendi embody Machiavellian heroes who are scoundrels, murderers of innocent people and hypocrites. Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are the authorities as well, Hamlet the secular one, and Nuruddin the spiritual one. The murderers are Claudius and Ayni-effendi. At the very beginning of both pieces of writing, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin find themselves in the position of victims whose family members, father and brother, are the victims of murder by Claudius and Aini-effendi. At the end of both parts, the protagonists take on the role of executioner.

Hamlet kills Claudius. In addition to being the perpetrator of a crime on a political and state level, he is also the perpetrator of a crime on a family level because by killing his brother Hamlet he deprived him of his father and thereby gave legitimacy to his potential revenge, which is Hamlet’s moral duty. Ahmed Nuruddin initiates a plot that will result in the death of the kadi. “Nuruddin’s great blindness (in relation to power) manifested itself immediately: he did not see, could not see, that such power as a principle is nothing other than a struggle for self-preservation [...]”²¹⁷ (Egerić 2000: 56). By reversing the roles, the circle is closed. “The man in question, the insignificant sheikh Nuruddin, [...], can, as in the fates of Shakespeare’s kings and murderers, see the ghostly, terrifying hum of the Grand Mechanism of History”²¹⁸ (Egerić 2000: 53). Nuruddin is also “the intelligence of the Grand Mechanism, its will, sacrifice and consciousness”²¹⁹ (Kott in: Egerić 2000: 53).

²¹⁶ „[...] Велики Механизам” (Kot 1990: 52).

²¹⁷ „Велика Нурудинова заслепљеност (у односу на власт) испољила се одмах: није видео, није могао видети, да таква власт као начело није друго до борба за властито одржање [...]” (Егерић 2000: 56).

²¹⁸ „Човек о којем је реч, незнатни шејх Нурудин, [...], може, као у у судбинама Шекспирових краљева и убица, видети сабласно, застрашујуће зујање Великог механизма историје (Егерић 2000: 53).

²¹⁹ „интелигенција Великог механизма, његова воља, жртва и свест” (Kott у: Егерић 2000: 53).

Belonging to the system is the main mark of Hamlet's and Nuruddin's social identity, and an important element of their masks, especially Nuruddin's, because these are masks that imply social appearance through the functions of dervish and kadi. Like Hamlet's social identity as a monarch, which is seriously threatened by his so-called madness, although it is not, but rather a deception for all the courtiers, they carry with them social status, because Hamlet, after the death of his father, was supposed to be the next crowned head, while Nuruddin is a dervish, an exponent of spiritual authority, and thus a representative of authority.

Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin's relationship to boundary situations is personal. They are personally involved as son and brother, as bearers of personal identity, and not only as bearers of social identity. We encounter emphasized emotionality in Hamlet at the beginning of the play, and in Nuruddin in the second part of the novel. In these moments, both protagonists surrender to their emotions, affects, feelings and passions. The relationship between Claudius and Aini-effendi is not the same as it is towards Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. Claudius and the kadi behave in accordance with their social position as figures of authority, power, control and decision-making. Hamlet and Nuruddin are subordinate because ideology demands obedience from them. However, boundary situations reveal the two protagonists in the light of personal identity. Due to heightened emotional involvement, the human dimension, which is protected by a mask, madness, and dervishism, transcends the social dimension.

According to Nietzsche, the mask signifies the difference between the essence, what is internal, the core, the truth, the authenticity, the originality, the being, in a word, the essence, the personal identity, and what manifests itself as external, which is an illusion, an illusion, a deception (Vattimo 2011: 13). In the case of Ahmed Nuruddin and Hamlet, it is a gap between the original, intimate, authentic being that is the bearer of personal identity and the mask that the subject uses in the social context within the social community in which he finds

himself. In the case of the sheikh, this mask coincides with his social identity, public function, the title of dervish, and then also the kadi, while in the case of the monarch Hamlet this is not the case.

“The very idea of a personal quality in man that directs his behavior and reactions and thus gives him an individual and unique psychological identity did not even exist in Shakespeare’s time. The basis of psychology was physiology [...], or ethics, which implied man’s commitment to the general categories of good or evil [...], or else vacillation between them. In neither of these two cases, however, was the psychological constitution understood as permanent or consistent”²²⁰ (Kostić 2010: 106).

This opens up space in English Renaissance drama for the changing nature of the hero, which is constantly in between. It is between this world and the next, between man and his socially constructed identity, between emotional and rational reasoning, between reason and affect, between acting and truth, between the “I” and the mask, which, in the dervish’s case, is first the dervish’s calling, and then the kadi’s.

At the beginning of the novel, this mask is an (anti)mask because it is not aware of its appearance. This will change later in the novel. The (anti)mask will become a mask. This also shows the changeability of the hero’s nature, as well as the instability and inconstancy of his character, to which the revenge tragedy as a subgenre is closely related. The question of character is significant in English Renaissance drama. It draws a parallel between Hamlet’s and Nuruddin’s changed behavior in these two works. Namely, “character in English Renaissance drama is not described discursively” (Kostić 2010: 106).

²²⁰ „Sama ideja o nekom ličnom svojstvu u čoveku koje usmerava njegovo ponašanje i reakcije i tako mu daje individualni i neponovljivi psihološki identitet nije ni postojala u Šekspirovo vreme. Osnova psihologije bila je fiziologija [...], ili etika, koja je podrazumevala čovekovu opredeljenost za opšte kategorije dobra ili zla [...], ili pak kolebanje između njih. Ni u jednom od ta dva slučaja, međutim, psihološka konstitucija nije shvatana kao trajna ili dosledna” (Kostić 2010: 106).

sively, but is gradually built up, acquiring line by line from scene to scene”²²¹ (Kostić 2010: 105). Their self is radically changed through the play and the novel.

This applies equally to Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, because there is a difference between their personalities at the beginning of the play and the novel and their personalities at the end. Their transformation continues throughout both parts. Hamlet alternately takes off and puts on his mask of madness so that towards the end of the play, in the scene with Gertrude, when he alone sees the Ghost, we are not sure whether he is truly insane at that moment or not, and whether the nature of his madness has been his construct all along, his consciously chosen weapon or not. His relationship to Claudius also changes, which conditions the change in Hamlet’s behavior, which goes from God-fearing to vengeful. With Hamlet, therefore, it varies from scene to scene, and from whether he is acting (madness) or not, which he does after gaining *the Dionysian insight*. “It is certainly knowledge that paralyzes the will, where there is no consolation, where life is denied by itself”²²² (Milić 2000: 135).

In Nuruddin, we also have a change from a man of God, an ideologist of Islamic exegesis to an avenger, from a calm, gentle and balanced believer who sees no further than the Koran to one who is a schemer, who hates passionately, who becomes a traitor and who thereby tarnishes the memory of his dead brother who did not tolerate injustice and who rebelled in the name of justice, which Nuruddin so ardently defends, for which he paid with his life. In Nuruddin, the change in behavior occurs through the acquisition of Dionysian insight (Ibid.) through the death of his brother.

“For the dervish, his brother’s arrest is disbelief, a horror from dreams and misunderstanding. The knowledge threw him out of the peace he

²²¹ „karakter se u engleskoj renesansnoj drami ne opisuje diskurzivno, nego se postepeno izgrađuje, dobijajući crtu po crtu od scene do scene” (Kostić 2010: 105).

²²² „To je svakako saznanje koje parališe volju, gde nema utehe, gde se život poriče sam sobiom” (Milić 2000: 135).

had won and disrupted his picture of the supposed harmony of the world and life”²²³ (Milošević 2005: 223).

As a result, his worldview, and thus his behavior, changes in social situations in which he is denied respect based on the title he believes he is entitled to. These are, first, encounters the muslim, then with a mufti, and finally with a kadi.

That is why wearing a mask is purposeful. They are “[...] external expressions of personal identity largely determined by the inner aspirations or motivations of that person”²²⁴ (Kostić 2010: 110). In other words, a literary character puts on or takes off a mask in order to present himself as someone else in a social context in order to achieve certain goals he is pursuing.

Shakespeare is interested in the intertwining of actions and characters, processes that occur in heroes, which are of a moral or spiritual nature. What is emphasized in both works is inaction. The reasons for inaction are what is intriguing in these two works. In this novel, the motif of madness, neither true nor false, is not present, but the motif of primordial hatred is present, as a dominant passion that leads to Nuruddin’s dehumanization no longer as a bearer of a title, but as a human being. “Ahmed Nuruddin has become a negative hero from the *Light of Faith*,²²⁵ (Selimović 2018a: 20) among other things, due to the lack of love. Escape from love leads to final dehumanization, to decline, to hatred, to bloody barbarians and the ecstasy of power, to crime and revenge [...]”²²⁶ (Delić 2021: 26).

²²³ „Za derviša, bratovljevo hapšenje je neverica, užas iz snova i nesporezuma. Saznanje ga je izbacilo iz osvojenog mira i poremetilo njegovu sliku o tobožnjoj harmoniji sveta i života” (Milošević 2005: 223).

²²⁴ „[...] spoljašnji izrazi ličnog identiteta u velikoj meri određeni unutrašnjim težnjama ili pobudama te osobe” (Kostić 2010: 110).

²²⁵ с в ј е т л о в ј е р е (Селимовић 2004: 12).

²²⁶ „Ахмед Нурудин је од „Свијетла вјере” постао негативан јунак, између осталог и због недостатка љубави. Бјекство од љубави води у коначну дехуманизацију, у пад, у мржњу, у крваве варваре и заносе власти, у злочин и освету [...]” (Делић 2021: 26).

Hamlet and *Death and the Dervish* share some characteristics of a revenge tragedy that are formally more important. Firstly, the conventional pattern of a revenge tragedy, according to Veselin Kostić, is one that includes two main aspects, one of which is the crime, the misdeed of the negative hero, who usually belongs to a high social class and as such possesses power that provides him with a certain protection in the social context, which complicates the task of revenge that needs to be carried out against him. The second one is revenge (Kostić 1982: 65).

If we could call Nuruddin positive at the beginning of the novel, he certainly is not such at the end because he has turned into everything he rebelled against.

Hamlet's metamorphosis goes from a literary hero who expresses emotions of sorrow, grief and disgust, who pretends to be crazy in order to achieve his plan and leave the impression of a court fool and buffoon, to, as the drama progresses, showing qualities worthy of a positive hero who does not want to commit a sin and kill a man who is not guilty, and devises a way to convince himself of Claudius' criminal act before killing him and thereby carrying out not the personal revenge of a son on his father's murderer, but the revenge of a ruler worthy of the throne of his state on one who is not.

Hamlet is not only an enlightened man, but also an heir to the throne illegally deprived of his throne. It is the conflict of two types of identity within him: personal and socially constructed that makes him an Althusserian subject, while the internal division between these two types of identity, and, even more, the rupture between two sets of moral values that are signs of different times and, therefore, different value systems, as well as the difference between the sober Hamlet and the one he becomes by acting out his madness, that is, between reason and the mask of madness, makes him a Nietzsche's subject who, being divided within himself, is always a multitude.

Loyalty to the title of dervish and kadi implies a refusal to allow the subject to use the Machiavellian means of those who use the aforementioned social positions for personal purposes, rather than for the public, common good. Since Nuruddin turns a deaf ear to this

by opting for lies, hypocrisy, and the sacrifice of an innocent man, he shows that the aforementioned titles are a mask, his transcendental “I,” and not his personal identity, with which he deceived himself until hatred enslaved him and forced him to subvert for the sake of revenge. This subversion, in Hamlet’s case, is the mask of madness.

“Disguise is not something that belongs to us by nature, but something that we freely adopt with a view to some goal, prompted by some need”²²⁷ (Vattimo 2011: 19). The mask hides the true intentions of the subject. He puts it on consciously. That is why Ahmed Nuruddin’s mask, until the encounter with the Muslim, when he learns that what he believed in most – his own social superiority based on the dervish vocation – is an illusion, an (anti)mask.

Nuruddin’s dervishism is a response to life’s disappointment, not to the real need of his original being to serve Allah. He does not go to the tekke out of humility and desire for service, but out of the need to, being injured, hide, separate, alienate himself, and, through his calling, secure for himself social prestige, recognition and respect of the community. Hamlet’s madness is a mask in the true sense of the word because he uses it to fulfill his goal – to find out whether Claudius is his father’s murderer and whether the Ghost of the King, his father, is telling the truth.

The gap represented by the mask can be traced in the light of binary oppositions between the being of the subject, the subject in itself, what the subject (thinks) he is, and his social position – the status he occupies within the social community, which distinguishes the subject from it. Ahmed Nuruddin calls this a title that he believes a priori secures him the respect of others. He thinks that they must respect him because they respect his rank.

In this way, he identifies himself with his rank, and vice versa, his rank with his personal identity, while in the play Hamlet, Laertes and Polonius are aware that the title transcends personal identity and that it must govern the decisions of the heir to the throne, and that

²²⁷ „Prerušavanje nije nešto što nam pripada po prirodi, već ono što slobodno usvajamo o s obzirom na nekakav cilj, podstaknuti nekom potrebom” (Vattimo 2011: 19).

he cannot make decisions with his heart, like an “ordinary” man, and marry Ophelia, but these must be decisions based on the position he occupies, as is the case with Ahmed Nuruddin until he transforms into an avenger, although he thinks that his kadi decisions can only be his own. He is so convinced of this that he confidently declares: “I’ll do what the law and my conscience command me to do”²²⁸ (Selimović 2018a: 345).

At the beginning of the novel, he sees no difference between the two identities, personal and social, dervish and kadi. For him, there is an absolute correspondence between Ahmed, the man, and Nuruddin, the dervish, the sheikh of the tekke. However, by the end of the novel he realizes that they are two different people, such as Hamlet, who is a grieving son, heir to the throne whose father was murdered, illegally usurped the throne, and therefore the state, but also the mother, from whom, we can say, Ophelia was usurped, namely by her father and brother, pointing out that Hamlet, if nothing else, the position he occupies as a legitimate pretender to the throne prohibits him from marrying her, which is why there is no point in her continuing to respond to his courtship, a madman who, in the eyes of others, above all Claudius, represents a danger to the country and its order, through Hamlet who faces death quite literally, holding Yorick’s skull, to Hamlet who does what an honorable ruler should do – kills the decadent usurper of the throne, thereby ensuring a bright future for Denmark in the form of Fortinbras. That element of sublimity makes his tragedy not quite tragic.

Hamlet does not shy away from murder as an act, but rather from committing the revengeful murder that his father’s Ghost commands him to do, as well as from suicide, which Christianity forbids through its commandment. He kills Polonius with a sword, and leads Rosencrantz and Guildenstern into a death trap without any second thought, but throughout the play he hesitates to kill Claudius, whom he only kills at the end of the play. This hesitation is best seen in the

²²⁸ „Чинићу оно што ми закон и савјест налажу” (Селимовић 2004: 356).

scene where Claudius prays, during which Hamlet can kill him without hindrance, because Claudius is at that moment on his knees, his back turned to his nephew, harmless and vulnerable, easy prey for the murderer, but Hamlet does not do so. Claudius' murder at the end of the play is a gesture of a ruler who does it in the name of the betterment of his country, and not personal revenge for his injured son. Hence the dimension of sublimity in Hamlet's act of killing Claudius.

Nuruddin's revenge is the personal revenge of a failed man steeped in dogmatically shaped vanity. It is also confirmed by his performance of the duty of a kadi. The role of a kadi is also a mask, a social identity, to which Nuruddin agrees without realizing that it is a metaphorical catul-ferman around his neck. The dogmatist in him, guided by his own pride, believes, indeed, that he will be independent in his decision-making and free to judge and adjudicate in accordance with his own will and legal regulations in which the law is the privilege of immoral rulers, Machiavellian characters who only need one more pawn to sacrifice for a game of chess in which human life is at stake.

Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin embody the multiplicity of identities. That is why they are contradictory subjects, divided within themselves, embodiments of the Nietzschean subject that is multiple in terms of consciousness and will, divided within itself into several of them, an internal plurality, an opposition to the integral subject, one whose nature is not fluid, but one, unique. Both share the opposition that exists between their personal and social identities, between their nature and social role, the titles they bear, dervish and kadi, as far as Nuruddin is concerned, and the title of monarch as far as Hamlet is concerned, which divides them from within.

The inner division caused by the multitude of identities and their opposition leads to a psychological split that is the foundation of Nietzsche's understanding of the subject. His conclusion is that the subject is never one, unique, indivisible, but rather it, and thus man as a subject, is always a plurality (Đurić 1997: 95). Nietzsche's understanding of the subject is conditioned by grammar in the sense of the basic grammatical relation subject – predicate, between which

there is a relationship that the subject is the performer of the action denoted by the predicate. Although he dealt with grammar, Nietzsche focused on thought as a phenomenon. He does not want to make the mistake that, according to him, Descartes made and to create an artificial connection between thought and the one who thinks it, i.e. its thinker. Nietzsche does not believe that the thinker exists. Nietzsche also does not fail to mention that there is no causal connection between thoughts. Nietzsche advocates the position that one thought does not generate another, that this is not the way thoughts arise, especially not thoughts in their ultimate form. He thinks that thinking is not an activity of the subject, because if it were, then man would be the one who could control his thought, which he is not. Nietzsche wants to say that this would mean that our thoughts are truly ours, and that this is generally not the case. Man does not master his thoughts, he is their slave. According to Nietzsche, there is no causal connection between I and I think. Neither is I a subject, nor is I a predicate. Although Nietzsche is aware of the influence of grammar on our thought, he denies the concept of the subject its grammatical heritage, "[...] that every occurrence is an action, that every action presupposes an agent"²²⁹ (Đurić 1997: 75). Because, if so, this would mean that there must be a causal connection between events, i.e. human action and intention, i.e. the phenomenon and its cause.

Nietzsche interprets the world through the prism of philosophy and compares antiquity and modernity in such a way that he sees their opposition. According to him, there is a relationship of both similarities and oppositions between the modern and ancient principles. Namely, Nietzsche thinks that "[...] the modern principle is most closely connected with the ancient, that it represents its transformation"²³⁰ (*Ibid*: 78). He establishes this by comparing ancient and modern man. Both are in search of support, the only difference is

²²⁹ „[...] да је свако збивање неко чињење, да свако чињење претпоставља неког учиниоца.” (Ђурић 1997: 75).

²³⁰ „[...] је нововековно начело најтешње повезано са античким, да представља његово преиначење.” (*Исто*: 78)

whether that support is within them or outside them. When it comes to ancient man, his support is not within him, but is always outside him. An ancient man “[...] understood the external as the measure of the inner”²³¹ (*Ibid.*).

This explains the role of the Olympian gods in the life of the Hellenes. Namely, the Greek gained the Dionysian insight, which Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin would acquire much later. He was fully aware of the dark side of human existence. He needed protection, so he sought it in the gods of Olympus, in whom he took refuge and protected himself from the monstrosity of existence and reality. Here we already find the relation of the external: internal in Nietzsche, who found the concept of the mask in their conflict.

Unlike the ancient people, the modern man is a man of broader horizons who understood that the ancient man made a mistake in choosing a support, that he should not have sought support in the external, but rather returned to the self, to his personality. He decided to find protection within himself. Therefore, the modern man used the mind as his refuge and thus, “[...] declared himself the first subject”²³² (*Ibid.*: 79.) This means that the modern man based his faith in his contemplative self, which is referred to by René Descartes, the father of modern philosophy, the one who made a turn in the previous medieval scholasticism that proclaimed God as the basis of all things.

Descartes starts from the fact that the subject, i.e. the thinking self, is what exists in itself, that it is unquestionable. And Nietzsche expresses the fear that Descartes is wrong because the existence of the thinking self depends on whether one considers that there is a separation of thought as such, of the thinker who thinks the thought there, and of thought as a phenomenon. If this premise is correct, it proves that the thinking self exists on the basis that there is a relationship of distinction between the thinker and thought. “Nietzsche doubts precisely what Descartes considered most undoubted – that there is

²³¹ „[...] оно спољашње схватио као меру унутрашњег” (*Истио*).

²³² „[...] прогласио себе првим субјектом” (*Истио*: 79).

such a thing as a subject or thinking self at all. He says that the position cogito, ergo sum is an arbitrary assertion, not a reasoned conclusion, because it already presupposes what has yet to be proven”²³³ (Ђурић 1997: 82).

Nietzsche was happy to refute Descartes. He believed that Descartes considered proven what he had not or had not fully proven, but rather assumed that it had been proven. One of the things Nietzsche criticized him for was, “[...] that he simply substantialized the subject, that he conceived the subject in the image of substance, that he transferred to it the provisions of substance”²³⁴ (*Ibid*: 85). Nietzsche believes that Descartes was wrong because he did not understand the relationship between subject and substance. According to Descartes, substance comes before subject, if it is the model that the subject should emulate. However, Nietzsche’s opinion on this relationship is completely different. He thinks that the relationship between subject and substance is as follows: “The concept of substance is a consequence of the concept of subject, and not vice versa”²³⁵ (according to Ђурић 1997: 78).

This is not the only place where Nietzsche disagrees with Descartes. They disagree on Descartes’ fundamental hypothesis that the self is a prerequisite for thought²³⁶ (*Ibid*: 88). Nietzsche argued that thought does not depend on the concept of self and that this concept is not the creator of thought, as Descartes thinks. Nietzsche sees the subject as a fiction, advocating the opinion “[...] that the function of

²³³ „Ниче сумња управо у оно што је Декарт сматрао најнесумњивијим – а то је да уопште постоји тако нешто као субјект или мисаоно ја. Каже да је став cogito, ergo sum произвољна тврдња, а не образложени закључак, јер се у њему већ претпоставља оно што би тек требало доказати” (Ђурић 1997: 82).

²³⁴ „[...] што је напосто супстанцијализовао субјект, што је замислио субјект по угледу на супстанцију, што је пренео на њега одредбе супстанције” (Исто: 85).

²³⁵ „Појам супстанције је последица појма субјекта, а не обрнуто!” (према Ђурић 1997: 78).

²³⁶ „[...] да је функција субјекта корисна у егзистенцијалном смислу” (Ђурић 1997: 91).

the subject is useful in an existential sense” (*Ibid*: 91). In this way, Nietzsche transfers the subject from the field of grammar to the field of reality and real life. For him, the ‘subject’ is the vital condition of organic existence [...]”²³⁷ (according to Đurić 1997: 91).

According to Nietzsche, the relationship between the elements of the multitude, namely consciousness and will, is “[...] the play and counterplay of forces, [...] the abundance of opposing drives and impulses [...]”²³⁸ (*Ibid*). Wholeness is what does not characterize Nietzsche’s subject, just as neither Hamlet nor Ahmed Nuruddin are whole. The basis of Nietzsche’s concept of disguise and his thought figure of the mask is the generation of an appearance, a delusion, an illusion. Appearance is the difference between what Ahmed Nuruddin and Hamlet Nuruddin are and what they present themselves as, Hamlet as a madman, and Ahmed Nuruddin as a dervish.

The split between listening to one’s own voice and the voice of an external authority such as religion, god, dogma is a problem that is the fundamental hub of their identity multiplicity. It gives rise to contradiction, which causes internal conflict. In the first part of the novel, Nuruddin’s transcendental “I” has curtailed his empirical apperception – the empirical “I” (Milić 2000: 35), personal identity. His transcendental “I” is an appearance. The empirical “I” (*Ibid*) is a being, a personal identity that is liberated by the appearance of hatred. In Hamlet, his empirical “I,” his “empirical apperception” (Milić 2000: 35), which is obliged to take revenge, fights against his “transcendental apperception” (*Ibid.*), which implies loyalty to an idea, or rather an ideal, to Christianity and “Islamic dogma”²³⁹ (Petrović 1981: 42), in a word, to religion.

²³⁷ „[...] да је функција субјекта корисна у егзистенцијалном смислу” (Ђурић 1997: 91). Ниче на тај начин пребацује субјект из поља граматике у поље реалности и реалног живота. За њега, ‘субјект’ је животни услов органског постојања [...]” (према Ђурић 1997: 91).

²³⁸ „[...] игра и противигра сила, [...] обиље супротних нагона и импулса [...]” (Исто).

²³⁹ „islamističkoj dogmi” (Petrović 1981: 42).

He nevertheless takes revenge and kills Claudius, violating God's commandment, thereby eliminating the influence of that authority within himself, and confirming the authority of his father's Ghost. Like Nuruddin, Hamlet is constantly on the border between his two "I"s: the experiential self, the one who is forced by a boundary situation to exist and act in the real, material world, and the self who believes in ideals and in the world that rests on them. Hamlet's disgust for his mother and her debauchery confirms that he believed in the ideal of her as a woman who remains faithful to her husband even after his death. Until she betrayed him, for which Ophelia paid the price, about whom, after her drowning, he says:

"I loved Ophelia.
Forty thousand brothers
Could not with all their quantity of love
make up my sum"²⁴⁰
(5. 1. 259–261)

3.2 MASKING: BETWEEN THE TRUTH AND AN ILLUSION

Hamlet might have had a chance not to be, like Ahmed Nuruddin, a failure as a man due to his lack of love.

Nietzsche's concept of the mask based on the difference between authenticity and construct, is what makes Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin suitable subjects for analyzing them in the light of this particular aspect of Nietzsche's philosophy. When it comes to disguising/masking principle, authenticity can be understood as the inner personality of a man, whereas a construct can be understood as what is external. Au-

²⁴⁰ „Волео сам
Офелију. Браће чердесет хиљада
Са свом множином своје љубави
Достигли не би моју”
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 123)

thenticity, hence, refers to the very core of a being, personal identity, the Self, true nature. Construct, on the other hand, is its representation in a social context, which is a social identity, public function, title when it comes to Nuruddin.

It denotes what is socially constructed. In his case, it is his ideologically conditioned Self, his dervish-oriented personality. Authenticity is the essence, the gist of a person, Unlike this, the construct is a mere form, the appearance aiming to achieve something, like in Hamlet's case, or rather like in Nuruddin's case in the second part of the book in which he uses his title and his dervish-oriented mindset to pursue justice.

Both Ahmed Nuruddin and Hamlet fall under the category of Nietzschean subjects. The Nietzschean subject is divided within himself. This means that a man is not a singular entity, he does not stand for singularity, but a plurality, the conflict between two contradictory "I"s, I comprising the roles of a son, brother, an heir to the throne, the son of a murdered father who is also a king, a ruler, the crucial political role in a community and its socio-political hierarchy and the state organization, I – the dervish, the religious and, simultaneously, political authority, a spiritual authority as well since dervish is a Muslim priest, the one who should represent the bearer of the God's words and his will, the supreme authority among the believers who confess them prior to death, who forgives their sins on behalf of the mighty God, thus ensuring their soul is unburdened with what they had done wrong while they were alive when they die. As such, he should represent the man of the virtue, who complies with the God's orders and live in accordance with them. However, the fact that he is consumed with vanity throughout the novel, his lies in the second part of the novel as well as his pretending in front of Mullah-Yusuf, to begin with, his choosing his calling instead of his brother, his wish to marry the late kadi's wife not just because he is fond of her but counting on the financial power and the reputation of her family to protect him, his devoting his life to being a dervish out of spite because he was hurt, even helping the fugitive, and, last, but not least, his demonic hatred

are all signs of betray his calling he had invested his entire previous part of life, all 20 years of serving it. For these reasons, the conclusion that him being the dervish is just an illusion could be drawn.

When analyzing the mask according to Nietzsche, we cannot argue one of its crucial features is its awareness of illusion. In *Hamlet*, the awareness of illusion exists within himself, in the scenes of his fake madness. He knows exactly where the line is. In Ahmed Nuruddin's case, however, this level of awareness does not exist at first. It is only later when it is created, by acquiring *the tragic knowledge* (Jaspers 1984: 234). This is what initiates both protagonists' spiritual metamorphosis. Moreover, it will condition their subsequent actions resulting in leading them towards them having to ethically determine themselves as opposed to being ethically neutral. By doing so, both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin will become ethically determined heroes since they make a deliberate choice to fulfil their destiny. His devotion to the dervish calling is hypocritical because he did not choose it out of genuine love and the need to serve "the Islamist dogma"²⁴¹ (Petrović 1981: 42), but out of the need to, due to disappointment because the girl he loved had in the meantime become someone else's, hurt and horrified by the scenes that were unbecoming of a human being, which he had seen in the war, the bestiality of his military comrades, who were not ashamed of their animalistic urges, debauchery and fornication. He does not run to dervishism with a pure heart, he flees into it, driven by the need for protection and separation, solitude and spiritual escapism. "Even then he noticed that obedience was not the real one, acquired from strength and religious enthusiasm, but was only a shelter, a refuge from the "powerful and evil of this world" to whom he was no match [...], for whom he was weak"²⁴² (Jerotić in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1973: 70).

²⁴¹ „[...] islamistička dogma [...]” (Petrović 1981: 42).

²⁴² „Још је тада он уочио да покорност није она права, из снаге и верског усхићења стечена, већ је само заклон, прибежиште од „моћних и злих овога свијета” којима није дорастао [...], за које је слаб” (Јеротић, Владета, „О неким метаморфозама „индивидуационог процеса” у роману „Дер-

Jerotić's position is important because it shows that the dervish's awareness that his dervishism was not primordial, but utilitarian. This implies that, if Nuruddin is aware of this, then it is not an (anti)mask, but a mask. Therefore, the boundary when it comes to Nuruddin's dervish illusion will be somewhat more flexible. He is an ideological, doctrinal immigrant and a social and life emigrant. Hence the loss and failure as fate.

It is undoubtedly that Hamlet masks himself when he employs *antic disposition*, just as it is certain Ahmed Nuruddin does not mask himself in the first part of the novel, when serving it through his submission. However, the acquisition of *tragic knowledge* (Jaspers in: Stojanović 1984: 234) is to a great extent related to the (non)existence of the mask of the two protagonists, because on the basis of it Hamlet decides to put on the mask, and Nuruddin's insight implies not only a reaction to the death of his brother, an innocent man, but also an insight into the dervish illusion.

Hamlet puts on a mask and that it is Dionysian in nature, and that Nuruddin's "mask" of a dervish is not a mask at all until he realizes that it is, as a matter of fact, one. What is more, it is the (anti)Apollonian mask. Consequently, the difference in their masking/disguising as well as the role they play has primarily to do with their ethical (in)determination.

Hamlet's mask of madness that generates the illusion through his behaviour of a lunatic fulfills its purpose of defense in an environment in which he is inferior to the others, spys, tyrants, sycophants. Nuruddin's (anti)mask, on the other hand, has the purpose of distinction since in the course of the first part of the novel Nuruddin insists that he is "something": a dervish, a sheikh, a member of the Order, and not "someone", a man, a brother, a son, a lover.

Therefore, he completely subordinates his personal identity to his socially constructed subjectivity, his public function rooted in the doctrine and ideology of Islamic exegesis in the first part of the

виш и смрт" Меше Селимовића" у: *Критичари о Мешу Селимовићу са аутобиографијом*, Свјетлост, Издавачко предузеће, Сарајево, 1973, стр. 70)

novel. He places the emphasis on his social status with an (anti)mask because he did not acquire it by birth, as he would like to have it, because it protects him.

Both *Death and the Dervish* and *Hamlet* talk tackle the phenomenon of boundaries. Both pieces of writing are characterized by endless inner hesitation, noticeable in the Ahmed Nuruddin and Hamlet. Fluidity is largely present in both works through the prism of conflicting contradictions, the most significant of which is the one between the ideological and moral idealism of both protagonists.

The central concept of Nietzsche's concept is the mask. We associate masking with theater. The theatrical mask determines the role of the actor on stage, and the Nietzschean mask of a person within the collective, but also within himself. Nietzsche's principle of masking (disguise) is used by the protagonists for their ultimate goal – the execution of revenge. In the context of *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, ethical determination is at stake.

Hamlet, for example, puts on the mask of a mad man so as to benefit from it. His mask is Dionysian in nature, which we will explain with the connection that Nietzsche finds between Hamlet and Dionysiac man (Nietzsche 2003: 39). It comprises the crucial characteristics of Hamlet's psychological-emotional structure, especially the phenomena such as his passivity and apathy, aka lethargy. These traits make the drama evergreen, timeless and elevate it to the level of the universal since everyone feels like Hamlet does at some point in their life, especially in the situations of facing the loss of a loved one or a friend, next of kin, etc. Hamlet thus ceases to be just a literary character like any other and just a man like any other.

He becomes a metaphor for feeling blue, acting while being hurt, angry and overwhelmed, making decisions while grieving some of which might be wrong or end badly. Lastly, bearing in mind that his obsession with his father lasts much shorter and is less intense than his obsession with his mother remarrying Claudius, we might also argue he is also a metaphor of the pathological relationship of a son with his mother.

On the other hand, what is noticeable in case of Ahmed Nuruddin's mask is the fact that it is actually an (anti)Apollonian (anti) mask. This statement is justified because dervish Ahmed Nuruddin lacks the awareness that his dervishness is an illusion in the first part of the novel, when his personal identity is non-existent or rather, hidden deeply behind his devotion to his calling. At the the begining of *Death and the Dervish*, we meet face to face with the protagonist who is entirely consumed by his profession. He acts like a dervish, talks like a dervish, thinks like a dervish, believing the whole world operates similarly. His discovering this is not the case causes him to eventually be overwhelmed with tragic disappointment. That awareness, obtained by having gin such a tragic insight due to facing his innicent brother's tragic death is the borderline between a mask and an (anti)mask. The mask and the (anti)mask are thus separated by the lack of awareness. A mask is an (anti)mask as long as it is not aware of it being fake. Once it recognizes that, it is no longer the (anti)mask. It becomes the mask.

At first, dervish Ahmed Nuruddin is merged with his title, his noble calling which is, at the same time, his public function. However, although the (anti)mask, his dervishism still possesses a vital characteristic of the Nietzschean mask. It is the protection from those compared to whom he is inferior, i.e. those in power, the power-holders. Furthermore, it is a means of distinction from those who are lower than him on the social hierarchy ladders.

The task that each individual should strive for is the integrity of his personality, his own inner unity. The problem arises when our social role, the mask, which is the source of our opinion, which is not ours, but is acquired, and our personality, our original being, are in conflict. In the case of the protagonists of the play *Hamlet* and the novel *Death and the Dervish*, we can say that there is a conflict between opinion and being in them, since their opinion is not theirs, but a set of internalized principles of imposed authority that exerts a profound influence on the consciousness of the two heroes. These authorities are institutions that support order, and serve to maintain the ideolo-

gy of the ruling class, of which the court as the generator of political ideology and the monarch as the representative of that doctrine in Hamlet's case are important for this thesis, and the "Islamist dogma" (Petrović 1981: 42) in Nuruddin's case, or rather, his relationship to it, which he uses as a refuge.

Disguise is an art. It is an illusion, a conscious adoption of another (sometimes someone else's) identity for the sake of protection in a social context (Radojčić 2017: 82) whose conventions defy those firmly rooted within us, adopted, acquired due to exposure to cultural and ideological matrices and value systems that we have internalized as our own, and which actually represent a set of acquired principles. A mask is a distinction, a difference in relation to ourselves, and in relation to others, a disagreement between our original personality and the role we play in a social context, group (collective) or social community, for the sake of some goal. The cause of the disagreement is the discrepancy between the value systems instilled in our consciousness and the adopted, acquired ones. Because the relationship between an individual and a group is never just a relationship between an individual and a group. It is always a question of the relationship between two types of identity: personal and social (collective) because we, as members of the human race, are social individuals, and a social "individual always creates its identity in a complex system of relationships with groups"²⁴³ (Mallier 1982: 19).

The divergence of these two identities in an individual creates an identity crisis due to internal division, due to the distinction between us and them, and the contradiction between the internal and external, which causes a difference in ourselves, an internal division. Differentiation from others with whom we stand in a relation of collective connection leads to internal conflict because a contradiction is created within us between the system of values that we have adopted as part of the collective and what is our essence, our original being, personal identity.

²⁴³ „jedinka stvara svoj identitet uvek u slojenom sistemu odnosa sa grupama" (Malrije 1982: 19).

Since a person participates in the creation of a value system within a social community, he thereby participates in the construction of a collective identity within himself, into which his personal identity as an individual should be molded and thereby limited. When, however, this does not happen, because the difference between the collective and individual value systems is too great, an internal conflict occurs within the individual, when he reaches for (un)masking. The relations between the individual and the collective, the social communities to which he belongs, are forms of social interaction that, by subjugation, transforms the individual into a socially constructed subject on the basis of his collective identity based on ideology – a value system.

Our relationship to the collective can be based on excessive identification with other members of the group or the principles that the collective promotes, implies and encourages, or on being different from the collective to which we belong due to circumstances (e.g., by birth), which forces us to adapt for the sake of easier survival. The first case refers to Ahmed Nuruddin, and the other to Hamlet.

Since in both works of which they are the protagonists, the question of the relationship between personal and collective identity is one of the supporting pillars of both literary structures, the clarification of the term collective identity is not without significance. The foundation of collective identity is ideology. What stands as a binary opposition to the ideological constitution of the collective identity of the individual, now already a subject, is the concept of personal freedom. It, however, is limited by the demands of the group, which molds the individual into a cultural, socially conditioned, traditional, ideological matrix that suppresses his autonomy. The system always strives for its survival at the expense of the freedom of those who make it up, because molding is the way of that survival, the lever that keeps regimes in power by subjugating and breaking personal will.

Disguise, namely, is closely related to the need for freedom because each individual is bound by certain laws, principles, and laws in accordance with which he exists, as a member of the human race, and thus also by some social community, whether national, religious,

ideological, or any other, whose molds limit his freedom, and thus inevitably call it into question.

It follows that, as a member of a group, and belonging to a group gives rise to a collective identity, a person does not have the right to his personal, individual, intimate choice, opinion, or act. His personal identity is denied to him, and his structure, internal and external, must be conditioned by the rules of the group of which he is a part. This is a field in which anything individual disappears, and in its place comes the collective, the general. The group shapes our identity by abolishing our right (not the need, but even the necessity) to our own being, personal autonomy and our own freedom.

”Identity, that essential backbone of the concept of personality is what makes a person different from others, to be who they are [...]”²⁴⁴ (Zizjulas 1985: 15). In the case of an individual as a socially constructed subject. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are not just Nietzschean subjects. „[...] that identity is provided and given by a state or some organized group”²⁴⁵ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 312). They are subordinate subjects in the Althusserian sense, which means that they are slaves to an opinion that is not originally theirs (Ibid). It goes without saying that every authority tends to subordinate its subjects. The existence of freedom in opinion lies the greatest danger to any authoritarian system, because it can lead to subversion and rebellion that would overthrow that order, whether it is a political order or a religious dogma (such as Islam and Christianity).

To subjugate an individual means to revoke his right to freedom of thought, to critical thinking, to revoke his personal position, his intellectual and emotional autonomy, and thus his independence and freedom, in short, to make him a subject. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are subjects in that they are in a subordinate relationship

²⁴⁴ „Идентитет, та суштанска окосница појма личност је оно што чини да неки човек буде другачији од осталих, да јесте онај који јесте [...]” (Зизјулас 1985: 15).

²⁴⁵ „[...] taj identitet obezbeđuje i daje država ili neka organizovana celina” (Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: 312).

to externally imposed authorities such as a monarch, a sultan, or a god. Hamlet's madness and Ahmed's hatred are subversive behaviors that threaten the order. They become a threat, and the threat must be removed.

An important difference between Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin when it comes to their collective identities is that Hamlet did not choose his social identity, he was born with it, since he is a prince – heir to the throne, a member of the royal family. He, therefore, acquired the status of a socially constructed subject by birth. He, as a socially constructed subject, is shaped by what Louis Althusser calls the family state ideological apparatus (Althusser 2009: 28). According to him, the role of these apparatuses is to support the state structure through institutions (*Ibid*: 78).

”Louis Althusser cites literature as one of the ideological apparatuses that support the reproduction of production relations, or social relations that are essential for the existence and maintenance of the capitalist mode of production, in his essay “Ideology and the Ideological State Apparatus”. [...] Althusser's interpretation of Marx implies that ideology is a system of representations (discourses, images, myths) that deal with the real relationships within which people live, and not just a set of self-delusions. [...] Ideology is a relationship to the world that is both realistic and imaginary at the same time. It is real in how people actually interpret their relationship to the social relations that shape their conditions in their lives, and imaginary in that it obscures the details of those conditions and how individuals are socially constituted within them. [...] Althusser says that “ideological state apparatuses” (IDAs) are structures in our society that maintain ideological practices. The phenomenon of ideology has the ability to define individuals as subjects. [...] ‘subject’ in the sense used by ideology refers to someone who submits to the authority of some of the social formations – which include God, the monarch, the boss, the man and morality”²⁴⁶ (Catherine Belsey in: Lešić 2003: 189–197).

²⁴⁶ „Luj Altiser navodi književnost kao jedan od ideoloških aparata koji podržavaju reprodukciju proizvodnih odnosa, ili društvenih odnosa koji su od

The dervish acquired his collective identity as a member of the Mevlevi order and the Islamic religious community. He was accustomed to and he belongs to the group as a soldier, who attacked the enemies of the faith with a knife. His personal identity is that he comes from a poor rural family who, after returning from a war in which he fought for Islam, after learning that the girl he loved was no longer a girl, devoted himself to the faith on an intellectual level to the point of exclusivity, completely putting his mind at the service of Islamic doctrine.

Ahmed Nuruddin thinks. Ahmed Nuruddin does not act. He will act only when he is forced to. Then he will write and let his artistic genius write the story of an unfortunate man whose record, *Death and the Dervish*, a book par excellence of Serbian literature, confesses a deep, poignant, human story about the pain of one man. That man, quite by chance, was artistically gifted and, in the central theme of the book – the murder of an innocent brother – very similar to Selimović himself. Certain individuals, especially those gifted with artistic genius, find it difficult and reluctant to give up their sense of freedom. What tempts them to break through the boundaries of these restrictions is their need for liberation, even when they are not aware of it, and they become aware of it only when it is threatened, as is the case with Hamlet, or when they push it deep within themselves, to the point of asceticism, as Ahmed Nuruddin did for twenty years.

suštinskog značaja za postojanje i održavanje kapitalističkog načina proizvodnje, u svom eseju „Ideologija i ideološki državni aparat”. [...] Altiserova interpretacija Marksa podrazumeva da je ideologija sistem reprezentacija (diskursa, slika, mitova) koji se bave stvarnim vezama unutar kojih ljudi žive, a ne samo skup samoobmana. [...] Ideologija je odnos prema svetu koji je istovremeno i realističan i imaginaran. On je stvaran po tome kako ljudi zapravo tumače svoj odnos prema društvenim odnosima koji oblikuju njihove uslove u njihovim životima, a imaginaran po tome što zamagluje detalje tih uslova i načina na koji su pojedinci u njima društveno konstituisani. [...] Altiser kaže da su „ideološki državni aparati” (IDA) strukture u našem društvu koje održavaju ideološke prakse. Fenomen ideologije ima sposobnost da definiše ličnosti kao subjekte. [...] ‘subjekt’ u smislu koji ideologija koristi se odnosi na nekoga ko se potčinjava autoritetu neke od društvenih formacija – koje uključuju Boga, monarha, šefa, čoveka i moral” (Belzi (Catherine Belsey) u: Lešić 2003: 189–197).

3.1.1 THE ROLE OF ACTING IN *HAMLET*:

“THE MOUSETRAP”

Rosencrantz, Hamlet’s former friend and current Claudius’ spy thus resembling Mullah-Yusuf in *Death and the Dervish* together with Guildenstern, informs Hamlet of the arrival of the actors: “We coted them on the way, and 1406 hither are they coming to offer you service”²⁴⁷ (2.2. 310–311). The arrival of the actors fits perfectly in Hamlet’s plan to make his uncle uncover his secrets, providing he is the bearer of one, as Hamlet is already knowledgeable about, but still doubtful. The Prince replies to him:

“He that plays the king shall be welcome – his
Majesty shall have tribute on me. The adventurous
knight shall use his foil and target, the lover shall
not sigh gratis, the humorous man shall end his
part in peace, the clown shall make those laugh
whose lungs are tickle o’ th’ sear, and the lady
shall say her mind freely, or the blank verse shall
halt for ’t”²⁴⁸
(2.2. 312–319)

Hamlet is preparing a plan to harm Claudius and that this plan involves the actors, as soon as he says it at that moment. He asks who the actors are in question. We learn from Rosencrantz that they are already known to Hamlet: “Those whom you used to love very much: the tragedians of the city”²⁴⁹ (*Ibid.*). While he was in the city,

²⁴⁷ „Прошли смо их на друму; они долазе овамо да вам понуде своје услуге” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 53). U ostatku teksta navedeni stihovi odnose se na engl. izdanje drame *Hamlet*, navedeno u bibliografiji. Zbog toga neće biti navođeno delo u svakoj parentezi ponaosob.

²⁴⁸ „Онај што игра краља добро ми је дошао. Његово величанство ће добити свој данак од мене; витез луталица ће употребити свој мач и свој штити; љубавник неће залуд уздисати; ћудљивац ће на миру свршити своју улогу; лакрдијаш ће насмејати оне чија се плућа лако голицају; а јунакиња ће слободно изразити мисли, па ма због тога храмали стихови” (*Истио*).

²⁴⁹ „Они које сте ви обично веома волели; трагичари из града” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 53)

the prince saw their plays. Since four months have passed since the murder of his father and his stay and life in the city), he asks whether their reputation is still at an enviable level and whether their plays are still as well attended as before. Rosencrantz answers in the negative and draws attention to the new, young actors:

Nay, their endeavor keeps in the wonted
pace. But there is, sir, an aerie of children, little
eyases, that cry out on the top of question and are
most tyrannically clapped for 't. These are now the
fashion and so berattle the common stages (so
they call them) that many wearing rapiers are afraid
of goose quills and dare scarce come thither²⁵⁰
(2.2. 329–335).

The word “outside” refers to what is outside, not inside. It indicates a lie and a pretense. Polonius explains who the actors are. There are four or five of them. After a warm welcome, Hamlet evokes memories of plays he has attended, from which he invites the actors. He himself recites a verse from one of those plays. Polonius praises his diction. Hamlet says that the actors are “[...] the mirror and chronicle of their time”²⁵¹ (*Ibid*: 59). This is important because Shakespeare himself was a member of one of the acting companies of that time.

The Prince wants them to perform the play *The Murder of Gonzago*, but for him to write “[...] a speech, of some dozen or sixteen lines”²⁵² (2.2. 87) The function of adding lines to the text is to shape the play to resemble a real situation that has occurred,

²⁵⁰ „He, њихов труд још одражава свој убичајени корак. Али вам се, господару, накупило некакве дечурлије, малих голуждраваца, који се деру из свег гласа, и зато им се немилосрдно пљеска: они су сад у моди и ти су сад толико загрејали по простим позорницама – како их они зову- да су многи што носе папире уплашени од гушчијих пера, и не смеју да се појаве тамо” (*Исѿо*).

²⁵¹ „[...] огледало и летопис свог времена” (*Исѿо*).

²⁵² „[...] један говор, од једно дванаестили шеснаест стихова [...]” (*Исѿо*).

so that the acting makes King Claudius feel uncomfortable enough to show his guilt. The actors agree to this. When they are no longer on stage after their arrival, Hamlet begins to reveal his idea: the actors agree to this. When they have withdrawn, Hamlet begins to reveal his idea:

“O, what a rogue and peasant slave am I!
Is it not monstrous that this player here,
But in a fiction, in a dream of passion,
Could force his soul so to his own conceit 5
That from her working all his visage wann’d,
Tears in his eyes, distraction in’s aspect,
A broken voice, and his whole function suiting
With forms to his conceit?”²⁵³ (2.2. 534–541)

He elaborates his aim:

“I have heard
That guilty creatures sitting at a play
Have by the very cunning of the scene
Been struck so to the soul that presently
They have proclaim’d their malefactions; 609
For murder, though it have no tongue, will speak
With most miraculous organ. I’ll have these players
Play something like the murder of my father
Before mine uncle: I’ll observe his looks;
I’ll tent him to the quick: if he but blench,

²⁵³ „О, какав подлац, ниски роб сам ја!
Није ли страшно да тај глумац ту
У једној песми, једном сну о страсти
Мађштом својом може да присили душу
Да од њеног дејства пребледи му лик,
У оку буду сузе, лицем страх,
Јецане у гласу, и држање све
С његовом маштом да дође у склад?”
(*Ишио.*: 59–61)

I know my course. The spirit that I have seen 615
May be the devil: and the devil hath power
To assume a pleasing shape; yea, and perhaps
Out of my weakness and my melancholy,
As he is very potent with such spirits,
Abuses me to damn me: I'll have grounds 620
More relative than this: the play 's the thing
Wherein I'll catch the conscience of the king²⁵⁴
(2.2. 574–590).

The organization of this play is Hamlet's plot, which aims to provoke a certain reaction in order to fulfill his own goal – revenge. In this monologue,

“[...] two significant components of Hamlet's spirit are perfectly intertwined: the emotional will for action and the rational analysis of the action itself. Thus, one action (the murder of the king) is postponed for

²⁵⁴ „Слушао сам
Да кривци, гледајућ какву представау,
вештином самом глуме беху тол'ко
потресени до срца да би одмах
признали јавно своја недела.
Убиство, иако нема језика,
Проговори органом чуднијим.
Приредићу да глумци играју
Нешто што личи убиству оца мог
Пред мојим стрицем.
Ја ћу пазити
На његов поглед, прозират до сржи.
Тргне л' се само, знаћу већ свој пут!
Дух који видех можда је нечастив,
А ђаво може на себе узети
Допадљив облик; штавише и можда,
Због слабости ми и сумосрности –
А он на такве има силу моћ –
На зло ме води, да ме упропасти.
Ја хоћу да имам стварније разлоге но овај”
(Исћо: 61).

the sake of another action (the mousetrap). But, this second action leads (if it succeeds) to the realization of the first (the murder of Claudius), that Hamlet symbol of establishing the disturbed harmony and setting the dislocated joint of the world”²⁵⁵ (Bajić in: *The Scene* 1967: 332).

the conviction that the Ghost is not deceiving him would allow him to kill Claudius in order to avenge the murder of his father, whom Claudius sent to the other world without the right to forgiveness of sins, and thus condemned him to torment in purgatory because “Hamlet’s father was killed at a time when he was not sufficiently prepared to go to the other world, and therefore his spirit must spend a certain time in the so-called purgatory, where he will be freed from his sins before he reaches heaven”²⁵⁶ (Milošević in: *Hamlet*, trans. Simić and Pandurović, 2006: 10). Hamlet gives the actors instructions on how to perform a play whose purpose is to confront Claudius with his crime and the discovery of it:

“Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounc’d it to you, trippingly on the tongue. But if you mouth it, as many of our players do, I had as live the town crier spoke my lines. Nor do not saw the air too much with your hand, thus, but use all gently; for in the very torrent, tempest, and (as I may say) whirlwind of your passion, you must acquire and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness. O, it offends me to the soul to hear a robustious periwig-pated fellow tear a passion to tatters, to very rags, to split the cars of the groundlings, who (for the most part) are capable of nothing but inexplicable dumb shows and

²⁵⁵ „[...] savršeno isprepletane dve značajne komponente Hamletovog duha: emotivna volja za akcijom i racionalna analiza same akcije. Tako se jedna akcija (ubistvo kralja) odlaže zbog druge akcije (mišolovke). Ali, ta druga akcija vodi (ako uspe) ostvarenju prve (ubistvo Klaudija) tom Hamletovom simbolu uspostavljanja narušene harmonije i nameštanju iščašenog zgloba sveta” (Bajić u: *The Scene* 1967: 332).

²⁵⁶ „Hamletov otac ubijen je u času kada nije bio dovoljno pripremljen za odlazak na drugi svet, pa zato njegov duh mora da provede izvesno vreme u takozvanom čistilištu, gde će se osloboditi svojih grehova pre nego što dospe u raj” (Milošević u: Šekspir, *Hamlet*, prev. Simić i Pandurović, 2006: 10).

noise. I would have such a fellow whipp'd for o'erdoing Termagant. It out-herods Herod. Pray you avoid it "²⁵⁷ (3.2. 1–14).

The measure that Hamlet insists on is the Apollonian dimension of limit, reason and self-control, "though this be madness, yet there is method in't"²⁵⁸ (2.2. 202 – 203) as Polonius says. The prince relies on the reaction to the play in the play that faithfully depicts the scene of the king's murder, which he assumes will upset Claudius and thus force him to unmask. The king is irritated by the content of the play and explicitly asks Hamlet: "Have you heard the arguments? Is there no offence in't?"²⁵⁹ (3.2. 225–226) At this point in the play, we can sense the revelation of Claudius' crime. Hamlet ironically replies that there is no crime and that everything is just the most ordinary joke: "No, no! They are only joking; they are poisoning themselves with jokes. There is not a shadow of crime here" (*Ibid*: 75).

At this point in the play (Shakespeare, *Great Tragedies* 2022: 72) the didactic notes state: *The faces of a pantomime enter: the king and queen express their love with gestures; she embraces him and he embraces her. She kneels before him, as if to assure him of her love. He lifts her up and rests his head on her shoulder; he lies down on the flowery rampart. She leaves him*

²⁵⁷ „Молим вас, изговорите тај говор онако како сам вам ја показао, да вам готово клизи са језика. Али ако будете жвакали, као што чине многи ваши глумци, онда ће ми то бити исто тако пријатно као да сам општинском добошару дао да говори моје стихове. Па немојте сувише ни тестерисати ваздух рукама, овако; него будите у свему умерени. Јер и у самој бујици, бури, или, да тако кажем, вихору страсти, морате имати и показати мере, која ће то ублажити. [...]. Али не будите ни сувише кротки, већ нека вас учи ваше рођено осећање мере: удесите радњу према речи, а реч према радњи, и нарочите се старајте да никада не прекорачите границе природе. Јер свака таква претраност промаши цољ глуме, чији је задатак у почетку и сад, био и јесте, да буде, такорећи, огледало природе: да велики покаже њено сопствено лице, пороку његову рођену слику, а самом садашњем поколењеу и бићу света његов облик и отисак” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 68–69).

²⁵⁸ „Иако је то лудило, ипак има у њему методе” (*Истио*: 50).

²⁵⁹ „Знате ли ви садржај тог комада? Да у њему нема неког злочина?” (*Истио*: 75)

when she sees that he has fallen asleep. Then a man appears, who takes off the king's robe, kisses it, and pouring poison into the king's ears, goes out. The queen returns, and when she sees the dead king, she expresses her pain with gestures. The poisoner returns with two or three mute figures, pretending to mourn the king with her. Then they bring out the corpse. The poisoner proposes to the queen, bowing to her. She seems to be disgusted by this offer at first and opposed to it; but in the end she accepts his love.

Everything that happens on the stage attracts Ophelia's attention. Her dialogue with the prince follows. She asks him:

"What means this, my lord?"²⁶⁰ (3.2. 131)

Hamlet replies:

"Marry, this is miching malicho, it means mischief"²⁶¹ (3.2. 132)

She assumes:

"Belike this show imports the arguments of the play"²⁶² (3.2. 133)

The later Hamlet's words are prophetic:

"We shall know by this fellow. The players cannot keep counsel: they ll tell us"²⁶³ (3.2. 134–135)

The previous part unambiguously refers to the fratricide, the loving relationship with the deceased's wife, while the one with the gifts refers to Ophelia, who returns the gifts he gave her at one point in the play to Hamlet, doubting his love for her. When one of the actors

²⁶⁰ „Шта значи ово, кнеже?”

(*Исџо*: 72)

²⁶¹ „Богме, то је потајно недело, а значи несрећу” (*Исџо*).

²⁶² „Можда овај приказ представља заплет игре” (*Исџо*).

²⁶³ „То ћемо дознати од овога. Глумци не зају чувати тајне. Они ће све испричати” (*Исџо*).

pours what is supposed to be poison into the ear of another actor, Hamlet utters: "He poisons him i' th' garden for his estate. His name's Gonzago. The story is extant and written in very choice Italian. You shall see anon how the murderer gets the love of Gonzago's wife"²⁶⁴ (3.2, 252–253)

Hamlet's words are an allusion to the murder of his father and the marriage between Claudius and Gertrude. The king is very disturbed by the scene in the play, and at that moment the king revolted, or perhaps it would be more appropriate to say, theatrically gets up and leaves. This convinces Hamlet that the ghost is not lying, that his brother is indeed the culprit for his death. The prince exchanges impressions about this with Horatio:

"O good Horatio, I'll take the ghost's word for a thousand pounds. Didst perceive?"²⁶⁵ (3.2. 287–288)

Horatio confirms Hamlet's doubts:

"Very well, my lord"²⁶⁶ (3.2. 278).

Hamlet replies:

"Upon the talk of the poisoning?"²⁶⁷ (3.2. 280)

Horatio ends this dialogue by saying:

"I did very well note him"²⁶⁸ (3.2. 281)

²⁶⁴ „Отрује га у врту да му томе државу. Његово је име Гонцаго. Та прича постоји, и писана је италијанским језиком. Одмах ћете видети како убица задобија љубав Гонцагове жене” (*Исџо*: 76).

²⁶⁵ „Добри мој Хорацио, дајем хиљаду фунти да је свака реч духа истинита.

Јеси ли приметио?” (*Исџо*: 77).

²⁶⁶ „Сасвим добро, господару” (*Исџо*).

²⁶⁷ „Чим је пала реч о тровању” (*Исџо*).

²⁶⁸ „Одлично сам уочио” (*Исџо*).

The uncle's sudden getting up and leaving proves to Hamlet that he is the murderer of his brother, Hamlet's father.

One pivotal moment in the tragedy is the play *The Murder of Gonzaga* [...]. As it happens the current king and queen Claudius and Gertrude are dragged into the drama for their entertainment like a nightmare. The king and queen of players attempt to undermine their audiences sense of reality. Hamlet has discovered all he needs to know about his uncles guilt by the time Claudius nerve gives out and the play devolves into chaos. The image of the theater stays behind them even though the players themselves leave Elsinore likely a little bewildered by everything. In order to ensure that somewhat more audience than Gertrude herself is present for the mother-son conversation Polonius as official as ever chooses to hide behind the frames in the queens wardrobe. It is a terrible plan. Hamlet thought he was the king and killed him in his hiding place this time with serious intent rather than in jest after Polonius who brought out Julius Caesar when he was young was assassinated in the Capitol. Hamlet imagines Claudius the fourth character in the tragedy to be the King of Players. The prince was ultimately able to distinguish between hypocrisy and truth appearance and reality with the aid of illusion. His foundation was the theater so it makes sense that he would bring it up again to explain how he destroyed Rosencrantz and Guildenstern two false friends. The idea that Hamlet is the Player King who sends a fictitious royal order to England sealed with his fathers seal is combined with the dramatic nature of the deception in this instance. Compared to its predecessors the final play in the tragedy is a little different. There is not much time left for Hamlet Gertrude Claudius and Laertes are dead²⁶⁹ (Righter 1967: 142–147).

²⁶⁹ „Predstava „Ubistvo Gonzaga” je prekretnica u tragediji. [...]. Kako se odvija, Klaudije i Gertruda, kralj i kraljica na vlasti, uvučeni su kao noćna mora u dramu predstavljenu za njihovu „zabavu”. Kralj i kraljica igrača pokušavaju da ugroze realnost svoje publike. U vreme kada Klaudijev nerv otkaže i predstava se rastopi u konfuziji, Hamlet je naučio sve što treba da zna o krivici svog strica.

Finally, Guildenstern informs Hamlet of Claudius's reaction: "The King is in his retirement marvellous distempered"²⁷⁰ (3.2. 290). The cause of this, in Guildenstern's opinion, is anger. Through Claudius's reaction during the performance of the scene "The Mousetrap", Hamlet unequivocally confirms that his uncle is the perpetrator of his father's murder (Milanović 2009: 359). However, since previously, until he was convinced that his uncle was guilty, he could not publicly make accusations against Claudius that he could support with evidence, he opts for the tactic of putting on a mask of madness. It is an expression of Hamlet's cleverly conceived plan with the main goal of making Claudius doubt the consequences of his actions, which will lead him to reveal his true face, that is, to reveal his true intentions that he hides behind a hypocritical smile (Hibbard 2008: 54). As a result, he realizes that he must test whether what the ghost is saying is true or not in order to confirm his belief that he has been telling him all along that Claudius is guilty (*Ibid*: 55)

He is given a chance to do both. That chance is the arrival of the actors at the court. The scene with the actors ends with an amazing demonstration of how the abilities of a dramatic artist, and the abilities

Sami igrači nestaju iz Elsinora, verovatno pomalo zbunjeni svime tim, ali slika pozorišta ostaje iza njih. Polonije, zvaničan kao i uvek, odlučuje da se sakrije iza ramova u kraljičinom ormanu kako bi „nešto više publike” od same Gertrude trebalo da bude prisutno na razgovoru između majke i sina. To je katastrofalna šema. Polonija koji je 'izveo Julija Cezara' u svojoj mladosti i koji je ubijen na Kapitolu, Hamlet je pogrešno shvatio da je kralj i ubijen u svom skrovištu, ovog puta ozbiljno, a ne u šali. U Hamletovom umu, Klaudije postaje Kralj igrača, četvrti u tragediji. Uz pomoć iluzije, princ je konačno odvojio izgled od stvarnosti, licemerje od istine. Pozorište je bio njegov kamen temeljac; čini se sasvim prirodnim da ga još jednom pozove kako bi opisao svoje uništenje dva lažna prijatelja, Rozenkranca i Gildensterna. [...] Teatralna priroda prevare ovde se meša sa sugestijom Hamleta kao Kralja igrača, koji šalje u Englesku lažnu kraljevsku naredbu, zapečaćenu očevim pečatom. Poslednja igrana slika u tragediji malo se izdvaja od onih koji su prošli pre nje. Gertruda, Klaudije i Laert su mrtvi; vreme za Hamleta ističe” (Rajter 1967: 142–147).

²⁷⁰ „Повукао се у своје одаје необично узрујан” Шекспир, *Велике шрапелује*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић 2022: 77).

of a person who is familiar with and connected to the theater, can be connected and, accordingly, reinforce each other. Everything seems to happen completely unplanned and spontaneous. His thoughts and feelings go hand in hand. From his first request for a “passionate speech,” which will be expanded by adding “a dozen or sixteen verses” to be written by the prince himself, to the story of Pyrrhus, another son who wants to avenge his dead father by killing Priam, then to the story of Hecuba, and finally to the plan to stage a play-within-a-play, *The Murder of Gonzago*. The success of the play-within-a-play is attributed to its subtle and refined function of revenge, because that is what it is, in a way. It provides the prince with the necessary evidence of the king’s guilt, which is revealed in the fact that this sequence of events, which has had an effect on his conscience, physically brings him to his knees (*Ibid.*).

The first actor provides a long monologue depicting the violent death of the elderly king Trojan, murdered by Greek warrior Furas, with the oppression of his father Achilles’ death. The prince often assumes that retaliation is right, but never condemns him. The performances of the actors of this reading make the revenge pirrus look disgusting and compassion for the dead free arm and his distracted wife Hekub. The existence of the actor pays attention to the acting theme that deals with the game and describes others. Hamlet thinks that the ghost is a demon who poses as the king of Hamlet, but Klaudius is a lowercase described as a legal king.

As the key characters engage in their roles, themes of surveillance, eavesdropping, and testing emerge. The Ghost, Claudius, Polonius, Rosencrantz, and Guildenstern spy on Hamlet, who in turn, observes them in various ways; his own complex inner nature seems to elude full understanding by himself or others. Furthermore, acting can also refer to action, not just passive thinking or storytelling, suggesting that Hamlet is torn between these two dialogical interpretations of the same concept (Watts 2002: 21). Hamlet expresses great pleasure at being asked to add lines to “The Mousetrap” to enhance its relevance to contemporary issues [...] (*Ibid.*: 24).

The motif of the fall of Troy and the ancient heroes mentioned in the play is important because of its correlation with the (sub)genre of revenge tragedy. Namely, “from *Gorboduc* onwards, revenge tragedies in England refer to the fall of Troy and, in particular, the death of Priam, as a cause for mourning. Hamlet’s contribution to this is the play he stages as a charade where the cause of his mourning must be recognized”²⁷¹ (Šofranac 2013a: 163).

Symbolizing the climax and crisis of the story, the scene of the play is a key point in Hamlet. Certain similarities can be found between the events leading up to Claudius’ crime and the play within the play, *The Murder of Gonzago*. The garden scene, the afternoon nap, the type of poison, the assassination technique, the queen’s courtship, and the usurpation of the throne are reflected in this extremely detailed and precise parallel. The story of Gonzago and what the Ghost claims coincide. The audience is unaware of the content of the interlude until the scene of the play begins. Hamlet aims to stir the king’s conscience and maintain the audience’s interest, so in order to achieve the dramatic intention, the acting must correspond to the conditions at the Danish court (Wilson 1967: 138–144). In the essay “Hamlet’s Question”, Jovan Hristić writes that Hamlet stages the play with the aim of reflecting Claudius’ soul in it. Referring to a work written by André Chastel, author of the 1961 work *Art and Humanism of Florence in the Age of Lorenzo the Magnificent*, Hristić deals with the phenomenon of the mirror. He uses it metaphorically, as a reflection of the eternal world into which the world in which we live flows. As in the literal use of the mirror, it serves to reflect an image on its surface that is sharpened and therefore better visible. For this purpose, according to him, the play will serve (Milanović 2009: 287).

Illustrating the behavior of individuals at the Danish court and depicting Elsinore as a grand theater, Shakespeare includes real actors

²⁷¹ [...], „od Gorbodaka nadalje, tragedije osвете u Engleskoj pozivaju se na pad Troje i, naročito, Prijamovu smrt, kao povod žalosti. Hamletov doprinos tome je predstava koju priređuje kao šaradu gde treba prepoznati uzrok njegove žalosti” (Šofranac 2013a: 163).

in the narrative – those whose profession is acting. [...]. At Hamlet's request, the leading actor of the troupe immediately gives an extended monologue about the fall of Troy and Queen Hecuba. The introduction of authentic actors to the court enriches the theme of acting and acting, or rather, disguise. While the actors who are members of the court try to conceal their true intentions with their masks, the actors of the troupe aim to reveal the primordial essence of the characters they play while on stage (Hristić in: *The Scene* 1967: 377–378).

In a play that gives Hamlet the task of capturing the king's conscience we see two spouses of people who conceal the truth and those who use art to expose it. Like the director it is encouraged to present their good and movements steadily by outlining the actors primary tenets prior to Hamlet's performance. This requirement is particularly related to the play's goal of revealing the king's perception and undermining the appearance of artificiality or false feelings (*Ibid.*).

The mirror is one of the most significant symbols of the Middle Ages. The role of books is to serve as a mirror, speculum, and the act of intellectual engagement represented a mirror. The mirror embodies the endless representation of knowledge and consciousness, acting as a point of convergence between the visible and invisible realms, where light permeates the dark physical existence (*Ibid.*).

The mirror that a dramatic performance should hold up, as Aristotle suggests that poetry is truer than history, is to reveal the hidden inner essence that lies beneath the facades worn by those who surround Hamlet. [...] The art of theatrical performance serves to reveal the underlying truths and hidden characteristics of the actors who wear masks that conceal their true identities. The king's response throughout the play is not about the similarities of circumstances, but about the deep connection between the identity essence of the villain depicted on stage and his identity, the one behind the mask of the benevolent uncle and the prudent state dignitary (*Ibid.*).

In the context of the court, the mirror is supposed to reveal the "innermost essence," the most hidden aspects of one's inner being, or in the spirit of our language, the depth of one's soul. The possibility of

exploring the inner self is unambiguous in drama, because it refers to the authentic self, and not to a mere appearance or representation, to an appearance, a mask. It overcomes the ambiguities and contradictions that arise when the true nature of an individual's personality is opposed to his acting (*Ibid.*). Throughout "The Mousetrap", Hamlet uses devices such as cynicism, irony, and lasciviousness in the footsteps of Othello. In this scene, Hamlet, like Othello, degrades women for whom he once had a respectful relationship. The target of his insults is Ophelia. His behavior acts as revenge or punishment directed at her. [...]. His mother, Queen Gertrude, is taken aback by his behavior, and he says that he cannot give any reasonable explanation because his spirit has been attacked by illness (Šofranac 2013a: 133)

Hamlet also knows the truth. He heard it from the Spirit, but he wants confirmation because the stakes are high. Therefore, he must be convinced that Claudius is guilty in order to have a moral alibi for the revenge that his Christian nature opposes. Therefore, he organizes a play in which professional actors, according to his instructions, will tempt the king, which would embolden Hamlet to carry out his father's order and avenge him. But he does not want it to be the revenge of a grieving son, who has gone too far in his grief and who will kill a man, driven by hatred and personal revenge. In this he differs from the dervish, who indulges his base impulses out of personal insult, out of wounded self-love, which is threatened by misfortune. No one but the two of them can do this – no one can carry out Hamlet's revenge for him, nor can anyone carry out revenge in Nuruddin's name. Revenge is their personal moral act, their moral duty. Its execution is an act of ethical determination.

Both traps, Hamlet's and Nuruddin's, carry with them a moral ambivalence regarding their justification. Both are moral idealists, so the phenomenon of revenge is not in line with their moral idealism. Nuruddin counts on Mullah-Yusuf's remorse. Hamlet counts on the same when it comes to Claudius. He uses the play as a cover for the realization of his plans, to take revenge after he is convinced of the king's guilt (in front of everyone present), and Nuruddin, with his

false mercy, of which Mullah-Yusuf was aware, which he himself confirms with the words: “[...] for I already knew everything”²⁷² (*Ibid*: 245), hides his true intentions – the need for proof of guilt that Mulla Yusuf’s behavior and physical indicators will give him so that he can, as he says, settle (*Ibid*: 240). Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin organize the “Mousetrap” with the ulterior motives – to realize their own interests. Both use these scenes as a tool to tempt their enemies to incriminate themselves and thus provide the impetus for revenge.

²⁷² „[...] јер сам већ све знао” (*Исџо*: 245)

4. SUBJECTIVITY AND IDENTITY IN HAMLET AND DEATH AND THE DERVISH

In the Larousse encyclopedia we find a definition of the term 'subjectivism' in the light of philosophy. Namely, it is:

„ – 1. philosophical doctrine according to which everything that exists is real only in function of man and the consciousness that gives him reality”²⁷³ (NOVA Larousse encyclopedia 1999: 1739).

Since we are interested in the internal processes in the protagonists, we should mention some other definitions of the term subject that are more related to psychoanalysis and psychiatry. In order to understand why subjective feeling is important in these two works, we will again refer to the aforementioned encyclopedia and the definition of the term subjective:

„ – 1. originating from a person defined as a thinking being, as opposed to objective”²⁷⁴ (*Ibid*);

Nietzsche interprets the world through the prism of philosophy and compares antiquity and modernity in such a way that he sees their opposite. He establishes this by comparing ancient and modern man. Both are in search of support, the only difference is whether that sup-

²⁷³ „ – 1. филозофска доктрина према којој је све што постоји, реално само у функцији човека и свести која му даје реалност” (НОВА Larousse енциклопедија 1999: 1739).

²⁷⁴ „ – 1. који потиче од особе дефинисане као мисаоно биће, супротно од објективан” (НОВА Larousse енциклопедија 1999: 1739);

port is within them or outside them. When it comes to ancient man, his support is not within him, but always outside him. Ancient man “[...] understood the external as the measure of the internal” (Đurić 1999: 78). This explains the role of the Olympian gods in the life of the Hellenes. He was fully aware of the dark side of human existence. He needed protection, so he sought it in the gods of Olympus, in whom he took refuge and protected himself from the monstrosity of existence and reality (Vattimo 2011: 22). Here we already find the relation of external:internal in Nietzsche, who found the concept of mask in their conflict (*Ibid.*: 15).

“Nietzsche wanted to overcome the situation created by the split between thought and being [...]. In this split he saw the deepest root of all troubles and misfortunes”²⁷⁵ (Đurić 1997: 118).

Nietzsche expresses the view that the subject is plural to itself. He formulates it in the following way: “The subject is not a simple unity like substance, but a complex multitude whose boundaries are quite uncertain”²⁷⁶ (*Ibid.*: 95). This formulation by Nietzsche is in line with the split self of the tragic hero, the one who is divided within himself, at the center of the battlefield of opposing forces. He goes a step further and says: “Man is a multitude”²⁷⁷ (*Ibid.*: 96). The explanation of this Nietzschean position is that

“[...] behind consciousness and will in every concrete individual man there is a multitude of consciousnesses and wills”²⁷⁸ (*Ibid.*: 97).

This inconsistency perfectly matches the inconsistency displayed by Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin in their oscillation between doing

²⁷⁵ „Ниче је хтео да превазиђе ситуацију створену расцепом између мишљења и бића [...]. У том расцепу је видео најдубљи корен свих невоља и недаћа” (Ђурић 1997: 118).

²⁷⁶ „Субјект није никакво просто јединство попут супстанције, већ сложено мноштво чије су границе сасвим несигурне” (*Исто*: 95).

²⁷⁷ „Човек је мноштво” (*Исто*: 96).

²⁷⁸ „[...] иза свести и воље у сваком конкретном појединачном човеку постоји мноштво свести и воља” (*Исто*: 97).

and not doing until the boundary situation and the conviction of it become temptations that will force them to react, Hamlet by the performance of his madness that he shows to the courtiers, and Ahmed Nuruddin by taking off the mask of a dervish and giving in to the hatred in which he will burn, which will be drowned by water. Literally.

Nietzsche finds

”[...] that the human self is the basic condition of thinking, that in this self the essence of things is hidden, that it is our self that is the cradle of the attitude of identity”²⁷⁹ (Đurić 1997: 79).

Both heroes subjectively react to boundary situations that represent the fact that they “[...] have truly seen to the essence of things [...]” (Nietzsche 2003: 39).

In the case of Ahmed Nuruddin, it is about the murder of his younger brother Harun by the regime to which, in a way, Nuruddin himself belongs, as the sheikh of the tekke and a member of the Mevlevi order, simply because he knew too much and thereby endangered the viability of the regime. Harun, namely, as the kadi’s scribe, saw confidential documents confirming that the defendant had pleaded guilty at the trial, although the trial had not yet taken place. He came across

“the interrogation of the guilty party, written before the man was interrogated, before he was brought to the town, before he was imprisoned [...]. They knew in advance what he would say, what he would confess, what would kill him. [...] and everything would have been as it was, if the young scribe had left that pre-prepared interrogation where he found it. And forgotten what he had seen. But did not do that”²⁸⁰ (Selimović 2018a: 104).

²⁷⁹ „[...] да је људско ја основни услов мишљења, да је у том ја скривена суштина ствари, да је то наше ја колевка става идентитета” (Ђурић 1997: 79).

²⁸⁰ „на саслушање кривца, написано прије него што је човјек саслушан, прије него што је доведен у касабу, прије него што је затворен [...]. Унапред су знали шта ће говорити, шта ће признати, шта ће га убити. [...] и све би било како је било, да је млади писар оставио то унапред припремљено саслушање ондје где га је и нашао. И заборавио што је видио. Али није” (Селимовић 2004: 100).

So, Harun was a witness to the lies that the regime uses to survive in power. He became convinced of the Machiavellian tendencies of the regime's exponents who represent and protect that regime, ensuring its continued existence in power through dishonorable means at the cost of innocent victims. Harun did not commit a crime. He was innocent. *Death and the Dervish*, among other things, is a story about the suffering of an innocent man so that the occupying power could keep its foot in a territory geographically distant from the empire, but not far enough from its dishonorable conduct.

The mufti, the musellim, and the kadi are what Claudius is in Shakespeare – power-holders who will stop at nothing to secure royal royalties for themselves. And no, they did not repent, but neither did Claudius for the murder of his brother, who, although a military leader who probably executed many enemy soldiers, in the context of the play Hamlet, in relation to Gertrude and Claudius, was also innocent. The scene in which Claudius prays and confesses his sins, conscious of his guilt, in which his prayer saves his life thanks to Hamlet's belief that if he kills him, he will not achieve what he wants – that Claudius would send him to hell, but would send him to heaven, which would not be revenge, the same scene in which he can also experience himself as a bloodthirsty hero who has been wronged, is a stage.

As are the scenes in Selimović's novel where Ahmed Nuruddin, the very wheel of power, as a religious eavesdropper, confronts the rulers whom he believed were only enforcing the law until their enforcement of the law killed his brother, which awakened in the dervish, as in Hamlet, emotions of sadness, a sense of injustice and humiliation.

These emotions are their subjective feelings, like Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia, onto whom he projected his feelings for his mother due to her free and frivolous behavior, which leads to the plot's plot and their transformation. From a humble Wittenberg student skilled in fencing, Hamlet becomes a murderer. From a humble dervish and sheikh of the tekke, Ahmed becomes an avenger and the mastermind of a conspiracy that will lead to the arrest of an innocent man. The

reason for the change is the situation they find themselves in due to the death of their loved ones, which they experience and which is tragic and morally unacceptable since it is about the suffering of an innocent man, but what both works emphasize is the protagonist's reaction to it, which is "[...] a form of subjective and to a fairly biased reaction to a tragic moral accident [...]"²⁸¹ (Milošević in: Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, trans. Simić and Pandurović, 1966: 6).

What connects these two murders, and thus the two mentioned heroes, is that they are innocent people who have suffered at the hands of criminals, whose murders provoke the duty of revenge of those closest to them by blood, the heir to the throne and his son, or brother, and the dervish. Both works deal with their subjective reaction to the crime, as well as the attitude of those in power towards it. The opinion of Gertrude, Hamlet's mother, and Claudius, the current ruler who, thanks to the crime, sat on the Danish throne, the perpetrator of the murder and the usurper of the throne, the queen's second husband. On Hamlet, on the other hand, it imposes a duty of blood revenge and calls into question the scruples, primarily Christian, according to which he had lived up to that point, especially considering his studies in Wittenberg. The obligation to carry out revenge and his aversion to it due to the Christian-founded fear of the afterlife based on committing a sin such as murder (and we will later see that the same is true when it comes to his contemplation of suicide), along with his contempt for his mother's adulterous behavior, give rise to a need for defense in Hamlet, which is why he puts on a mask of madness, which is why, many critics agree, he hesitates to fulfill his duty. "Shakespeare's hero does not undertake anything real or serious to take revenge on his father's killer [...]"²⁸² (*Ibid*: 5), says Nikola Milošević.

²⁸¹ „[...] oblik subjektivnog i u priličnoj meri pristrasnog reagovanja na jedan tragičan moralni udes [...]" (Milošević u: Šekspir, *Hamlet*, prev. Simić i Pandurović, 1966: 6).

²⁸² „Šekspirov junak ne preduzima ništa stvarno ni ozbiqno da se osveti ubici svog oca [...]" (Milošević u: Šekspir, *Hamlet*, prev. Simić i Pandurović, 1966: 5).

Nietzsche describes the lethargy felt by the heir to the throne as “[...] an ascetic disposition that denies the will [...]”²⁸³ (Nietzsche 2003: 39) in carrying out the most important task that Hamlet finds himself faced with at the request of his father’s Ghost, whom he initially doubts.

Meša Selimović gives us an insight into the consciousness of a servant of Islam, loyal beyond measure, who is a soldier of Allah, in war and in peace, who carried a knife in battle, and in peace he spreads the word of Allah and abhors corporeality. Emphasized intellectualism and refusal to participate in the reality that has been passing by him for twenty years, as it would have if he had not existed, are the main features of Ahmed Nuruddin’s character until the moment he learns of his brother’s death. The boundless and unquestioning service to faith implies restraint, an awareness of the existence of a border, which is metaphorically represented by the tekke gate, which divides his dervish imaginary from reality in many ways, one of which is particularly striking. It is the discrepancy between these two worlds according to the reactions of the people who make them up. Ordinary people in the real world are free to act, while the slaves of faith, Ahmed Nuruddin, Hafiz-Muhammad, Mullah-Yusuf and Mustafa, behind that door are only slaves of faith. There is no relationship between them, they are slaves of Islamic doctrine.

They live their service to Allah and devotion to the will of God in the field of thought, but not of action. Imbued with the Koran and their relationship with it, the dervish and the others in the tekke, we cannot say friends, because there was nothing personal between them, only common, perform magical thought figures strictly limited to the surahs and verses of *the Holy Book*, annulling themselves, completely identifying with their social roles until they completely merge with their social identity, until the moment when the answer to the question “Who is that?” becomes “Dervish Ahmed Nuruddin, sheikh of the tekke,” until instead of “who am I?” the question becomes “What am I?”, which is a metaphysical question whose depth exceeds the depth

²⁸³ „[...] asketsko raspoloženje koje poriče volju [...]” (Niče 2020: 43).

of any other metaphysical question, as Jovan Hristić notes (Milanović 2009: 292). The question of personal identity implies viewing oneself as an individual through the prism of the characteristics of one's own personality that concern only our "I." Personal identity is our private, intimate, authentic "I" (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 100), our essence, core, how we perceive ourselves. Personal identity is our originality. It is the nucleus that remains when the layers of the collective are removed, whether it is memory or belonging to a collective. Personal identity is what lies beneath the roles we play in everyday life. It is what we are independently, in ourselves, with our own being, the basis of the relationship we have established with ourselves, not as part of a particular group, community or society at any level, from the matrix of class, social affiliation, by identifying ourselves with a part of ethnicity, race, gender, sexuality, or any other category that would classify us as a group.

Personal identity is based on our "[...] private being [...]"²⁸⁴ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 100). Our personal "I" (*Ibid.*) is based on values that are inherently ours, and do not spring from collective matrices. Our emotions, affects, passions, feelings, the way we react in given situations, our intimate relationship to an event, and most often tragic events are overemphasized, cause sincere, hasty and often uncontrolled outbursts of emotion that are the subjective reactions of each of us. Examples of such situations are boundary situations. They touch us on a deeper level than the rational one because they concern our innermost being, our subjective experience and how we receive and process it on an emotional level.

"For a more complete determination of human personality, it is necessary to take into account the private, experiential domain, that is, selfhood – "the personal unity that I consider myself to be; my individual, inner being" [...] Man also has his reflective essence – Self (English Self) – that is, a sense of what kind of person he is; what he assumes to be. Person and Self are inextricably linked, because one's personal

²⁸⁴ "[...] приватно биће [...]" (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 100).

experience of existing as a person, as well as that person's experience of existing as a special, unrepeatable person with certain characteristics, are located in an embodied person. An embodied person represents the time-spatial center of the Self, that is, our understanding of ourselves"²⁸⁵ (Stojnov 1999: 142).

The fact is that we are all social beings and that we establish relationships with others on many levels, but identifying with a group or classifying ourselves in a group belongs to the sphere of our social "I". This is the sphere of our social or collective identity. Social identity defines us as a member of a group, collective or community, from our family to the club we support. Our commitment to the collective is based on sharing adopted, acquired values on the basis of which we connect with others who share the same values. In this way, we recognize ourselves on the basis of value affinity. "That part of the core structure around which there is agreement and which is experienced in a common way among the largest number of members of a social group (nation, class, culture, profession, etc.) refers to social identity"²⁸⁶ (*Ibid*: 143).

Ahmed Nuruddin is a member of the dervish order. That is his profession. He is the sheikh of a tekke. He is also a musellim. A fighter of Allah, first on the battlefield, then in the tekke. He also comes from a poor rural family to which, after the death of his brother, he feels a moral duty embodied in a biological imperative (Ivanov 2017: 384). He

²⁸⁵ „Za potpunije određenje čovečije ličnosti neophodno je uzeti u obzir i privatni, doživljajni domen, odnosno jastvenost (engl. selfhood) – „lično jedinstvo za koje Ja sebe smatram; moje pojedinačno, unutrašnje biće“ [...] Čovek ima i svoju refleksivnu suštinu – Jastvo (engl. Self) – odnosno osećaj o tome kakva je on vrsta osobe; šta on pretpostavlja da jeste. Osoba i Jastvo su neraskidivo povezani, zbog toga što su nečije lično iskustvo o tome da postoji kao osoba, kao i iskustvo te osobe da postoji kao posebna, neponovljiva osoba određenih odlika, smešteni u otelotvorenoj osobi. Otelotvorena osoba predstavlja vremensko – prostorno središte Jastva odnosno našeg poimanja sebe” (Stojnov 1999: 142).

²⁸⁶ „Onaj deo sržne strukture oko koga vlada saglasnost i koji se doživljava na zajednički način među najvećim brojem članova neke društvene grupe (nacije, klase, kulture, profesije, itd.) odnosi se na društveni identitet” (Исцо: 143).

is, of course, poor by birth. As he himself says: "It's not about wealth, I don't have it and I don't respect it much in others either"²⁸⁷ (Seli-mović 2004: 32). He is first a brother, and then the brother of a dead man. In his father's eyes, he is his former son (*Ibid*: 75) because, fed by Allah, he decided to belong to a surrogate family. He is a member of the authorities, spiritual, but still authorities. Ahmed Nuruddin is a servant sworn to loyalty to the "Islamic dogma"²⁸⁸ (Petrović 1981: 42), blinded not by the service of Allah but by the service of his own alienation through Islamic exegesis, which is his protective cocoon from the tragedy in which the world is stewing. He is a cog in the mechanism of the Order.

Ahmed Nuruddin is an orthodox believer who, for the glory of Allah, attacks the heretical enemy with a weapon between his lips. He wields a knife. He is one of many soldiers, Allah's fighters. His social identity in battle is his belonging to the regiment. Hamlet is a swordsman. Ahmed Nuruddin is also a scholar, educated to preach the will of Allah by reciting surahs from the Koran by heart even when no one is there to hear them. Hamlet is a highly educated young man studying at the University of Wittenberg with a wide range of interests, of which philosophy and art are most prominent in the play.

Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are well-educated men in high positions. Both are authorities. Both are rebels, like so many Don Quixotes before and after them, in literature and in life. They are also criminals. True, Hamlet is a murderer, unlike Nuruddin. They are failed lovers.

All of the above are answers to the question, "What are Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin?" The question, "Who are Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin?" remains unanswered.

Since the plan shifts from the question, "Who am I?" to the question, "What am I?" In the two authors, we have a clear indication that their heroes are more than "ordinary" people who contemplate

²⁸⁷ „Није у питању иметак, немам га и не поштујем га много ни код других” (Селимовић 2004: 32).

²⁸⁸ „islamističkoj dogmi” (Petrović 1981: 42).

themselves exclusively from the position of an independent being because they are fundamentally not. Both heroes, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, are more than one individual enclosed in their personal individuality. They are subjects, bearers of a public function and, accordingly, always two people, one of whom is the bearer of a social identity and the other the bearer of a private one, which is why there is an internal disagreement between the two aforementioned identities. The problem arises when social and private identities conflict within one person, within Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. The basis of this division is the lack of correspondence, "[...] the impossibility of achieving a state of absolute correspondence between being and consciousness, nature and spirit, essence and appearance"²⁸⁹ (Vattimo 2011: 13), between true consciousness, one's own attitude and what, as socially constructed subjects, the dervish and the monarch, must think.

The question, therefore, is no longer "who am I?" but "what am I?" From personality, we move on to his, or rather their, function. Ahmed Nuruddin is a religious leader, a dervish, a sheikh of the tekke, an accomplice in the exercise of power.

"What am I?" This is the question that Hamlet keeps asking himself. Am I a coward or a scoundrel? he asks in his monologue after the recitation of the First Actor and in the monologue after the passage of Fortinbras's army in the campaign against Poland. Hamlet is trying to penetrate into his nature, into his motives, he is trying to discover his essence, his daimon that is standing invisible somewhere on his back. As in a monologue about an actor, he asks himself again: what am I? [...]. In the Confessions of Augustine, we will find the same question: Augustine says: "And then I turned to myself and asked, "Who are you? – Man, I answered" (X,6). Augustine asks: tu, quis es? And then: "What then am I, Lord?" What is my nature? – Quid ergo sum, Deus meus? Quae natura sum? (X, 17). These are not the same questions. We all know who is who, and that is why Augustine answers to himself: man. The man we meet on the street, who buys a newspaper, the man who waits

²⁸⁹ „[...] nemogućnost da se postigne stanje apsolutne podudarnosti između bivstva i svesti, prirode i duha, suštine i pojave" (Vatimo 2011:13)

for someone in a bar, the one who types this text on the typewriter, the one who is the director of the theater or the ambassador. And that is why Augustine can ask himself: who am I? and to give himself the answer. But when he wants to ask what I am, he turns to God. Because man alone cannot answer that question; for himself, he can never be an object of observation and examination; only for someone who is beyond all humanity can man be such an object as to answer the question: what is he becomes possible. For himself, man is elusive, and perhaps incomprehensible”²⁹⁰ (Hristić in: *The Scene* 1967: 384–385).

The issue of blood and family loyalty is important in both writings because the disruption of family relationships is one of the central motifs in both pieces of writing that strongly affects both protagonists. Namely, the dervish separated from his primary family and severed ties with his father and brother by completely surrendering to the dervish calling. His new family were people spiritually close to him who, like him, had closed themselves off to the world of Islam in which he was the only real thought. In the first part, we see his emotional distancing towards his closest biological relatives, his father and brother, with

²⁹⁰ „Šta sam ja? To je pitanje koje Hamlet neprekidno postavlja samome sebi. Jesam li ja kukavica ili podlac? pita se u svome monologu posle recitacije Prvog glumca i u monologu posle prolaska Fortinbrasove vojske u pohodu protiv Poljske. Hamlet pokušava da pronikne u svoju prirodu, u svoje motive, pokušava da otkrije svoju suštinu, svoga daimona koji mu nevidljiv stoji negde na leđima. Kao u monologu o glumcu, on ponovo pita sebe: šta sam ja. [...]. U Ispovestima Avgustinovim naći ćemo isto pitanje: Avgustin kaže: „I tada se okretoh sebi i zapitah „Ko si ti? – Čovek, odgovorih” (X,6). Avgustin pita: tu, quis es? A zatim: „Šta sam, dakle, ja, Gospode? Šta je moja priroda? – Quid ergo sum, Deus meus? Quae natura sum? (X, 17). To nisu ista pitanja. Svi mi znamo ko je ko, i zato Avgustin sam sebi odgovara: čovek. Čovek koga srećemo na ulici, koji kupuje novine, čovek koji čeka nekoga u kafani, ovaj koji kuca na mašini ovaj tekst, onaj ko je direktor pozorišta ili ambasador. I zato Avgustin može da pita samog sebe: ko sam ja? i da samom sebi da odgovor. Ali kada želi da upita šta sam ja, on se obraća bogu. Jer na to pitanje čovek sam ne može da odgovori; za samoga sebe, on nikada ne može da bude predmet posmatranja i ispitivanja; samo za nekoga ko je izvan svake ljudskosti, čovek može biti toliko objekat da odgovori na pitanje: šta je on postaje moguć. Za samoga sebe čovek je je neuhvatljiv, a možda i neshvatljiv” (Hristić u: *Scena* 1967: 384–385).

whom he lost affective connection. However, after Harun's murder, his inner relationship towards his brother changes radically.

The scene in which Ahmed Nuruddin talks to his father is full of a feeling of emotional coldness, but also of the immediate need to break it due to his brother's misfortune. However, this does not happen. This is one of the places in the novel where it is most poignant to see how deeply Ahmed Nuruddin has become immersed in his faith, and how much he has separated himself from his family, and how much he longs for his father's closeness, so that his words hurt him in the depths of what still exists beneath the dervish robe, which is a naked man (Selimović 2018a: 20). Dervishism is an (anti) mask. A dervish is a socially constructed subject based on the identification of personal and social identity. The conflict between the letters of the Koran and the laws of Islam and the personal hurt due to the loss of his brother is what creates an internal conflict within Ahmed Nuruddin. Both works, *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, emphasize the subjectivity of the main characters and their conflicts, internal ones, within their beings, as well as their conflicts with the environment, more precisely with the rulers who have done them injustice. In *Death and the Dervish*, subjectivity is also present in the following way:

"The first person singular, subjective narration and subjectivization of the world, the transformation of the world into an experience, enhance the emotional power of individual passages. There are frequent repetitions in the function of rhythmization and lyricization, and the omission of verbs, which suggest to us that this is about conjuring up an inner state in anticipation of an event, or rather an execution. Here is a short passage that could be titled "The Last Midnight": Pasavanji somewhere in the dark announced midnight. My last midnight, the last day: with my end I will welcome its beginning. The only thing that is emotionally relatively flat is the first sentence – a report on what was heard: midnight was announced. But it triggers the narrator's subjective reaction to that objective sound, so the narrator is transformed into a lyrical subject. Everything that follows is subjective; everything is the reaction of that lyrical subject to the announcement of midnight. For him, it is the last midnight,

which made it exceptional and unique, so the attribute last is repeated with the noun day. Both ellipted sentences are reduced to an object. But these ellipted sentences, already by their syntactic connection with the previous one – in the previous one they still have the subject, predicate and adverbial clauses: Pasavandžija je sigvalj u mraku – subsequently subjectivize that previous sentence, that is, Pasavandžija's announcement of midnight. On that day, the beginning and antecedent will be the death of the speaking subject, expressed as an inevitable future by the future first and the very functional antithesis end of life – beginning of day in inversion: the end of life precedes the beginning of day. Pasavanji's announcement of midnight is, for the speaking subject, an announcement of death"²⁹¹ (Delić 2021: 31–32).

Through the plots of both works, we get to know the world through the eyes of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, the inner, subjective experience of injustice and the world that changes before their eyes, and in fact it does not change, but they change, and with it the

²⁹¹ „Прво лице јединице, субјективно приповиједање и субјективизација свијета, претварање свијета у доживљај, појачавају емотивну снагу појединих пасуса. Честа су понављања у функцији ритмизације и лиризације, па изостављања глагола која нам сугеришу да је ријеч о дочаравању унутарњег стања у ишчекивању збивања, односно погубљења. Ево кратког пасуса који би се могло насловити „Посљедња поноћ”: Пасавандџија је негдје у мраку огласио поноћ. Посљедњу моју поноћ, посљедњи дан: својим крајем дочекаћу му почетак. Једино је емотивно релативно равна прва реченица – извјештај о ономе што се чуло: оглашена је поноћ. Али она покреће субјективну реакцију приповједача на тај објективни звук, па се приповједач преображава у лирски субјекат. Све што слиједи је субјективно; све је реакција тог лирског субјекта на оглашавање поноћи. То је, за њега, посљедња поноћ, чиме је добила на изузетности и постала јединствена, па је атрибут посљедњи поновљен и уз именицу дан. Обје елиптиране реченице сведене су на објекат. Али те елиптиране реченице већ својом синтаксичком везом са претходном – у претходној су им остали и субјекат, и предикат и прилошке одредбе: Пасавандџија је огласио у мраку – накнадно субјективизују и ту претходну реченицу, односно пасавандџијино оглашавање поноћи. Том дану ће почетак и претходница бити смрт говорног субјекта, исказана као неминовна будућност футуrom првим и врло функционалном антитезом крај живота – почетак дана у инверзији: крај живота претходи почетку дана. Пасавандџијино оглашавање поноћи је, за говорног субјекта, оглашавање смрти” (Делић 2021: 31–32).

world that surrounds them. Selimović is connected to Shakespeare by the process of character building, which is

„[...] interiorization, or the emphasis on the personal experience of the events depicted, the presentation of the internal dynamics of mental processes and emotional states, the convincing expression – in speech or behavior – of the reaction to external circumstances conditioned by the individual nature of the dramatic character”²⁹² (Kostić 2010: 38–39).

Selimović's novel deals with the inner turmoil of Ahmed Nuruddin and the tectonic disturbances in the being of the protagonist Ahmed Nuruddin, which are parallel to those experienced by Shakespeare's Hamlet. For these reasons, the terms subjectivity and subject should be explained from the perspective of the sciences that deal in more detail with the analysis of a person's inner state, namely psychoanalysis and psychiatry.

In the paper “Subjectivity in Psychoanalysis and Psychiatry”, Srđa Zlopaša, provides the following definition of the term subjectivity:

“Subjectivity can have multiple meanings and represent what is: individual, unrepeatable and authentic in experience, private, personal impression, bias, one-sided judgment, inner experience, feeling that cannot be verbalized, intuitiveness, something unverifiable, immeasurable, non-existent, imagined”²⁹³ (Zlopaša 2015: 64).

Subjectivity and the subjective experience of reality, as well as the response to it, are important elements of the analysis of both characters,

²⁹² „[...] interiorizacija, odnosno naglasak na ličnom doživljavanju prikazanih zbivanja, predočavanje unutrašnje dinamike mentalnih procesa i osećajnih stanja, uverljivo iskazivanje – u govoru ili ponašanju – reagovanja na spoljašnje okolnosti uslovljenog individualnog prirodom dramskog lika” (Kostić 2010: 38–39).

²⁹³ „Subjektivnost može imati više značenja i predstavljati ono što je: individualno, neponovljivo i autentično u doživljaju, privatano, ličan utisak, pristranost, jednostran sud, unutrašnji doživljaj, osećanje koje nije moguće verbalizovati, intuitivnost, nešto neproverljivo, nemerljivo, nepostojeće, zamišljeno” (Zlopaša 2015: 64).

since in the novel we are dealing with, as in the drama, we follow the tragic stories of two characters in which their experience of the world, and the end of it, are based on subjective experience. This results in reactions that occur due to exaggerated affects that are the result of an excessively strong emotional, subjective reaction to injustice. Hamlet's reaction is feigned madness, and Ahmed's is hatred. Both are Dionysian in origin, arising from intensified affects due to facing a boundary reaction.

The inner experience is what paints the characters of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin with human colors, which humanizes them. Because of their suffering and struggle against the ruthlessness of those in positions of power, they cease to be just literary characters. Their intimate experience is the basis of the readers' identification and their reception of these two works, which thus cease to be just literary works. The difficult fates of the characters are no longer theirs alone. Every person can find themselves in them. They are no longer the heroes created by Shakespeare and Selimović. They are us.

The answer to the question, "Who are Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin?" may be sought in how they present themselves in the social environments in which they find themselves. This would mean that they are what they portray themselves to be. Hamlet is a madman. Ahmed Nuruddin is a dervish.

Although Nietzsche emphasizes the unity of the two principles from which ancient tragedy springs (Đurić in: Nietzsche 1998: 11), in *Hamlet* and the dervish, their opposition is emphasized, the contradiction of the two elements that are at the heart of the mask, the Apollonian and the Dionysian, as well as the points at which their change occurs within the subjects in light of the ethical dimension of Nietzsche's phenomenon of masking (disguise). "Ethical aspects refer to practices of hiding and pretending in a social context, motivated by the need for protection, or rather distinction"²⁹⁴ (Vattimo 2011: 19).

²⁹⁴ „Etički aspekti odnose se na prakse skrivanja i pretvaranja u socijalnom kontekstu, motivisane potrebama za zaštitom, odnosno razlikovanjem” (Vattimo 2011: 19).

Hamlet is afraid of possible divine punishment after death if he kills Claudius and thereby violates God's commandment, and at the same time, he is pressed by the duty to avenge his father. Ahmed Nuruddin is bound by the rigid mold of Islamic doctrine, and pressed by the duty to avenge his brother. The voices of religion and externally imposed duty are in conflict with the personalities of Hamlet and Ahmed, but they will, nevertheless, put on and/or take off their masks and take revenge. The gap between our own "I" and the voice of external authority within us is what this work will deal with. It is the conflict between our own and the collective, socially rooted consciousness through religion and morality within us, which both heroes become aware of when they "[...] have truly seen to the essence of things [...]"²⁹⁵ (Nietzsche 2003: 39).

For Ahmed Nuruddin, the mask provides protection from the world and its challenges, sensual and terrible, so that he does not have to participate in life, but is withdrawn, at a safe distance from what is really happening in a world that is in no way connected to the world of the tekke. The tekke is a boundary. Not only physical, but also mental, emotional and spiritual, a point where reality has no reach. But also a point of intersection between Ahmed Nuruddin – the man and Ahmed Nuruddin – the dervish. It allows both to be spared from reality, thereby providing protection. But it is artificial. The problem with artificial protection is not so much that it is artificial, but that it is not real.

Dervishism, the (anti)Apollonian (anti)mask, is the foundation of Ahmed's identity as the sheikh of the tekke. He deeply believes that it provides him with protection by clearly distinguishing him from the village headman as a religious leader who, due to the social prestige he believes he enjoys, is singled out on a pedestal of the hierarchical ladder. However, he will be bitterly disappointed when he learns that this is only a deception and that, when he has not performed his human and fraternal duty, he has become invisible in the eyes of people. Therefore,

²⁹⁵ "[...] bacili pronikljivi pogled u suštinu stvari [...]" (Niče 2020: 43).

his mask is socially constructed, because it is not based in himself, but in his actions that are valued or not by the community.

The purposes of the mask, protection (Vattimo 2011: 22) and distinction (Klass, T. N. Von Peitschen und Masken in: Radojčić 2017: 83), are the goal with which Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin mask themselves. Since reality defeats them by being steeped in crime, lawlessness, moral decadence and the collapse of all the lofty values they were taught either through Wittenberg studies or “the Islamist dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42), Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin must find a way to fulfill their duty in the new circumstances that have arisen for them, after having “[...] truly seen to the essence of things [...]”²⁹⁶ (Nietzsche 2003: 39). Therefore, Hamlet puts on a mask, and Ahmed takes it off and gives himself up to hatred, the flames of which will burn him.

Nietzsche gives the concept of “[...] a mask that has a single expression, in lies and disguise”²⁹⁷ (Vattimo 2011: 45). In both cases, it is an illusion, and we connect illusion to the Apollonian world of illusion, which is the Islamist doctrine in the mind of the sheikh of the Mevlevi tekke, Ahmed Nuruddin. The connection between illusion and mask is rooted in illusion, in what only appears to be, but with the death of his brother it is revealed that it was actually just a building on the sand (Milošević 1978: 175). This is the moment when his metamorphosis begins.

He could have continued living his peaceful dervish life devoid of anything personal, in which the only emotion that exists is love for Islam and Allah, but, now that he has realized that he has been living a lie, he has decided to stop living the passive life of a religious scholar, a servant of God, and to avenge his brother.

In doing so, he turns against the authority, which he believed to act in accordance with the law, to which, as a religious leader, he himself belonged. He decides to betray what he has invested his entire previous

²⁹⁶ „[...] bacili pronikljivi pogled u suštinu stvari [...]” (Niče 2020: 43).

²⁹⁷ „[...] maske koja ima jedan jedini izraz, u laži i prerušavanju” (Vattimo 2011: 45).

life in and to become someone else. He is no longer a dervish. Dervishism was imposed on him, he chose hatred himself. The subversive Ahmed, Nuruddin avenger, is born in him. The metamorphosis shows that dervishism is a mask, a disguise that was intended to protect Ahmed from life and to give him a social position that he did not acquire by birth, believing that this position deserves the respect of people.

If he had calmly accepted his brother's death and continued to be the sheikh of the tekke, accepting what he himself had said, that death was no reason for discouragement, then dervishism would truly be his self, his personal identity. In that case, there would be a unity between man and dervish. The dervish's turn to hatred shows that loyalty to Islam collapsed like a house built on sand (Milošević 1978: 175) during the first strong wave, only because that wave washed it over. While others were drowning in the sea, the dervish watched it calmly. In his mind, indoctrinated with "Islamic dogma"²⁹⁸ (Petrović 1981: 42), the law and the Koran are two sides of the same coin with which human will has nothing to do, even if it is the will of the ruler. According to Nuruddin, life and death are in the jurisdiction of Allah. "Is it hypocrisy or blindness"²⁹⁹ (Selimović 2018a: 104)? In reality, they are under the jurisdiction of the musellim or the kadi or, in the case of Hamlet, Claudius.

In *Death and the Dervish*, therefore, Ahmed's transformation from a man absolutely devoted to his faith into a man who hates, despises, plots, and frames innocent people for his own interests, thereby identifying himself with those he blamed for his brother's death, who are both guilty and responsible for it, draws a distinction between what only appears to be, the peaceful dervish self-isolation and the replacement of one reality with another, the real one, which actually happens with the false one that exists within Ahmed's "thought-frames"³⁰⁰ (Egerić 1982: 20), which is a mask, and what is the true face of Ahmed Nuruddin, which is shown after the dervish

²⁹⁸ „Islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

²⁹⁹ „Je ли то лицемерје или сљепило” (Селимовић 2004: 100)?

³⁰⁰ „[...] misli-ramovi [...]” (Egerić 1982: 20).

mask is removed, which is an illusion, pretense, deception, delusion, deception, reverse.

At the moment of the scene with the mufti, Nuruddin thinks that Harun is alive, but in reality he is not. Nuruddin, like his brother, is just a pawn in a chess game in which human life is at stake. Reality is a game of power in which “little” people are actors, puppets who see only the scene that is currently happening, but do not understand the whole play. Individual scenes are plays – within – plays. In some of them, the puppets are masked, as is the case with Hamlet’s madness and Nuruddin’s dervishism.

Hamlet’s disgust with the world he is surrounded by and the people in it communicates with the novel *Death and the Dervish* because Ahmed Nuruddin goes through the same process as Hamlet, the process of gaining insight into the true, dark side of reality. They [...] have truly seen to the essence of things [...]”³⁰¹ (Nietzsche 2003: 39). Thus, both of them are faced with ugly, unpainted, unadorned realities, which Hamlet despises in a woman’s face because it hides his nature, like a mask, similar to his mask of madness that hides his intentions of unmasking the usurper king and revealing the truth about his father’s death, which will allow him to make the right move and thus save himself from sin.

Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin hide behind their masks from the disgust that overwhelms them as soon as they think of the real world. As long as they are masked, they are protected, Hamlet by his madness, and Ahmed Nuruddin by his dervishness. „But as soon as everyday reality penetrates consciousness again, as such it causes a feeling of disgust [...]”³⁰² (*Ibid*). Hamlet puts on the mask of madness in order to learn to navigate in a world he has not known before. His madness is his Dionysian mask, just as Ahmed’s Dionysian mask is hatred because it contains a Dionysian excess, as in Hamlet’s madness.

³⁰¹ „[...] bacili pronikljivi pogled u suštinu stvari [...]” (Niče 2020: 43).

³⁰² „Али чим свакидашња стварност поново продре у свест, као таква изазива осећај гађења [...]” (*Истио*).

It is hatred as an intensified affect directed against the musellim as a decision-maker. Just as Hamlet's madness is a concrete weight that keeps him anchored in a restless sea of courtly and interpersonal intrigues that he could not even suspect, so Ahmed's hatred is in the second part of the novel. In the first part it was dervishism.

"Ahmed Nuruddin is the expression of a doctrine. Nuruddin's individuality is, therefore, mediated. Nuruddin's conviction that he is the light of faith indicates the depth of submission"³⁰³ (Petrović 1981: 46).

In both literary pieces, *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, the main characters go through a process of transformation due to a tragic event that unexpectedly happened to them. Death is a boundary situation. The foundation of the metamorphosis of the beings of Hamlet and Ahmed Nurdin are the situations in which their loved ones find themselves, which strongly shake the two protagonists and change their way of perceiving the world. "Shakespeare in Hamlet's monologues, like Montaigne in the *Essays*, depicts the flow, the transition of beings from one state to another, the contradictory, decentered and polycentric subjectivity, its instability and changeability"³⁰⁴ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 92). These events confront them with the illusions and apparitions in which their spirit had previously resided. Blind to reality and the cruelties that it and its agents employ, the two heroes each lived their own illusion. Both were thrown into it without prior preparation, unexpectedly, and the shock that these situations produced on their unprepared minds was all the stronger.

In the case of Ahmed Nuruddin, it is about the arrest of his own brother, who, at the moment when Ahmed tries to ask about him,

³⁰³ „Ahmed Nurudin je izraz jedne doktrine. Nuruddinov individualitet je, dakle posredovan. Nurudinovo ubeđenje da je on svetlo vere ukazuje na dubinu potčinjavanja” (Petrović 1981: 46).

³⁰⁴ „Шекспир у Хамлетовим монолозима, као и Монтењ у *Опегима*, приказује ток, прелаз бића из једног стања у друго, противречну, децентрирану и полицентричну субјективност, њену непостојаност и променљивост” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 92).

has already been killed. The knowledge that Harun is no longer alive forces the dervish to take off the mask of the dervish's social function that has grown into his face. The truth about the death of his brother, who suffered because he knew what he shouldn't, which the authorities she did not want to know, it removed the veil of the Koran and the holy words from Ahmed Nuruddin's eyes, forced him to truly look within himself, to deeply examine his scruples and, instead of the endless contemplation to which he, as a dervish, was prone, to turn to action. The trouble is that this action was motivated by hatred, to which he turned when everything he had believed in until then had lost its meaning.

The soothing words he had spoken to those who had lost loved ones suddenly became – just words. He no longer found solace in them, nor did he see death as merely a transition from one form to another. Without a solid foundation and without an anchor that would pull him to the surface of the water, the dervish went astray. Just as Athena was born from the head of Zeus, we can freely say that the awareness of Harun's murder gave birth to Ahmed Nuruddin, a brother, a son, and a man. This was the decisive moment in which the dervish renounced the constraints of canon and dogma and acted as a human being primordially shaken by a family tragedy. "The realization that his brother was killed because he had mistakenly discovered a staged trial and the confession of an accused "political" prisoner was the defining moment of his life"³⁰⁵ (Andrejević 1996: 59), his acquisition of Dionysian insight (Milić 2000: 135). The way the dervish reacted to the news of Harun's death, for which the repressive, rebellious state apparatus was responsible, revealed how ostracized he had been up until that moment. Ahmed Nuruddin was defeated by the world outside the tekke. A world he did not know existed, in which the values he thought ruled in it were trampled. He did not know how to position himself, how to fight against that world. "Nuruddin

³⁰⁵ „Сазнање да је брта убијен зато што је грешком откриоу унапред режирано суђење и признање оптуженог "политичког" затвореника пре-судан је час његових мена" (Андрејевић 1996: 59).

was convinced that he lived in a world of pure and great moral order [...]”³⁰⁶ (Skakić 1976: 51).

Being alone with himself, with people equally indoctrinated with dogma, in the tekke, given over to endless introspection and the constant repetition of learned prayers and lines of the Koran in which he lived, he increasingly withdrew into silence and peace, because reality is merciless, unfair, it is impossible to parry it, one can only escape from it. But the death of his brother changes that. “All the elementary truths in Ahmed Nuruddin’s life experience a transformation, placed in the space of his suffering because of the evil he has done [...]”³⁰⁷ (Andrejević 1996: 64). His brother is killed. Sheikh Nuruddin is personally affected.

For the first time, he becomes aware that his social function does not secure him any respect, even from the most insignificant representatives of the authorities. He is personally affected by the treatment that everyone else, the rest, receives from those in power. Completely devoted to his faith, the dervish learned to count on the due respect being shown to him, the sheikh of the Mevlevi tekke, a member of the Mevlevi dervish order, however, he understood all the arrogance of the highest circles of power which would be fertile ground for the poisonous seed that would later make him become the same as those who had despised him when it was most difficult for him – when he lost his brother, and, even more so, when he came – to ask.

The act of humanity, asking for his brother who, at that moment, he thinks is arrested and imprisoned in a fortress, the dervish confuses with an act of humility. He, the dervish, is forced to beg the ruthless and

³⁰⁶ „Сазнање да је брат убијен зато што је грешком открио унапред режирано суђење и признање оптуженог „политичког” затвореника, пресудан је час његових мена” (Андрејевић 1996: 59).

„Nuruddin je ubijeden da živi u svijetu čistog i velikog moralnog reda [...]” (Skakić 1976: 51).

³⁰⁷ „Све елементарне истине у животу Ахмеда Нурудина доживљавају трансформацију, смештене у простор његове патње због учињеног зла [...]” (Andrejević 1996: 64).

arrogant rulers who humiliate him with his weapon – words, lazily and disinterestedly, almost ignoring him, with a sting that released poison at the point where the brother ends and the dervish begins. At that moment, the world in which he lived with the mask behind which he hid and the real world that had been waiting for him outside all along split in two. It is the moment when the seeds of his change are sown.

Throughout the novel, the main character's inner struggle between what he is and what he has become unfolds. His original being rebels and overcomes the dervish in him, horrified by the horror that has befallen him. He must choose between the impulses of his injured brother and what is implied and expected of a dervish. The sheikh is torn between himself and the mask.

The hero of the play *Hamlet* faces a family tragedy. At the beginning of the play, we learn that the prince Hamlet has seen the Ghost of his father, who informs him that he has been killed and that he has been poisoned by his brother, young Hamlet's uncle, Claudius, who later married the widowed queen, Gertrude, and ascended to the Danish throne. This knowledge shakes the prince to his core, who adores his father, and accepts the Ghost's proposal to avenge him but spare the queen. The death of the old king marks the end of life as the prince has known it up to that point. The murder of his father represents the gap between Hamlet's youthful carefreeness and the poison of the courtly world, metaphorical and literal, the one hidden in the bottle in Claudius's hand that ended Hamlet's father's life. The Prince is a strongly philosophically inclined hero, who spends most of his time in contemplation, turned towards himself, and existential questions.

It is clear that Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are tragic heroes based on two demands that exclude each other and which are so contradictory to each other that they cannot be reconciled in one being. Because of this conflict, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are constantly between two extremes, between what they are and what circumstances dictate to them. "Ethical issues inherent in tragedy and the 'private being' of the tragic hero in Shakespeare's tragedies are intertwined

with political examination of the nature of power in the community”³⁰⁸ (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 100).

Finally, and against oneself in the name of one’s own ethical affirmation in relation to the State, its representatives, and the state administration. As for the novel *Death and the Dervish*, in the “[...] Ottoman Empire, the management of religious affairs [...] was institutionalized as a hierarchical segment of the state administration”³⁰⁹ (Tanasković 2018: 276). Therefore, we can and must view Ahmed Nuruddin as a member of the power system.

That is why making a decision is so difficult. Because no matter what they choose, they betray something. Should they betray themselves or their principles, their honor? And what if we perceive honor as the backbone of our identity? And what if we are ruins without it? And, again, human principles and the biological imperative (Ivanov 2017: 384) dictate revenge on those who are our blood. In the case of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, this means revenge. And it implies rebellion. Rebellion in itself means subversion against the system and its centers of power – Claudius, the kadi, and the musellim in the first place.

Both societies, the one depicted in the novel *Death and the Dervish*, and the one depicted in *Hamlet* through the highest instances of power, such as the court, and through the individuals who personify the ruling order with their personalities, are societies in which ideology is one of the supporting pillars, and in which dogma is a powerful instrument of control. Disobedience in such societies is severely punished, and the government calls its repressive punitive methods and actions a threat to the order, dogma. In such societies in which traditional cultural matrices are strong, such as those that

³⁰⁸ „Етичка питања својствена трагедији и ’приватном бићу’ трагичког јунака у Шекспировим трагедијама преплетена су с политичким испитивањем природе моћи у друштвеној заједници” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 100).

³⁰⁹ у „[...] Османском царству, управљање верским пословима [...] било је институционализовано као хијерархизовани сегмент државне администрације” (Танасковић 2018: 276).

are the bearers of dogma – the church and the court, „[...] the offense against dogma is the gravest sin in a society that is ideologically marked”³¹⁰ (Dedović 2012).

Ideological concern is present in both works through the prism of the protagonist’s orientation to religious doctrines. In Nuruddin’s case, it is Islamic religious doctrine, and in Hamlet’s case, it is Christian. Being bound to politics and religion and the constraints they necessarily impose, their opinion is not theirs. It is metaphysical in nature and deeply folk in the sphere of transcendental, abstract values that are of general, universal meaning, which is why they overshadow the human and individual. Over – “I” takes precedence over “I”. Man ceases to be a man, he becomes an instrument through which the aforementioned concepts manifest (Prohić 1972: 75). In addition, both are ideologically determined characters. They are a monarch and a dervish, bearers of spiritual and worldly power. The two of them are at least their own “private Being” (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 100).

The tragedy of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin is reflected in their division. Similar to Hamlet, a comprehensive understanding of Ahmed Nuruddin’s character requires examining both aspects of his behavior – his proactive measures and moments of restraint. Furthermore, his actions and inactions can be viewed from two different perspectives (Petrović 1981: 11–12). The difference is that Nuruddin’s death is absolutely tragic, while Hamlet’s is not, because Hamlet has previously proven that he does not kill Claudius out of blind hatred, to make up for the loss of his father, but rather to free the country from usurpers and criminals. This is the act of a dignified ruler, not a grieving son. At the same time, the subject thus prevails over the man. Nuruddin dies eager for life. It seems that it is not so much the dervish who dies as the man in him.

The goal of the spiritually awakened individual – spiritual in the context of religion, as Nuruddin is – is not to establish connections

³¹⁰ „[...] ogriješenje o dogmu što je najteži grijeh u društvu koje je ideološki markirano” (Dedović 2012).

with those beyond the metaphorical barrier of the tekke threshold. Rather, the goal is to withdraw as deeply as possible from the world on the other side of it. The devout person seeks self-realization in order to reach the highest level of perfection, which can only be achieved through complete separation and solitude. However, as the spiritual individual becomes more focused on his spirituality as a concept, he becomes less defined by his personal identity. The ultimate realization of the spiritual ideal is equated with the dissolution of one's individual personality. To approach one's true self is to approach the divine, which requires the rejection of the shortcomings inherent in human nature until it is completely eradicated (Petrović 1981: 13).

On the other hand, this man died before the beginning of the novel, when, having lost his love and the woman he loved, he retreats from the world to a tekke. Drowning is only the dying of the body. The spirit died before the beginning of the novel, and once again, during the novel itself, when Nuruddin was overcome by hatred. The dervish and the kadi were only masks with which he defended himself from the world. Hamlet, with his mask of madness, faced the world.

„[...] the phenomenon of the political is understood as the very reality of events, the course of life, an elementary social relationship. The political is [...] directly experienced as an act or a decision to act. It has permeated the entirety of being, and is therefore understood as the normal order of things, even when that order is completely morally disturbed. To live in the world means to exist as a political existence”³¹¹ (Prohić 1972: 74).

Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin faced this. Their opponents, the system against which they rebelled, are an ugly reality before which it is necessary to put on or take off a mask in order to take revenge.

³¹¹ „[...] fenomen političkog je shvaćen kao sama realnost zbivanja, životni tok, elementarni društveni odnos. Političko se [...] neposredno živi kao čin ili odluka da se čini. Ono je proželo cjelinu bivstvovanja, pa se zato shvata kao normalan poredak stvari, čak i kada je taj red moralno potpuno poremećen. Živjeti u svetu znači bivstvovati kao politička egzistencija” (Prohić 1972: 74).

However, the motives from which Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin carry out revenge are completely different. For Hamlet, revenge is a matter of honor, and not so much his honor as a man, or even a son, as his honor as a ruler. And for Nuruddin, revenge is an act that embodies the motto “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth”. That is why the two of them are (not) the tragic heroes of the tragedy of revenge.

Both works end with death, which is an element of tragedy. However, we have found the source of tragedy in their internal division, which is the basic characteristic of the Nietzsche’s subject (Đurić 1997: 97). The awareness of the ugliness of reality that Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin acquire is embodied in the Nietzsche’s phenomenon of the mask, its removal and putting on, masking and unmasking, which is the response of the two protagonists to reality. In this reality, *the Grand Mechanism* (Kott 1990: 52) of horror mercilessly grinds innocent people: Harun, King Hamlet, Hadji-Sinanuddin, Ophelia, Polonius, Hassan.

Unlike Hamlet, who, according to Nietzsche, being Dionysiac man, is decisively defined by lethargy and disgust (Nietzsche 2003: 39), as well as simulating madness, Ahmed Nuruddin has hatred that escalates after learning about his brother’s death.

Negative feelings of hatred, anger, sadness, and apathy appear in the two protagonists after acquiring tragic knowledge (Jaspers in: Stojanović 1984: 234). Ahmed Nuruddin acquires this knowledge through the murder of his brother, and Hamlet through the murder of his father, which he will only later learn is a murder that he must avenge. In the play *Hamlet*, however, as in the novel *Death and the Dervish*, it is not just about knowledge, but about a specific type of knowledge that entails the acquisition of Dionysian insight (Milić 2000: 135). After he gains the aforementioned insight, and despite the request of the Ghost of his deceased father to avenge him, what follows and constitutes one of the focal points of the play is Hamlet’s hesitation in acting, accompanied by exceptional thoughtfulness and endless analysis.

Ahmed Nuruddin’s rage in the second part of the novel has one target: the musellim, the exponent of power and the cog in its repres-

sive system. What is similar in Hamlet's disgusting attitude towards his mother and Ophelia, and then towards everyone else, and in Ahmed's attitude towards the musellim, which is the attitude of hatred of man towards his function, is personal insult. Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are personally offended by the injustice inflicted on them, Hamlet by the behavior of Ophelia, who rejects him, and his mother, who is too lustful for his idealistic measure of good taste, and Ahmed Nuruddin by the musellim's disrespect for him and the evil he has hidden from him.

This sublimation of Hamlet's madness could also be attributed to the hatred that awakens in Ahmed Nuruddin after the murder of his brother. It also represents a Dionysian state, but not as strong as Hamlet's false madness. Hamlet has madness, it has him. Nuruddin has also hatred. The meaning is now surrender to destructive impulses that allows evil to triumph.

They are increasingly tied to the world of their dead. Neither Hamlet nor Ahmed Nuruddin can separate themselves from that world. Hamlet is tied to the world of the dead by the Ghost of his murdered father, whom he meets one night on the ramparts of Elsinore castle. Ahmed's connection with the world of the dead is visible in the scenes of the novel in which he goes to look for Harun's bones in order to bury him as close as possible to the tekke, and thus to himself, to remind him that Harun stood up against injustice, but also in all the scenes in which he addresses his dead brother, who is more alive to him after death than while he was actually alive. The influence of the dead brother and the dead father is too great and too deeply rooted in the two heroes.

Therefore, neither one nor the other can separate themselves from the otherworld, because the threads that connect them to that world are too strong, they influence their perception of the world too much and radically change their previous understanding of life. His brother has become a symbol of struggle for Nuruddin. He feels obliged to continue this struggle, just as Hamlet feels obliged to obey the Spirit, but he still does not do so until the end of the play. Hamlet is calculating because of his godliness. He doubts. Ahmed does not

doubt. Hamlet is not yet ready for everything. He needs proof that the spirit is telling the truth. Ahmed was not ready for everything while he was protected by the (anti)Apollonian mask of dervishism. Ahmed is now ready for everything.

Dionysian horror is revealed in the moral fall of Ahmed Nuruddin, a former moral idealist, at the Olympic heights of Islamic exegesis, who organizes a plot for the Hadji-Sinanuddin, which leads to his arrest, to the imprisonment of an innocent man, like Harun was, like King Hamlet, after all. This plot of his can be compared to Hamlet's "mousetrap". Both the intentions of the two protagonists are realized in such a way that both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin had ulterior motives – the realization of their own interests. In doing so, they came very close to the Machiavellian limit of utilitarianism, which was crossed by those against whom the plots were aimed – the rulers in the *Hamlet* and in the *Death and the Dervish*.

Staying aloof and living in environments where reality did not actually happen, where thought was the only event, such as the dervish tekke and the university, is no longer an option for either Ahmed Nuruddin or Hamlet. Ahmed Nuruddin has the same problem, who does nothing when he should do everything. They must therefore determine themselves ethically.

Both hatred and madness have their roots in overemphasized affects, in exaggerated, explosive reactions, which is the basis of the Dionysian mask according to Nietzsche. But since Ahmed's hatred is not a mask, but his real reaction, we can say that the intensification of the affects is the Dionysian element of his hatred. Ahmed's hatred is real, Hamlet's madness is false. "[...] he feigns madness (although, sometimes this mask of "freak" merges with the one who wears it [...])"³¹² (Šofranac 2013b: 102).

In Ahmed Nuruddin, we have a gradual increase in emotions throughout the novel. At the very beginning, he is calm in the tekke,

³¹² „[...] on glumi ludilo (mada, ponekad se ta maska „čudaka" stapa sa onim ko je nosi) [...]" (Šofranac 2013b: 102).

within the claustrophobic molds of Islamic exegesis, his life is in accordance with the Koran, his personal identity coincides with his socially constructed identity. Dervish, functionally associated with the religious side of his consciousness, supports and respects the image of self-assessment. Since the Koran is this consciousness and its foundation, we must distinguish the Koran as the basis of this consciousness and consciousness itself. In order to achieve inner harmony, one must eliminate any discord between the external world and one's consciousness, even going so far as to merge the two. This represents the religious and metaphysical dilemma faced by Ahmed Nuruddin (Petrović 1981: 10).

Nuruddin does not understand his subordination and lack of freedom. He chooses to be a slave to Islam. Ahmed's perspective is changed by the situation of his brother's murder. Nuruddin no longer experiences death as a concept; which it had been for him until then. The concept of death has transformed from a universal concept that affects everyone into a personal possibility that affects him specifically. For the first time, he thinks about the terror associated with dying. The dervish's illusion is revealed as an instinctive understanding of the reality that lies behind the barrier represented by the tekke wall (*Ibid.*: 14).

The difference between Nietzsche's understanding of the Apollonian illusion and Ahmed's service to Islam as the illusion of life is that Nietzsche's understanding of the Apollonian illusion implies awareness of the illusion, and Ahmed does not have this awareness. Until his encounter with the musellim in the first part of the novel, he lacks the "[...] Apollonian element, by which Hellenic consciousness rises to self-consciousness"³¹³ (Đurić in: Nietzsche 1998: 14), that is, the insight that he attached greater value to his dervishism and dervish act than his calling really carries. He really believes in dogma, only and exclusively in dogma, to the very limits of his subordinate

³¹³ „[...] apolonski elemenat, kojim se helenska svest uzdiže do samosvesti” (Đurić u: Niče 1998: 14).

consciousness until that encounter, and after that he begins to doubt everything he believed in.

In Ahmed Nuruddin, we have a gradual increase in emotions throughout the novel. At the very beginning, he is calm in the tekke, within the claustrophobic molds of Islamic exegesis, his life is in accordance with the *Koran*, his personal identity coincides with his socially constructed identity. In order to achieve inner harmony, one must eliminate any discord between the external world and one's consciousness, even going so far as to merge the two. This represents the religious and metaphysical dilemma faced by Ahmed Nuruddin (Petrović 1981: 10).

Nuruddin does not understand his subordination and lack of freedom. He chooses to be a slave to Islam. Ahmed's perspective is changed by the situation of his brother's murder. Nuruddin no longer experiences death as a concept; which it had been for him until then. The concept of death has transformed from a universal concept that affects everyone into a personal possibility that affects him specifically. For the first time, he thinks about the terror associated with dying. The dervish's illusion is revealed as an instinctive understanding of the reality that lies behind the barrier represented by the tekke wall (*Ibid*: 14).

The difference between Nietzsche's understanding of the Apollonian illusion and Ahmed's service to Islam as the illusion of life is that Nietzsche's understanding of the Apollonian illusion implies awareness of the illusion, and Ahmed does not have this awareness. Until his encounter with the musellim in the first part of the novel, he lacks the insight that he attached greater value to his dervishism and dervish act than his calling really carries. He truly believes in dogma, only and only in dogma, to the very limits of his subordinate consciousness until that encounter, and after that he begins to doubt everything he believed in.

Ahmed dies morally equal to those against whose moral inadequacy he rebelled, becoming a slave to the acquisition of Dionysian insight (Milić 2000: 135). Ahmed was born a slave, since he belongs

to a low social class, that of the poor. He lived as a slave to faith, fighting and obeying the letter of the *Koran*, living in accordance with its principles, respecting the “Islamist dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42) to the point of fanaticism, then turning against it. As a judge, he betrayed the only light he had gained in life, the light of love and loyalty to another man, whom he had betrayed. Ahmed, called Judas. Dominated by the Dionysian principle of destructive hatred, he dies as a slave to Dionysus who was born in his grief, strengthened in his anger, and exploded in his hatred.

In Selimović’s novel, Ahmed Nuruddin is, therefore, torn between his original being, his social function as a dervish, which is his Apollonian (anti)mask, and between the Dionysian elements within himself, lethargy, indecision, hesitation in situations in which he should be at most human and help his brother, and the hatred after Harun’s death that has completely consumed him.

Hatred is Ahmed’s excess. The difference from Hamlet is that Nuruddin does act out of hatred. In him, hatred erases the boundary, and thus the Apollonian mask falls from his face. He is divided not only between his original and socially constructed identity, but also between his former self, the previous version of himself, and his current self. Moreover, somewhere between these two versions of his personality is his personality as a judge, which is also a socially constructed identity, because it is a public one.

So, there is Ahmed as an original being, a member of a lower social class, the son and grieving brother of the innocently murdered Harun, then Ahmed, the dervish, then Ahmed the judge, and, finally, Ahmed, the avenger. Not counting Ahmed the drowned man. In Ahmed Nuruddin’s first part of the novel, the Apollonian principle in the form of dervishness is dominant, which limits his action and generates his lethargy, which is a characteristic of the Dionysian man (Nietzsche 2003: 39) according to Nietzsche, hesitation and uncertainty when acting, while in the second part, Dionysiac principle in the form of hatred as an intensified affect is dominant.

One gets the impression that Hamlet fought for life in death, and Ahmed for death in life. The irony is that Hamlet thought about death, and Ahmed about life. Therefore – to be (split in two). Therefore – not to be. Multiplicity. Duality. Nietzsche denies the existence of internal unity in the subject. Their tragedy lies in their internal division as Nietzsche's subjects (Đurić 1997: 97). Nietzsche's subject is decentered, which means that it has no foothold in itself. Foothold is the most important characteristic of human wholeness. Hamlet's and Nuruddin's foothold is fluid. These are madness and dervishness. Neither of these footholds is permanent. Both are illusions.

Hamlet is a victim. He has experienced injustice, his rights as a human being, heir to the throne, man, son have been violated. He has all the rights, what's more, his duty is to preserve honor, fulfill the task given to him by his father's Spirit, to avenge him. The tyrant who has seized the throne knows that Hamlet, as the one who should be the next legitimate ruler, has the support of the people. But Hamlet does not take revenge for a long time. The reasons for his hesitation are one of the most intriguing not only of Shakespearean scholars around the world but also of critics, professors of English literature, theorists and, of course, readers. Inactivity by nature, an emphasis on thought processes, giving priority to the intellect rather than the practical, active side of the personality that achieves goals, madness, melancholy, all these are possible causes of his passivity.

What distinguishes Meša Selimović and Shakespeare in these two pieces of writings is the motivation of their heroes to carry out revenge, which threatens their death, and thus their lives.

Compared to Ahmed Nuruddin, Hamlet might be regarded as a hero. This only reinforces the fact that Ahmed Nuruddin, compared to Hamlet, is an anti-hero. For, he becomes an authority, not only in his actions but also by the title of kadi, which, just as legitimately acquired authority in Renaissance England gives the ruler the right to punish, so he acquires this right. His appointment as kadi is an attempt by the authorities, the dominant discourse, to suppress his subversive actions. Ahmed Nuruddin took the bait and resorted to a

Machiavellian approach, for which he paid with death. But not just by death, but by a tragic death that is the end of the tragic life of a dervish, a sheikh of the tekke, who failed to be a son, a brother and a lover, but did not fail to be an enemy, an exponent of power, a drummer of empty words, a passive observer of circumstances until adversity forced him against the wall of the tekke, where the dead Harun awaited him, and with him a moral debt to his own blood, a connection to the world of Hades, from whose darkness the Ghost of King Hamlet rose, burdening his son with the moral duty of revenge. Although Hamlet's (in)action was initially directed at himself, his own feeling of sadness and the multiple injuries inflicted on him by Claudius, Hamlet from the beginning and the end of the play are two different people, just like Ahmed Nuruddin. Hamlet realizes and comes to terms with the fact that it is not about his personal salvation, but about the collective, common salvation of the community, the state, which will also bring him peace. He realizes the truth that without the common, there can be no individual salvation. This insight frees him, despite the fact that he pays for it with his own sacrifice.

5. HAMLET AND AHMED NURUDDIN: THE TRAGIC HERO AND HIS SELF

In her book *In Search of Shakespeare*³¹⁴ Zorica Bećanović-Nikolić explains the concept of the tragic hero as a complex self with extremely polarized contradictions within himself (Bećanović-Nikolić 2013: 90). She claims that

“tragic heroes have a very complex identity, which Shakespeare expresses through the monologues and actions of his heroes. Their self is, in itself, most often contradictory, and each of the contradictions is taken to the extreme: let’s think of Hamlet, who strongly feels that he must avenge his father, and that, for a variety of reasons, he cannot do so until, paradoxically, Claudius, as the main active figure of the drama, unlike the inactive Hamlet, allows him to act; [...]”³¹⁵ (*Ibid*: 90).

Hamlet is thirty years old, inclined to contemplation, a passive hero who transforms into his opposite, his Shadow, an avenger-actor. The Ghost is an important factor in the play because it is he who visits Hamlet and reveals the truth that his brother, Hamlet’s uncle,

³¹⁴ Зорица Бечановић-Николић, *У потрази за Шекспиром*, 2013, Досије студио, Београд.

³¹⁵ „Трагички јунаци имају врло сложен идентитет, који Шекспир изражава монолозима и чиновима својих јунака. Њихово сопство је, у себи, најчешће противречно, а свака од противречности доведена је до крајности: помислимо на Хамлета који снажно осећа да мора да освети оца, а то, с најразличитијим разлозима, не може да учини све доку му, парадоксално, Клаудије као главно делатно лице драме, за разлику од неделатног Хамлета, не омогући да дела; [...]” (*Исто*: 90).

poisoned him and killed him, and that it is up to Hamlet to avenge him, but to be careful not to endanger his mother, Gertrude. The Ghost is, in itself, a supernatural element, which is important to mention since the introduction of supernatural elements is also one of Shakespeare's actions.

Let us also think of the unfortunate and tormented Nuruddin. Ahmed Nuruddin is a sheikh of the Mevlevi order, a dervish, a contemplative man, who at the beginning of the novel spends his time in the tekke of his order, indoctrinated and imbued with dogma, and in the second part, he is a judge, a ruler and a traitor to his only friend. By betraying Hassan, as well as by political scheming, sheikh Nuruddin met his Shadow and became his own opposite, at least according to the plot of the novel.

Politics is very present in Meša Selimović's novel *Death and the Dervish*. We can say that it is one of the most important hubs of this work. The relationship of the dervish to the authorities, and the authorities to the dervish, occupies a special place in the transformation of Ahmed Nuruddin and the wider range of topics covered in this novel. Hamlet is in conflict with his uncle Claudius, because he poisoned his father, the King of Denmark, Hamlet, whom the prince loved and for whom he deeply, in the opinion of the queen, too intensely and unnaturally, mourns. The focus of the conflict is that Claudius, his uncle, married his mother, Queen Gertrude, too soon after the death of King Hamlet.

But the true conflict that defines the play *Hamlet* is the prince's inner conflict and the young Hamlet's conflict with himself. The split in his soul is caused by external circumstances, the boundary situation, and the circumstances that occurred immediately after it. The germ of the tragic is in the very being of the protagonist, and it is brought to light by external circumstances. His character is what pushes him towards the end.

In the case of the hero of *Death and the Dervish* Ahmed Nuruddin, there is also a split in his 'private being' (*Ibid*: 100), his inner self, caused first by his brother's arrest, and then by his death, the tragedy of which is enhanced by the fact that Harun was innocent. Nurud-

din's inner conflict in the novel is threefold: first, we have a dervish turned to the ideals of justice and truth, dedicated to meditation and silence, the balance of whose existence is gradually disrupted by the knowledge of his brother's arrest, then a dervish disappointed to the core by the death of his brother, and, finally, a former dervish who is not up to the political role of a kadi.

His personal choice is what makes him a tragic hero who, by his own personal example, shows the trampling of the principles by which he lived his entire life, only to betray them in the end by becoming the same as those he fought against. Cruel.

A dervish is a representative of a religious institution. He has a title, the title of dervish, a church dignitary, a sheikh of the Mevlevi order, a kind of religious aristocracy. As a dervish, he is responsible for taking care of the sublimity and purity of the human spirit. As such, he should be a beacon of ethics, a walking moral compass whose needle unerringly points in the direction of correctness, justice, and fairness, a spiritual vertical by which the actions of a society are measured, over which the all-seeing eye of the light of faith watches, which has been blinking when it should have been most vigilant.

In *Death and the Dervish*, Ahmed Nuruddin, the dervish, enters into conflict with the exponents of the power apparatus, the mufti, the musellim, and the kadi, after learning that his brother is imprisoned in a fortress. He then encounters injustice, harshness, arrogance, and cruelty and indifference of the rulers that, until that moment, he had not recognized. Then it becomes clear to him that his dervish title, behind which he hid and in which he only believed, means nothing to those who make decisions about life and death, and he decides to plot, like Hamlet, who organizes a play to check whether the words of the Ghost are true, although his "prophetic soul" (Hamlet, I.5.40) knows that they are, which sets off a chain of events that will lead to his death, as in the case of Ahmed Nuruddin, who, like Hamlet, decides to rebel, to do something, but he himself becomes the one he hated because he was not fought with humanly, before joining Harun in the darkness of Hades.

Hamlet fights against Claudius, the king, and the dervish goes to the mufti, the musellim and the kadi. At that time, Ahmed Nuruddin, the brother, but sheikh Nuruddin, the head of the tekke. In *Death and the Dervish*, the instrument of power signed an order to kill a man who had exposed the lawlessness of the rulers, those who should enforce the laws, not break them, and thereby protected political immorality that threatens not only the independence of the individual, but also his life, if necessary. This fully corresponds to the position of the New Historians,

“[...] that in a hostile environment, they are caught in a complex network of forces that all together pose a threat to their freedom”³¹⁶ (Pechter 2002: 125).

Freedom, or rather, the lack of it is a striking feature of these two pieces of writing, especially when it comes to their opening parts. It is also one of their most dominant topics. given that

“Any form of freedom, the one that can appear in thought or speech, is a potential threat to the order. That freedom threatens its unquestionableness and unlimitedness”³¹⁷ (Lešić 2003: 31).

The story of Hamlet, like the story of Ahmed Nuruddin, is a story about

“[...] a modern man with a split psyche and repressed drives, unable to coordinate three functions: emotional, intellectual and volitional”³¹⁸ (Brkić 1959: 20).

We can see both as “[...] a man full of doubt and hesitation, inner struggle and indecision [...]”³¹⁹ (*Ibid*: 21).

³¹⁶ „[...] да су у непријатељском окружењу, ухваћени у сложenu мрежу сила које све заједно представљају претњу по њихову слободу” (Пехтер у: *Домейи*, 2002: 125).

³¹⁷ „(...) мјеру слободе, слободног мишљења и слободног изражавања која доводи у питање апсолутну моћ Власти” (Lešić 2003: 31).

³¹⁸ „[...] modernom čoveku podvojene psihe i potisnutih nagona, nemoćnom da koordinira tri funkcije: emotivnu, intelektualnu i voljnu” (Brkić 1959: 20).

³¹⁹ „[...] čoveka punog nedoumice i oklevanja, unutrašnje borbe i neodlučnosti [...]” (*Исџо*: 21).

Both are

“[...] simultaneously confused and disgusted by what they do, with a penetrating reflection that sees the problem, like a metaphysical scanner, and that strikingly marks it [...]”³²⁰ (Kostić 2011: 39).

Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are divided and lost in the interspace between the Self and the Self that is its negation.

In exploring the connections between the Renaissance and Shakespeare, Milica Spremić draws on John Dollimore's perspective on the 17th century. He argues that the decisive role in shaping a person of that era, in shaping his identity, is not played by his original, authentic nature, but by external, social and historical forces that govern and decide on his behalf. Therefore, the socio-historical context in which an individual lives plays a crucial role in his understanding of the world and shaping his worldview (Spremić 2011: 23).

“According to Dollimore the 17th century is a milestone between two socio-political systems, two times and two systems of completely different values and understandings, one of which is the system of medieval feudalism and the era of Christianity according to which man can exist only in harmony with God, and the era of humanism and humanistic ideals, which is the germ of the beginning of the modern era in which man exists as a separate entity that is founded in itself in its own reason”³²¹ (Dollimore in: Spremić 2011: 23–24).

Their contradiction Hamlet, although a literary character, represents the prototype of a man who found himself in such a socio-historical context. Due to his position in time, he is divided within himself and a hostage of the gap between these two polarities.

³²⁰ „[...] istovremeno zbunjen i zgađen onim što čini, sa prodornom refleksijom koja vidi problem, kao metafizički skener, i koja ga upečatljivo obeležava [...]” (Kostić 2011: 39).

³²¹ „On sedamnasti vek vidi kao prelazno doba između hrišćanskog egzistencijalizma srednjeg veka, koji čoveka shvata kao jedinstveno biće čija je suština Bog, i prosvetiteljskog humanizma, koji postavlja tezu o čoveku kao individui” (Spremić 2011: 23–24).

Their contradiction is what gives rise to Hamlet's inner division between loyalty to the religious doctrine of Christianity, to the Ghost's command to sanctify him, and to his own self, to his original nature, to his being who abhors the imposed task of vengeance. Dollimore points out that at the 17th century is the space between two Christianity doctrine of the Middle Ages that views a man as an entity based in God and the Humanism according to which a man is an independent as such (*Ibid*).

Applied to Hamlet, this play reflects the circumstances of Renaissance England and the images of the world that were in force at the time, which include the absolutist power of the monarch, the liquidation of political dissenters, a Machiavellian approach to governance that approves of, and even implements the elimination of, potential threats such as people who recognize the true, repressive nature of the rotten political apparatus, which connects the circumstances in England at that time with the circumstances depicted in Selimović's *Death and the Dervish*.

This understanding of the Renaissance as an intermediate space between the Middle Ages and the modern era is characteristic of many modern historians. John Branigan draws attention to the theatrical nature of Renaissance circumstances in the fields of politics and intertwined social relations. He argues that the theatre in England during the Renaissance is actually concerned with the political system, with a special emphasis on the ruler and the entire political and social discourse of the time (*Ibid*). This is of importance for this thesis because it seeks to interpret the role of masks and the principles of masking, disguise and unmasking according to Nietzsche on the examples of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin and in relation to their relationship to the authorities, Claudius, who is a monarch instead of a monarch and the musellim, the kadi, the mufti, and the Piri-Voivode and the defterdar who are the heralds of Nuruddin's death in *Death and the Dervish*. In both cases, it is a struggle of the individual against the system, only these individuals simultaneously belong to that system.

But when the system personally lashes them with its criminal whip, the masks come to expression, whether they are put on, as in

the case of Hamlet's simulated madness, which the rest of the court perceives as a serious threat to the absolutist order, or they are taken off, as in the case of Ahmed Nuruddin, in whom the dervish mask, before being taken off, due to the absence of awareness of the illusion, exists as an (anti)mask. But the encounter with the musellim represents a turning point in that the anti-mask becomes aware of its own illusion and from that moment on it exists as a mask. Ahmed Nuruddin realizes that his calling had weight only within his ideologically colored world of Islamic doctrine in his mind, that it is important only as his transcendental "I" and that he is now in a position to, asking about his brother, whom he thinks is imprisoned, and Harun is already dead, speak from his empirical "I" (Milić 2000: 35). These two "I" belong to worlds that have nothing in common. Ahmed Nuruddin thought of them as one. For him, the same world.

Hamlet's inner division is the discord between his inner being on the one hand and ideology on the other. The danger lies in the rebellion of the inner being against ideology and its norms that aim to tame wild subjectivity. An even greater danger is that at the heart of the inner division of the heir to the Danish throne, whose feelings and rights as a son and ruler have been violated, there is revenge as a duty. It is imposed by an external authority, the Ghost of his father, the innocently murdered King Hamlet. Hamlet intimately, privately does not want to take revenge. He is a divided subject, Nietzsche's and Althusserian.

He is conditioned and determined by the voice of the collective to which he belongs in terms of tradition, morality, religion and other collective ideals rooted within the same social community. The voice of the authorities who shaped these ideals in that community is the acquired, adopted voice of the protagonist's conscience, such as Christianity and Islam, which are the nucleus of their subordination. Up to a boundary situation, the voice of another, borrowed conscience is dominant in Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. It is the matrix which manages to expose the two persecutors as divided between their personal, social identity and their identity in terms of social appearance – the mask, which embodies the difference between the two

“I”s and the two worlds of values to which they belong. The mask is the space of the internal conflict of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin.

Just as the dervish Ahmed Nuruddin is on the border of two worlds: the real world of political pragmatism based on Machiavellian practice that involves hypocrisy and political elimination of (innocent) people, so Hamlet is not only on the border between two ages, each of which carries value systems that contradict each other, and not only between himself and the voice of external authority within himself, but, like Ahmed Nuruddin, between two worlds: the world of the living (dead) and the world of the dead. In 1910, Peter S. Taletov describes Hamlet as a person who is on the border of two worlds, one of which is the world that Hamlet has hidden behind his idealistic premises, the sublime world of humanistic ideals that has no points of contact with the empirical world. He sees in Hamlet's constant existence between these two worlds his tragedy of indeterminacy. It is a constant existence between reality and illusion, reality and fantasy, truth and illusion, empirical and transcendent. Hamlet, therefore, finds himself between two worlds, one of which is objective, real, material, existing in itself, the so-called external world. The other world, in every way opposite to the empirical one, is a world that is a construct of his interior, an idealized, fairy-tale world, a phantasmagoria full of ideals and idealized standards that are not applicable to the empirical world because these two worlds contradict each other, as is Hamlet's being. His inability to determine himself is the cradle of his tragicism (Milanović 2009: 53).

This criticism of Hamlet is fully consistent with the types of “I” of N. Milić, for whom there are empirical and transcendent “I”. In Hamlet, as in Ahmed Nuruddin, these two “I”s are incompatible. Their simultaneous existence in both heroes makes them Nietzsche's, i.e. divided subjects. This contradiction in the I gives rise to an internal conflict that prevents them from achieving wholeness. Hamlet is torn between the demands of these two worlds, the real and the unreal, idealized world which, being such, is built on the foundation of the artistic and intellectual sublimity of the being of a Renaissance ruler

who is a lover of philosophy, a good speaker and an admirer of the theater. The dissonance of the worlds that stand opposite each other in a dialogical relationship, are opposed to each other completely, which is the source of the tragedy of the heroes.

This critic believes that the discord between the two aforementioned worlds, one that exists within and the other that exists outside the hero, is the cause of the paralysis of Hamlet's will, which is hindered by his intellect (*Ibid.*). According to him, the cause of Hamlet's passivity, and thus his hesitation, is in his mind, spirit and intellect, which hover between two worlds, but there is a difference between this and the view of some contemporary critics, who believe that the two worlds between which Hamlet is crucified are the world of the living and the world of those who are no longer alive, the world from which the Ghost of Hamlet's father comes, the world to which he sends Guildenstern and Rosencrantz. This is the opinion advocated by Jasminka Marić in her book *Philosophy in Hamlet*, the world to which, by decision and approval of the kasaba's authorities, Nuruddin's own brother Harun, a symbol of rebellion and resistance to the repression of the totalitarian regime, was sent, and perhaps also Is-haq, P.S. Taletov believes that this is an imaginary world, on the one hand, and a so-called real world, on the other, a world whose exponents are Claudius, Gertrude, Polonius, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (*Ibid.*). In other words, Hamlet is on the border between the empirical and transcendental worlds of his own idealism.

Ahmed Nuruddin is also between two worlds. He vacillates between a world limited by the rigid rules of Islamic exegesis with which his mind is full, where Islam, like every other religion, is understood as a transcendent ideal, and a world that probably never believed in ideals. The exponents of such a dishonorable world are the musellim, the mufti and the kadi who hide behind the mask of public office with which they conceal their own Machiavellianism. They are arrogant and arrogant political figures who, in terms of their political function as rulers, can be compared to Claudius, in terms of their neglect of corpses to Gertrude, in terms of their cunning to

Polonius, and in terms of their stupidity, such as the attempt to tempt the main character of Hamlet, Ahmed Nuruddin, with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. This primarily refers to the mufti and his attempt to create an illusion by exchanging theses according to which Ahmed Nuruddin chooses brother between the law and his brother, thereby undermining the law. The parallel between Gertrude and the town authorities is based on the laconic acceptance of the death of an innocent man as a natural order of things and an integral part of human life, as a turning point in the wheel of history from which no one has yet escaped. The parallel with Claudius is based on the illegal actions that both he and they use to decompose the state.

The aforementioned critic goes a step further and sees Hamlet as a man in control of his emotions, who acts courageously and without hesitation when the situation demands it, as was the case in the scene in which he kills Polonius, in which he prepares a death trap for his friends, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, in the scene in which he is rude to Ophelia, or when he hurls a torrent of insults at Laertes (*Ibid*).

In the empirical world, Hamlet is surrounded by decadent people, murderers, scoundrels, sycophants, and half-wits. It is a world of self-interested, greedy people, a world of traitors and spies, which is why the world of the play Hamlet communicates with the world of the novel *Death and the Dervish*. It is a world of corrupt rulers, musellim, mufti and kadi, a world of hypocritical people blinded by their own interests, such as the kadinitsa, a world of sejmen who only wait for an order to attack like rabid dogs, who, in their half-heartedness, resemble Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, a world of vali and deferdar who demand that Ahmed Nuruddin betray Hassan, a world that, like the one in which Hamlet moves, is decadent to the core. Hamlet, therefore, finds himself between two worlds, one of which is objective, real, material, existing in itself, the so-called external world. The other world, in every way the opposite of the empirical one, is a world that is a construct of his interior, an idealized, fairy-tale world, a phantasmagoria full of ideals and idealized standards that are not applicable to the empirical world because these two worlds contradict each other,

as is Hamlet's being. His inability to determine himself is the cradle of his tragedy (*Ibid*). He is, always between, an in-between Hamlet.

In Hamlet, as in Ahmed Nuruddin, these two "I"s are incompatible. Their simultaneous existence in both heroes makes them Nietzschean, self-divided subjects, whose "I" is plural and contradictory. This contradiction in them gives rise to an internal conflict that prevents them from achieving wholeness. Hamlet, like Nuruddin, is torn between the demands of these two worlds.

Petar S. Taletov believes that the discord between the two mentioned worlds, one that exists in reality and the other, the world of the ideal that exists in the hero, is the cause of the paralysis of Hamlet's will, which is hindered by his intellect (*Ibid*). According to him, the cause of Hamlet's passivity, and thus his hesitation, lies in his mind, spirit, and intellect, which hover between the two worlds. There is a difference between this and the view of some contemporary critics, who believe that the two worlds between which Hamlet is crucified are the world of the living and the world of those who are no longer living. In other words, Hamlet is on the border between the empirical, the real and the transcendental world, the world of his own idealism.

"The main feature of this Taletov's analysis and understanding of Hamlet's character is a kind of Schopenhauerian analysis of the human personality into several independent immaterial centers: feelings, or rather temperament, intellect and will"³²² (*Ibid*: 54).

Arthur Schopenhauer is Nietzsche's philosophical father. And Nietzsche sees his subject as a multiplicity divided within itself. One of the divisions to which this could refer is the one just mentioned. Isn't this the fundamental conflict of beings in *Death and the Dervish*, the one between Ahmed the man and Nuruddin and his calling,

³²² „Glavno obilježje ove Taletovljeve analize i shvatanja Hamletovog karaktera jeste neko šopenhauerovsko raščlanjavanje ljudske ličnosti na više nezavisnih nematerijalnih centara: osjećanja, odnosno temperamenta, intelekta i volje" (*Исџо*: 54).

first of all, dervish and then kadi when his instinctive reaction in a fit of emotion was that he would not, did not want to and could not betray Hassan?

Ahmed Nuruddin also finds himself between two worlds. He vacillates between a world bounded by the rigid rules of Islamic exegesis that his mind is full of, where Islam, like every other religion, is understood as a transcendental ideal, and a world that probably never believed in ideals. The exponents of such a dishonorable world are the musellim, kadi and mufti who hide behind the mask of public office with which they conceal their own Machiavellianism. They are arrogant and haughty political figures who, in terms of their political function as rulers and decision-makers, can be compared to Claudius, in terms of their neglect of the dead man to Gertrude, in terms of their cunning to Polonius, and in terms of their lack of honor to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.

The parallel with Claudius is based on the illegal actions that both he and they use to remain wealthy. The parallel between Gertrude and the town authorities is based on the casual umesto laconic acceptance of the death of an innocent man as a natural order and an integral part of life. The aforementioned critic goes a step further and sees Hamlet as a man in control of his emotions, who acts courageously and without hesitation when the situation demands it.

In the empirical world, Hamlet is surrounded by decadent people, murderers, scoundrels, sycophants, and dishonest people. It is a world of self-interested, greedy people, a world of traitors and spies, which is why the world of the play Hamlet communicates with the world of *Death and the Dervish*. It is a world of corrupt rulers, musellims, kadies, muftis, Piri-Voivode, a world of hypocritical people blinded by their own interests, such as the kadi's wife, a world of sejmen who only wait for an order to attack, who, in their half-heartedness, resemble Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, a world of valies and defterdars who demand that Ahmed Nuruddin betray Hassan, a world that, like the one in which Hamlet moves, is decadent to the core. That is why Denmark is one of the most terrible dungeons:

“Denmark’s a prison
[...]
A goodly one, in which there are many confines,
wars and dungeons; Denmark being one o’thorst”³²³
(2. 2. 239–242)

Denmark in the novel *Death and the Dervish* is a fortress. It is not just a prison. It is a place of murder, like the garden of Elsinore where Claudius killed King Hamlet in his sleep, a mass grave of scattered unmarked bones, many of which are innocent. The motif of a terrible dungeon is a morbid motif that corresponds to the legacy of the Elizabethan tragedy of revenge. In such a world, he must resort to various means to achieve his goal. His means is the mask of madness.

As we learn in Milanović’s book *Hamlet in Serbian Criticism*, Svetislav Stefanović focused in his criticism of Hamlet on the typically Nietzschean element of disgust, which, along with lethargy and asceticism, is one of the most dominant in the man whom Nietzsche calls Dionysian (Nietzsche 2003: 39). According to him, Hamlet suffers deeply because of the ugly world in which he lives, in which even what should be fundamentally Beautiful, Good and Sublime is tainted by the general rot of the world and its fetid breath (Stefanović in Milanović 2009: 74).

According to Stefanović, who relies on Milenko Vesnić’s interpretation of *Hamlet*, we encounter a Dionysian reality, the one from which the Olympian Greeks were protected by the gods. This is the painful reality of a world steeped in decadence, in everything that the humanistic ideals of Beauty, Good and Sublime are, ideals that are as

³²³ „Данска је тамница.
[...]
Те још каква; са многим преградама,
ћелијама и апсанама; а Данска је једна од
најгорих”
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 51).

much aesthetic as ethical, the opposite, a world in which one does not live, but wallows as if in a puddle, a world that reeks of sewage, the one

“[...] in which everything is nasty and disgusting, in which even the sweetest becomes bland, like love, and what is the highest is only ugly and monstrous, like royal power and authority over people”³²⁴ (Stefanović in Milanović 2009: 74).

It is a world of two women with knives in their hands who aim at Hamlet or Nuruddin's back, it doesn't matter, because both of them bounce off the decadence of this and that world, the world of weakness that for Hamlet has the moral value of the adulteress who is his mother, the world of Ophelia – the traitor, the world of girls with whom the love is impossible in the whirlwind of war, the world of comrades – spies, a world that is nothing more than a stage in which everyone poses, wears masks and plays their roles.

The prince is a bright mind eager for a sublime world that does not exist. He is a lover of philosophy, a lover of wisdom, but the function of wisdom in Hamlet's understanding of the world is devastating because it reveals the world in all its baseness and weakness. This wisdom generated his disgust on several levels: in the family domain, in the domain of friendship, love, and on the human level (*Ibid*: 75).

Zoran Gluščević insists on duality. It refers to the division of the world and morality in whose disharmony the dramatic conflict arises. One world, i.e. one type of morality is embodied in Hamlet, and the other type of morality is related to the world that surrounds him (Gluščević in: Milanović 2009: 201), a world in which feudal laws, customary law, a world of false relationships and artificiality in interpersonal relationships apply, a world focused on gaining interests, a world of utilitarianism and Machiavellianism, a stale and conventional world of rigid social norms and patterns of behavior whose purpose is to hide true intentions, in a word, a world that is disgusting and

³²⁴ „[...] u kome je sve gadno i gnusno, u kome i ono što je najslade postaje bljutavo, kao ljubav, i ono što je najviše samo je grdno i nakazno, kao kraljevska moć i vlast nad ljudima” (Stefanović u: Milanović 2009: 74).

evil. This is the world of drinking and partying from the beginning of the drama, the world of debauchery because of which the Danes as a people are labeled decadent, a world in which an individual focused on his ideals and transcendental illusions in his mind does not know how to find his way, as is the case with Hamlet.

He, unlike the false world, is naturally disgusted with evil and injustice, with the moral humiliation that he witnesses at the moment of his most powerful life turning points: his mother's insult of a hasty remarriage to his father's murderer, to a usurper of the throne who dared to twist time from his wrist and threaten the moral order. By killing his brother, he subordinated the order to himself and put it into his own hands, literally, in the form of a bottle of poison that he poured into his brother's ear in order to achieve his goals, lucrative in the first place.

Hamlet, especially at the very beginning of the play, is inclined to show his true feelings of grief, sadness and pain for his father. On the other hand, his behavior is colored by resentment towards his mother and the court for passing over the death of the king, his father, so lightly. He considers such behavior as a denial of respect for his late, beloved father, which reveals all the immorality and inhumanity of the Danish court in feudal times. Hamlet places great importance on humanity as an ethical category. He does his best to protect himself from everything that could stain him on a moral basis (Milanović 2009: 201). Isn't Hamlet's tendency to preserve his polished moral image identical to Ahmed Nuruddin's fanatical need to preserve the moral dimension of his dervish character?

Death and the Dervish begins with Nuruddin's recognition of plurality within himself. In the course of writing the confession that is his intimate trial, he recognizes himself in three roles. The first role he assigns to himself is the role of judge, the second is the role of the accused, and the third role is the role of witness. The trial in question is related to the case of his own brother, who thanks to him came to the town from his native village of Johovac, where their father remained, his brother's imprisonment and his murder for no reason.

The defendant in this trial will be Nuruddin, the bearer of a social identity, always belonging to something, since he is the sheikh of the tekke, a dervish, a member of the Order, a servant of Allah, in war, in a soldier's tent, on the battlefield, an attacker on a heretical enemy, in peace, in the tekke where he hid after returning from the war for the faith that he believed to be the only, correct and unquestionable. He retreated to the tekke to escape the horrors of war, the blood, the fornication, the foul language, and the fact that his girlfriend, the only woman in his life who, since she represented love, was the bearer of the meaning of life, did not wait for him, but rather, perhaps with his child in her womb, married him.

The lawyer will be Ahmed, who has pledged to his father to ask the town's decision-makers why his brother was arrested, just as Hamlet pledged to his father's Ghost to avenge him. Ahmed is a son and brother, a man who trembled before the teapot because it reminded him of his old feelings for the woman who, although already married to another, had suggested that he escape. Harun's death freed the captive man under the dervish's robe. That man's name is Ahmed. His hostage's name is Nuruddin. And vice versa.

The judge will be Ahmed Nuruddin, the bearer of (at least) two contradictory consciousnesses, human and dervish. Human consciousness recognizes the individual man, seeks his bones to bury near it, if only to justify its hatred. The dervish is a supporter of sacrificing a man in the name of law, dogma, exegesis, the general and the collective.

The trial is an attempt to examine both of his consciousnesses and to decide which of the two is (wrong). It is a cross-examination of his inner plurality, during which both Ahmed and Nuruddin present their arguments. Behind Nuruddin stand Order, Islam, Allah, heaven; behind Ahmed blood, genetics, family, biological imperative (Ivanov 2017: 384).

Nuruddin is accused of moving away from the dervish role of a servant of God by Ahmed's actions in the name of saving his brother. The jurors at this trial are Hasan, who in the dervish morally challenges a man to fight for his brother, Is-haq, who tempts him to make a decision, and the Machiavellian rulers who are Harun's murderers, although not

the executioners, but those who tried to ensure that the executions took place. Their reason for eliminating the man who knew too much is to prevent the spread of the rot that is also present in Denmark. The jury is also the community, the social environment represented by Ali-hodja, which, through him, decides on Nuruddin's social visibility by (dis) approving of his Hamlet-like passivity after Harun's death, Aliaga, part of Ahmed Nuruddin's plot, Hadji-Sinanuddin, the victim of the same, Mullah-Yusuf, Harun's traitor, Aini-effendi's informant, Hassan's savior.

All three roles are functions.

Once upon a time there was one man. Who united many people in himself at different stages of his life. Boy, son, brother, lover, kadi, avenger, even a prisoner, Ahmed Nuruddin is a multitude, a man divided within himself. A man who has no self. A man who does not know who he is. A man who may have never known who he is. Or perhaps he always knew, but chose to hide, from himself and from others, in order to hide his identity as a poor peasant. A man walled in "[...] a closed doctrinal system [...]"³²⁵ (Tanasković 2018: 231) of Islam that presupposes human life as a principle.

A man who was a son, but ceased to be so through alienation and belonging to a secondary, spiritual family to which he subordinated his biological one. A man who was a brother, but ceased to be so because, thanks to the repression of those in power, the akiyavelists who bloodied their hands like Claudius did, by killing an innocent man, he was left without a brother. A man who was a lover, but ceased to be so. A man who was a soldier, but ceased to be so. A man who was a dervish, then stopped being one. A man who was a kadi, then stopped being one. A man who sacrificed everything. Starting with himself.

He is orthodox. He has a name, although it is not important. What is important is what it means: "*Light of Faith*"³²⁶ (Selimović 2018a: 20). And it is not his. It has become his. He and the name have coexisted. They fell in love with each other by chance. And they stayed that way.

³²⁵ „[...] затворени доктринарни систем [...]" (Танасковић 2018: 231)

³²⁶ с в ј е т л о в ј е р е (Селимовић 2004: 20)

He serves faith. Or what he thinks faith is. A replacement. A spare life. A quasi-meaning. He is his own public function. He is equal to his title. It is the foundation of his socially constructed identity. He is a dervish of a Mevlevi tekke. Some dervish. Any one of them. He knows everything about the *Koran*. He does not know much about the world. He is a man who has emigrated into himself. An outcast. Alienated. Remote. Lonely.

Accustomed to judging only and exclusively within his own standards, according to what his conscience dictates, thinking that conscience has something to do with power. These standards are not even his own, they are acquired. The rules of Islamic exegesis are his scales. He is Justice. His other name is Ahmed Nuruddin. But that is not very important. He is first a dervish, and only then a man. He is the sheikh of the tekke. What else would he be in his forty years, most of which he has spent living in his head, a messy attic of the great thoughts of prominent Islamic poets and thinkers whose words he has appropriated as his own?

He is not what he is. Or it could be the other way around: he is what he is not. He is divided into the self he once was, his original being and his social calling, his dervish title, behind which he has nothing to hide. And he needs to hide. In the tekke. Because it allows him to escape from the reality he does not know how to fight against. It protects him from gaining Dionysian insight (Milić 2000: 135). Ahmed Nuruddin is a man who thinks that the world he believes in, created on the basis of what he has read in many books, is the same world that awaits him when he opens the mandala. There was a divine harmony between these two worlds until the moment when his brother was imprisoned. Then he realized that the two worlds are not similar in any way.

His dogmatism is the determinant of his identity. But, it is necessary to discover “[...] the psychological essence of his dogmatism: it is narcissism, moral self-love”³²⁷ (Glušćević 1981: 2033).

The dervish believes in the Order. He loves his title and

³²⁷ „[...] психолошку суштину његовог догматизма: то је нарцисизам, морално самољубље” (Глушчевић 1981: 2033).

“[...] a constructed dogmatic idea of himself [...] with rational coolness and moralistic calculation, or with the sole anxiety that his cold vanity will not be stained with moral stain”³²⁸ (*Ibid*: 2031).

Ahmed Nuruddin is, as a member of the Order, a representative of spiritual authority in the *Death and the Dervish*. He is the head of the Mevlevi order who has pledged to live in accordance with the rules of the holy book and the principles of Islam, Islamic exegesis, and in fact a religious doctrine that is rigid and does not allow any deviations, especially not in the name of his “I” and personal position. He has no right to err in what the faith preaches, because he is also an ideologically shaped subject in the service of Islamic doctrine. Neither he, nor Hamlet, has the right to rebel against this system because he himself belongs to the system. This changes, however, when his brother, who is innocent, is arrested and then executed. From a subordinate servant of Islamic exegesis, Ahmed becomes a man, a son, a brother, and an avenger. His original being, his personal identity, takes precedence.

As the head of the dervish order and as a kadi, he is an Althusserian subject because he is shaped by ideology. Since he is constantly in a position between two extremes, between Ahmed, the bearer of a personal identity, son, brother, and even lover, and Nuruddin, the socially constructed subject, he is a Nietzschean subject because he is divided within himself between two contradictory identities that exclude each other.

As a dervish, he is forced to hide behind the general and to neglect his personal and individual, like the kadi, after all, which is why he betrays Hassan, and as a son and brother, he feels an obligation first to his father to inquire about Harun, which he considers humiliating, and then to the memory of his brother, who, dead, becomes a symbol of his rebellion, which is a direct opposition to the dervish he was.

³²⁸ „[...] исконструисану догматску представу о себи [...] са рационалном хладноћом и моралистичком рачуницом, или са једином стрепњом да на његову хладну сујету не падне морална мрља” (Исто: 2031).

Later in the novel, he will become a kadi, an exponent of the political state ideological apparatus (Althusser 2009: 28). He will betray his best friend in the name of the order, thereby actually betraying humanity and its phenomenological value, as a way of thinking and acting and end tragically, as an unrealized lover, an accomplished avenger, and as a failed man due to the rejection of love.

He weighs what is right and what is wrong, and whether Is-haq is guilty or not, but not because of Is-haq, but because of his (clear) conscience. Emotionally distanced, hidden under the dervish uniform, torn from his family, from his father and Harun, he has condemned himself to be at a loss every day (Selimović 2018a: 387) because he has not known love or salvation, nor has he come to terms with death, unlike Hamlet, who dies reconciled. In Ahmed Nuruddin's case, the dominant influence is the social role of the dervish of the Mevlevi order, which he believes brings him respect, admiration and prestige, and then the role of the kadi, the ruler, the representative of political power, similar to those he fought against and despised because, when he thought he had humbled himself by coming to ask about his brother, they played with him, knowing that Harun was no longer alive, and that Ahmed Nuruddin was fighting in vain for a dead man. The collision with disrespect from not only political figures, but also from an ordinary guard was the dervish's tragic knowledge (Jaspers in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 234), a collision with the reality in which he was degraded from a respectable person to a "kind of" dervish, which, as he perceives it, deprived him of the social greatness that he believes his position carries.

This arouses resentment in him and wounds his vanity, causing anger at the realization that the reality outside the tekke courtyard is not the same as his understanding of reality. Moreover, it is completely different. This realization subconsciously arouses in the dervish the suspicion that perhaps he has been living in an illusion all along and that what he believes in with his whole being is only an illusion. This is the basic element on the basis of which we can conclude that his dervishism is a mask, but, until the encounter with the musellim, it is

still an (anti)mask, because until then Nuruddin is not aware of this illusion. He then becomes aware of it, which is why the (anti)mask becomes a mask.

Nuruddin appears to the musellim, the mufti and the kadi as Ahmed, a man obliged to Allah and people to at least ask what happened, the brother of a man who, as far as he knows, is imprisoned, the son of a father who, through Ahmed, his former son, prays for Harun, the only son he still has. They show the hypocrisy in which none of the aforementioned rulers are humans, but rather representatives of the authorities. Their immorality goes to the extent that the musellim even offer the option of accusing Ahmed's brother. This proposal shows the limit of the bestiality of the executor of the authorities. There is none.



6. THE FUNCTION OF INNER CONFLICT IN HAMLET AND AHMED NURUDDIN

Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin end their lives as avengers. They are guilty. Hamlet is a murderer. Nuruddin is a schemer and a traitor. Both are guilty because in their path of revenge they used the same means as those they fought against. In doing so, they became their equals. Both have transformed from fighting against Machiavellian heroes to becoming Machiavellian heroes themselves. They are wronged by the hypocritical rulers and murderers, parts of the firmly established structure of God's order in the Elizabethan worldview (Kostić 1983: 44), and who are equally wicked behind the crimes in *Death and the Dervish* and Aini-effendi before all others, and then the musellim and the mufti in the first part of the novel, while in the second part it is Piri-Voivode and the defterdar. In *Hamlet*, it is Claudius.

Although they may not have directly participated in of Harun's murder, unlike Claudius, who committed the murder of his brother with his own hand, they must have known about the crime because they belong to the apparatus of power responsible for the execution of an innocent man. They certainly did not oppose him. Behind Nuruddin's death in the second part of the novel, Piri-Voivode and the defterdar will stand out. In the encounter with Nuruddin, who is asking about his dead brother, all those in power behave as functions, not as people. Representing the side of the "law", they represent their right to make decisions that serve their interests and justify these decisions with the law.

The crimes of the authorities in both parts are external circumstances that influence Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, as well as inspired their actions (inaction). We can call these circumstances their evil fate, because their subsequent actions are directly related to the impact that the boundary situations had on the two heroes. At the beginning of the piece of literature, they are, therefore, victims. At the end, they take revenge. In both writings, we follow the development of the protagonist's metamorphosis. Throughout the play and the novel, both main characters are internally divided between two contradictory attitudes, opinions, principles, two contradictory understandings of reality. But they are torn between two types of reality, one physical, material, apparent, tangible, which is the real world, and the other, which is made up of ideals that are transcendent in their nature, such as religion and morality (Fink 1981: 68). This division stems from their character. It gives rise to inner conflict.

The trigger for Hamlet's and Nuruddin's vengeful behavior is the moral debt for the death of a family member. They are not guilty of it. They are guilty of revenge. Challenged by the fate disguised as a boundary situation, they entered the torrent. That water is the one in which Ahmed Nuruddin will drown, the one in which Ophelia drowned, for whom Selimović says is "the symbol of the purest character in literature"³²⁹ (Selimović 1983: 269).

True, no one raised a hand against her, but social circumstances did contribute to her suicide, with the same ease with which Ahmed gave up the woman he loved, her and no other, her giving up on Hamlet because of the structure of the Elizabethan world that prohibits the mixing of classes (Kostić 1983: 44), and which is uttered by her brother and father, Polonius and Laertes, another lamented son in the play, Hamlet's murderer who agrees to the duel, behind which is Claudius. Laertes is behind the dishonor of the duel with his trick – poisoning the tip of the sword, which is supposed to ensure Hamlet's death.

³²⁹ „[...] simbol najčistijeg lika u literaturi” (Selimović 1983: 269).

Hamlet thinks about revenge as a prince who deserves the throne, and Nuruddin thinks about it as atonement (Selimović 2004: 240) for the death of an innocent brother, but also as what the community expects from him as a man who has been wronged. Finally, he thinks like an injured brother.

If Hegel's understanding of tragedy had to be summed up in one word, then it would be conflict. What, according to Hegel, as Bradley believes, decisively defines tragedy and what it inherits is precisely conflict. It can exist between two or more characters, and it can also be an inner conflict inside of the main character. Conflict, according to Hegel, is the core of tragedy, and it implies the misfortune and evil fate of the hero filled with suffering and misery. Conflict is the herald and essence of suffering, its root cause and path to tragedy. When it comes to tragedy and the tragic, on one side there is a conflict, and on the other, consequently, suffering (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 59–60).

According to Hegel, tragedy is a conflict that exists between internal impulses related to the spiritual dimension of human existence (*Ibid*). In other genres, these impulses coexist harmoniously and function in synergy, with none excluding the other, which means that they are not mutually contradictory. In tragedy, it is about the latter. It therefore insists on their mutual conflict that leads to the inner division of the protagonist. In a hero, there does not have to be a conflict between two polarized extremes in the sense of binary oppositions such as good and evil, where there is a clear antagonism in the ethical markers of two universal categories, one of which is positively and the other negatively value-marked (*Ibid*: 60).

It is quite possible that the tragic conflict in question is that between two polarities, both of which can be classified as “good”, with each of these polarities carrying with them certain demands that do not tolerate the demands of the other polarity. These demands exclude and cancel each other. They are contradictory. Each of the aforementioned polarities seeks to enthrone its own demands as the only relevant, valid and valid, and indeed the only possible, the only existing ones, while insisting on the annulment of the demands of the

other polarity (*Ibid*: 60). In the case of both protagonists, “it is tragic that respecting one necessarily entails offending the other” (*Ibid*: 60). These polarities can be the family and the laws of “the biological imperative” (Ivanov 2017: 384) on the one hand, or the state and the laws of the state system on the other (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 62). Both the state and the family carry a positive connotation in the ethical coordinate system (*Ibid*: 60).

The Ghost is an important factor in the drama because it is he who visits Hamlet and reveals the truth that his brother, Hamlet’s uncle, poisoned him and killed him, and that it is up to Hamlet to avenge him, but to take care not to endanger his mother, Gertrude, in any way. The Ghost is, in itself, a supernatural element, which is important to mention since the introduction of supernatural elements is also one of Shakespeare’s methods. As Bradley says, Shakespeare

“[...] introduces ghosts and witches who have supernatural knowledge. [...] the supernatural is always in the closest connection with the character. It gives confirmation and a distinctive mark to the inner urges, which are already present and exert an influence [...] on the suspicion in Hamlet”³³⁰ (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 563).

In his essay, Bradley argues that

“[...] the center of tragedy lies in the action that arises from the character or in the character that is immersed in the action”³³¹ (*Ibid*: 562). He thereby wants to emphasize that “[...] misfortune and collapse necessarily follow from the actions of people and that the main source of these actions is character”³³² (*Ibid*.).

³³⁰ „[...] uvodi duhove i veštice koji raspolažu natprirodnim znanjima. „[...] natprirodno uvek stoji i najtešnjoj vezi sa karakterom. Ono daje potvrdu i distinktivno obeležje unutarnjim porivima, koji su već prisutni i vrše uticaj [...] na podozrenje kod Hamleta” (Bredli u: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 563).

³³¹ „[...] središte tragedije leži u radnji koja proističe iz karaktera ili u karakteru koji se utapa u radnju” (*Исцѹо*: 562).

³³² „[...] nesreća i slom slede nužno iz postupaka ljudi i da je glavni izvor tih postupaka karakter” (*Исцѹо*).

What is certainly common to Shakespeare's tragedies is that they all

"[...] depict the complex identity and boundary states of consciousness of the tragic heroes, at the same time poetically stage them and offer them to the viewer's and reader's psychological analysis. The questions of morality, existence and death are necessarily connected with religious questions that are present in Shakespeare indirectly and implicitly. [...] "Shakespeare's tragedies, finally, always touch on politics"³³³ (Bečano-
vić-Nikolić 2013: 89).

Politics is very present in the work *Death and the Dervish* by Meša Selimović. We can say that it is one of the most important hubs of this piece of literature. The relationship of the dervish to the government, and the government to the dervish, occupies a special place in the transformation of Ahmed Nuruddin and the wider spectrum of topics covered by this novel.

Let us return to the inner states of the heroes.

"Although Hamlet and the King are mortal opponents, yet what heightens our interest and remains in our memory at least as much as their conflict, is the conflict in the soul of one of them"³³⁴ (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 566).

Bradley thinks about it this way: "[...] whatever forces operate in the human spirit, be they good or evil, personal passion or impersonal principle, doubts, desires, considerations, ideas – all this can inspire, shake, capture and direct the human soul. In Shakespeare's tragedy,

³³³ „[...] приказују сложени идентитет и гранична стања свести трагичких јунака, истовремено их поетски упризорују и нуде гледалачкој и читалачкој психолошкој анализи. Питања морала, бивствовања и смрти, нужно су повезана с религијским питањима која су код Шекспира присутна посредно и имплицитно. [...]. Шекспирове трагедије, најзад, увек дотичу и политику” (Бечановић-Николић 2013: 89).

³³⁴ „Premda su Hamlet i Kralj smrtni protivnici, ipak, ono što pojačava naše interesovanje i ostaje nam u pamćenju bar onoliko koliko i njihov sukob, jeste sukob u duši jednog od njih.” (Bredli u: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 566).

some of these forces are shown through conflict. They are shown to operate in people and create conflicts between them”³³⁵ (*Ibid.*).

In his lecture on Hegel’s theory of tragedy, which is included in the collection *Theory of Tragedy* in the form of an essay, Bradley writes that

“[...] in every tragedy there is some kind of clash or conflict – a clash of feelings, ways of thinking, desires, wills, intentions; a clash of one person with another, or with circumstances, or with himself; one, several of them, or all kinds of conflicts, as the case may be”³³⁶ (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 58–59).

This is shown to be true in the case of the protagonists, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. Hamlet and Claudius his uncle collided. Since Hamlet the Danish king loved and deeply regretted the prince he poisoned him. But because his uncle Claudius wed his mother Queen Gertrude too soon after King Hamlet’s death he and he diverged more. But the real conflict that defines the play Hamlet is the prince’s internal conflict and the young Hamlet’s conflict with himself. The split in his soul is caused by external circumstances, the boundary situation, and the circumstances that occurred immediately after it. The germ of the tragic is in the very being of the protagonist, and it is external circumstances that bring it to light. His character is what pushes him towards the end. In short, “[...] tragedy shows the split and self-destruction of the spirit, or the discord of the spirit that entails conflict and ruin”³³⁷ (*Ibid.*: 70). The death of both heroes, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, confirms this.

³³⁵ „[...] koje god sile delovale u ljudskom duhu, bile one dobre ili zle, lična strast ili bezlični princip, sumnje, želje, obziri, ideje – sve to može da nadahne, uzdrma, zahvati i usmerava ljudsku dušu. U Šekspirovoj tragediji neke od tih sila prikazane su kroz sukob. One su pokazane kako delaju u ljudima i stvaraju sukobe među njima” (*Исѹо*).

³³⁶ „[...] u svakoj tragediji postoji neka vrsta sudara ili sukoba – sukoba osećanja, načina mišljenja, želja, volja, namera; sukoba jednog lica sa drugim, ili sa okolnostima, ili sa samim sobom; jedna, nekoliko njih, ili sve vrste sukoba, već prema slučaju” (Bredli y: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 58–59).

³³⁷ „[...] tragedija pokazuje rascep i samorazaranje duha, ili razdor duha koji povlači sukob i propast” (*Исѹо*: 70).

In the case of the hero of the novel *Death and the Dervish*, Ahmed Nuruddin, there is also a split in his inner being caused first by his brother's arrest and then by his death, the tragedy of which is enhanced by the fact that Harun was innocent. It shows the trampling of the principles by which he lived his entire life, only to betray them in the end by becoming the same as those he fought against.

“That a tragedy is a story about suffering is probably the most obvious fact to many. Hegel speaks very briefly about it; partly, perhaps, because it is obvious, but more because for him the essential issue is not suffering, but its causes, namely, action or conflict” writes Bradley in the same essay (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 59). Action is action or lack of action, activity or passivity, action or hesitation. In the case of the two protagonists, it is a matter of postponing the execution of revenge and transformation from deep contemplative to the sphere of initiation to the execution of the act. He goes on to explain that, “the reason that a tragic conflict seems so to us is that it is itself a conflict of spirit.” It is a conflict, it should be said, between the forces that rule the world of man's will and action – his “ethical essence.” Family and state, blood ties between parent and child, brother and sister, husband and wife, citizen and ruler, citizen and citizen, with the obligations and feelings consistent with these ties; and also the force of personal love and honor or devotion to some great cause, or to an ideal interest like religion and science, or to some kind of social welfare – such forces are prominent in the tragic plot [...]”³³⁸ (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 560).

³³⁸ „Da je tragedija priča o patnji, to je verovatno mnogima najočiglednija činjenica. Hegel govori vrlo ukratko o tome; delimično, možda, zato što je to očigledno, ali više zbog toga što za njega nije suštinsko pitanje patnje, već njeni uzroci, naime, radnja ili sukob” u istom eseju piše Bredli (Bredli u: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 59). Radnja je delanje ili nedostatak delanja, aktivnost ili pasivnost, akcija ili oklevanje. U slučaju dvojice protagonista reč je o odlaganju izvršenja osвете i transformaciji iz duboke kontemplativnosti u sferu pokretanja na izvršenje čina. On nastavlja objašnjavajući da „razlog što nas se tragički sukob tako doima jeste što je on sam po sebi sukob duha. On je sukob, valja reći, između sila koje vladaju svetom čovekove volje i delovanja – njegovog „etičkog suštastva.” Porodice i države, krvne veze između između roditelja i deteta, brata i sestre, muža i žene, građanina i vladara, građanina i građanina, sa obavezama

The dervish is, as we know, a representative of a religious institution. He has the title of a dervish, a church dignitary, a representative of high religious circles, even a kind of religious aristocracy. Hamlet, on the other hand, is a representative of the monarchy, a prince, the heir to the throne. Both are persons from the high ranks of society, which is one of the features of Shakespeare's tragedy. He uses persons from high society to express the tragic plot. As Bradley says,

“in Shakespeare tragedy always concerns men of ‘high station,’ often kings or princes; if not then the leaders of the state [...]”³³⁹ (*Ibid.*).

Bradley also gives an explanation for this Shakespearean decision. Namely,

“[...] the story of a triumvir, prince or general will have its own sublimity and grandeur. His fate affects the well-being of a whole people or kingdom; and when he falls suddenly from the height of earthly greatness to the dust, his fall creates a sense of contrast, of man's helplessness and the omnipotence – perhaps the whim – of Fortune or Fate, to which no story of private life can equal”³⁴⁰ (*Ibid.*: 560–561).

It is clear that Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are tragic heroes on the basis that

“the essential tragedy is the split of being and the collision of the inner moral essence [...]”³⁴¹ (*Ibid.*: 60),

i osećanjima usklađenim sa tim vezama; a isto tako i sila lične ljubavi i časti ili odanosti nekoj velikoj stvari, ili jednom idealnom interesu poput religije i nauke, ili nekoj vrsti društvenog blagostanja – takve su sile istaknute u tragičnoj radnji [...]” (Bredli u: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 560).

³³⁹ „u Šekspira se tragedija uvek odnosi na ljude „visokog položaja,” često na kraljeve ili kneževe; ako ne onda na prvake u državi [...]” (*Uscūo*).

³⁴⁰ „[...] priča o trijumviru, princu ili generalu imaće vlastitu uzvišenost i veličajnost. Njegova sudbina pogađa blagostanje celog naroda ili kraljevstva; i kad on padne iznenada sa visine zemaljske veličine u prašinu, njegov pad stvara osećaj kontrasta, čovekove bespomoćnosti i svemoći – možda hira – Sreće ili Sudbine, kojoj nijedna priča iz privatnog života ne može biti ravna.” (*Uscūo*: 560–561).

³⁴¹ „suštinska tragičnost jeste rascep bića i sudaranje unutarnjeg moralnog suštastva [...]” (*Uscūo*: 60). „I jedna i druga sila koje se nadmeću u pravu

two demands that exclude each other and that are so contradictory to each other that they cannot be reconciled in one being. Because of this conflict, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are constantly between two extremes, between what they are by themselves and what circumstances dictate to them to be.

“Both the competing forces are right for themselves and to that extent the demand of each of them is equally justified; but the right of each of them is imprinted in error, because each is blind to the right of the other, and seeks that absolute supremacy that does not belong to any one exclusively, but to the whole of which they are only parts” (*Ibid*: 60).

And that whole is a balanced personality.

Hamlet is always looking for something that will help him understand the strangeness of the life he is just getting used to. And in the play it is clear that

“[...] Hamlet’s whole personality is in conflict not with an opposing spiritual force, but with circumstances, and even more, with difficulties in his own nature”³⁴² (*Ibid*: 64).

In the conflict between hesitation and the duty of revenge on his father’s murderer and dogma and revenge on the murderers of his own brother,

“it is tragic that respect for one necessarily entails offense against the other”³⁴³ (*Ibid*: 62),

says Bradley. That is why making a decision is so difficult.

su za sebe i sve dotle je zahtev svake od njih jednako opravdan; ali pravo svake od njih je utisnuto u zabludu, jer je svaka slepa za pravo druge, i traži onu apsolutnu prevlast koja ne pripada nijednoj isključivo, već celini čiji su oni samo delovi” (*Исцѐо*: 60).

³⁴² „[...] cela Hamletova ličnost u sukobu ne sa jednom protivnom duhovnom silom, već sa okolnostima, i još više, sa teškoćama u vlastitij prirodi” (*Исцѐо*: 64).

³⁴³ „tragično je što poštovanje jedne nužno povlači ogrešenje o drugu” (*Исцѐо*: 62).

In *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, the question of the protagonist's ethics is one of the central ones, with the ethical uncertainty of both in situations that require them to make a decision playing an important role.

The importance of religion in the works is reflected in Nuruddin's experience of serving Islam and "Islamist dogma"³⁴⁴ (Petrović 1981: 42), which limits his personal identity to the point of not having it. This changes after learning about his brother's death. This is the moment when Nuruddin is unmasked. Then the man in him appears, still claiming to act as a servant of God, but in fact he serves the destructive passion of hatred which, although negatively marked, is a characteristic of man, not of a dervish. This is the moment when Ahmed Nuruddin acquires his personal identity.

At the beginning of the novel, religion is a shield behind which the dervish Ahmed Nuruddin hides, deaf and blind to everything else, to others, to himself. There is Allah, there is *the Holy Book*, there is a tekke, there is a mosque, there is an Order. There is a belonging to all of this, as the basis of his social identity. At that time, Ahmed Nuruddin still does not have a personal identity. Dervishism is an Apollonian mask, based on appearances. It is also an (anti)mask because the dervish does not realize that appearances are just that – appearances. But it is a mask, because the emphasis on the dervish title is the way in which Ahmed Nuruddin presents himself in a social context, expecting respect based on his rank.

Hamlet is torn between the moral obligation to avenge his murdered father and thereby fulfill the request of his father's Ghost and his hesitation to do so when the opportunity presents itself, while Claudius is vulnerable, on his knees praying, easy prey for someone who wants his head. Hamlet knows that he should do it, he is aware that he should kill Claudius and thus carry out blood revenge, but he does not do it until the very end. Despite reproaching himself for not doing it, he still does not do it.

³⁴⁴ „[...] Islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

“Bradley located the tension Hegel speaks of between the drive for self-determination in the hero and the external determination of his character, i.e. in Shakespeare, he found it within the character. [...] Hegel’s ‘conflict of the spirit’, that is, the conflict of those forces that govern man’s will and actions, such as the state and the family [...] in Shakespeare, Bradley believes, is a conflict of the spirit within a single self, which is perhaps best seen in the examples of Hamlet”³⁴⁵ (Bečano-
vić-Nikolić 2007: 89).

Hamlet is torn between loyalty to his family, the state, and himself. Ahmed Nuruddin is torn between loyalty to his family, his brother, the “Islamist dogma”³⁴⁶ (Petrović 1981: 42), the Order, and, in the second part of the novel, to himself.

Ahmed Nuruddin refuses to fight more intensely for his brother because he is constrained by the principles of Islam, which presupposes family laws. He is more attached to the title of dervish than to his family and brother, and therefore he is more determined and ready to leave Harun’s life to God’s will. But he still goes to the political authorities in kasaba to ask about Harun. He does not claim whether Harun is guilty or not, he asks. But what he asked about him, for the dervish of the Mevlevi tekke, is tantamount to humiliation. He has come down from his religious heights and humbled himself for his blood. And yet, the fact that he humbled himself is more important to him. His feelings are more connected to the surrogate family he found behind the walls of the tekke than to his primary family, which is why his reaction to Harun’s imprisonment is lukewarm until he learns that he had been killed.

³⁴⁵ „Bredli je napetost o kojoj govori Hegel, između poriva za samoodređenjem u junaku i spoljašnje određenosti njegovog karaktera smestio, tj. kod Šekspira, pronašao unutar lika. [...] Hegelov ‘sukob duha’, to jest sukob onih sila koje vladaju čovekovom voljom i činovima, poput države i porodice [...] kod Šekspira je, smatra Bredli, sukob duha unutar jednog jedinog sopstva, što se možda najbolje vidi na primerima Hamleta” (Bečano-
vić-Nikolić 2007: 89).

³⁴⁶ „[...] islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

Then an avenger awakens in him, brimming with hatred. Up until that moment, his actions were in accordance with absolute adherence to religious dogma. For him, religion was above everything else in life. He subordinated everything to it, surrendered himself completely to it, with his whole being, renounced himself and love, agreed to a failed life, but the veil fell from his eyes after Harun's murder. Something woke up in him, something buried, which had been sleeping under the dervish robe all those years, but was still present, like the need to judge and pass judgment, which is why he became a kadi.

The moment of his brother's death is the moment when Ahmed Nuruddin ceases to be a dervish, a spiritual leader, and becomes not just a man, but an embittered man who realizes that the world he thought he lived in does not exist. That is the moment when an inner conflict begins within him. Instead of fighting for his brother, returning to his roots and crossing the bridge that separates him from his father, a desperate old man who has already said goodbye to one son within himself, he decides on a path of revenge that will end with his death.

In both *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, the moral worldview of the two heroes is called into question. A.S. Bradley writes the following in the same essay:

“The essential tragedy is the split of being and the clash of the inner moral essence; not so much the war of good against evil, as the war of one good against another. Both these separate forces confront each other, making the demands irreconcilable”³⁴⁷ (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 60).

Both protagonists are like a pendulum swinging between two irreconcilable extremes, which leads to an inner conflict within them. They are torn between the fight for their dead and the internal blockage that does not give them the right to fight.

³⁴⁷ „Suština tragičnosti jeste rascep bića i sudaranje unutarnjeg moralnog suštastva; ne toliko rat dobra protiv zla, koliko rat jednog dobra sa drugim. Obe ove izdvojene sile suočavaju se međusobno, čineći zahteve neizmirivim” (Bradley u: Stojanović (pr.) 1984: 60).

“Both one and the other force are right in themselves and so far the demand of each of them is equally justified; but the right of each of them is imprinted in delusion, because each is blind to the right of the other, and seeks that absolute supremacy that does not belong to any exclusively, but to the whole of which they are only parts”³⁴⁸ (*Ibid*).

Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin must decide between lethargy, apathy, unwillingness to act because their being opposes it, and the decision to take revenge.

In Hamlet, passivity is present until the last scene of the play, and in Nuruddin in the first part of the novel, in which, under the pretext of serving the faith, he refuses to fight for Harun. He is only initiated into action, disastrous, devastating, Machiavellian, wrongly motivated, in the second part of the novel, after he learns of Harun's death, which releases hatred in him. In the second part of the novel, Nuruddin thinks about the consequences in Machiavellian categories. How sacrificing of Hadji Sinanuddin will lead to the fulfillment of his goal – the final showdown with the rulers of the town, Harun's murderers, whose place he will literally take, becoming a judge instead of a judge and a Machiavellian (instead of a Machiavellian). In the first part of the novel, he does not think. The *Koran* does it for him. Hamlet, unlike the dervish, thinks, most often in the key of Christianity.

“Hamlet's hesitation throughout the entire plot of the play is conditioned by filial love and the urge for revenge and moral feelings that do not allow such an act”³⁴⁹ (Ćosović 2020: 41).

In Hamlet, there is his inner disagreement regarding the act of taking revenge in accordance with the guidelines of his father's Ghost.

³⁴⁸ „I jedna i druga sila koje se nadmeću u pravu su za sebe i sve dotle je zahtev svake od njih jednako opravdan; ali pravo svake od njih je utisnuto u zabludu, jer je svaka slepa za pravo druge, i traži onu apsolutnu prevlast koja ne pripada nijednoj isključivo, već celini čiji su one samo delovi” (*Истио*).

³⁴⁹ „Хамлетово двоумљење током целокупне радње драме условљено је синовском љубављу и поривом за осветом и моралним осећањима која не допуштају такво дело” (Ћосовић 2020: 41).

Hamlet thinks about the potential consequences. For him, it is not a question of the act, but a question of what that act entails. It is about the consequences. Hamlet sees the bigger picture and guards his anger. He does not allow it to blind him, so he weighs what he should do. This makes it difficult for him to choose.

This does not exist with Ahmed Nuruddin. He is guided by personal injury and allows it to completely engulf and control him. He is full of hatred. It is the motivation behind his actions. His moral downfall lies in the fact that from a man devoted to the service of religion and its rules, he became an avenger and thereby betrayed both his past and future self, condemning his present self to death.

What the Machiavellian heroes in both pieces of writing represent is unadulterated, primordial moral evil (Bradley in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 576–577), and “evil appears everywhere only as something negative, unfruitful, powerless, destructive, as the principle of death”³⁵⁰ (*Ibid*: 577). In both works, the main characters face moral evil within themselves and around them.

“The main source of the upheaval that causes suffering and death is never good in Shakespeare’s tragedy: good only supports this upheaval by its tragic intertwining with its opposite in one and the same character. The main source, on the contrary, in every case is evil; and moreover, it is [...] in almost all cases evil in the full sense – not mere imperfection, but complete moral evil”³⁵¹ (*Ibid*: 576–577).

This evil is embodied in the motives of crime and revenge, and its bearers are Machiavellian heroes, but also protagonists, who use the same methods as Machiavellian heroes on their path of revenge.

³⁵⁰ „zlo se svuda pojavljuje samo kao nešto negativno, neplodno, nemoćno, razorno, kao načelo smrti” (*Mcūo*: 577).

³⁵¹ „Glavni izvor potresa koji izaziva patnju i smrt nikad nije dobar u Šekspirovoj tragediji: dobro potpomaže taj potres samo svojom tragičnom prepletenošću sa svojom suprotnošću u jednom te istom karakteru. Glavni izvor, naprotiv, u svakom slučaju, jeste zlo; i ono je štaviše [...] u maltene svim slučajevima zlo u punom smislu – ne puka nesavršenost, nego potpuno moralno zlo” (*Mcūo*).

The strongest division of these two literary heroes is that between their two selves, two “I”s – the experiential one and the transcendental one, transcendental apperception (Milić 2000: 36), which is characterized by an absolute belief in transcendent ideals: for Nuruddin, this is “Islamist dogma”³⁵² (Petrović 1981: 42), and for Hamlet, these are the humanistic ideals of man on the border of two ages the old, feudal and the new, modern. The relationship between these two “I”s could be described as the relationship between the inner and the outer.

The inner is the natural, innate, biological, what the heroes themselves are, their personal autonomy: emotional, mental and spiritual, and the outer is the voice of the Other within them, the externally imposed authority, the ideological matrix and the mold it imposes like a mace on an animal’s head that narrows its horizon and does not allow it to look at any other side than the one it is exclusively required to look at.

Our own “I” is that which is unconditioned by the voice of the Other, it is our own, immanent to us, what we really feel, think, a worldview that is not shaped by the Other, nor imposed from without, that is not determined by doctrine, our social position, ideology, belonging to a collective or the rank we occupy within a community, religious, political, social or any other, it is the self in itself, our personal identity, the true, authentic, private, original “I”, the identity of Hamlet as a son, a man, a lover and Nuruddin as a son, brother and lover.

This is the essence of the Nietzsche’s understanding of the subject. For him, the subject is a multitude, a “I” divided within itself. Being divided, the subject is never one whole person, grounded in itself, but is always in between, always on some border, on neither side, always “nowhere”. Ethically, it is a position of neutrality, non-interference, ignorance, non-participation, escape, turning a blind eye, lacking the courage to confront, showing no interest or sincere disinterest, a position in which, until the very moment of revenge, both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are entrenched, hesitant in their contemplativeness and contemplative in their hesitation.

³⁵² „islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

In order for a person to be realized, to acquire his wholeness, whether he is a man or woman of flesh and blood or “merely” a literary hero, they must determine themselves. Determination requires the strength of will, taking sides, interference, participation, struggle, even if it is a quixotic struggle against windmills, the mark of moral idealism.

Both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin are between indeterminacy and determination. Indeterminacy is the thought of an act. Determination is the act itself. They are in between.

In other words, in order for us to believe in ideals, they must be an inherent part of us, our original conviction and the very core of our being. This is one of the reasons for the dervish's tragedy. He does not have this conviction. He did not become a dervish, a member of the Mevlevi order, because he is a believer; he became one because the girl he loved had to marry another man while he was participating in a war thinking he would not come back. He was not inspired by faith as a vital need to submit himself to it and to make his life a function of his belief in the ideal, but rather it was the path of least resistance, an expression of his disgust for one woman, a woman who had already belonged to another man, and which he projected not only onto other women, but onto the whole world, becoming “*Light of Faith*”³⁵³ (Selimović 2018: 20) far enough away from people, both physically and spiritually and figuratively. The tekke, dervishism, “Islamist dogma”³⁵⁴ (Petrović 1981: 42) thus became his “nutshell” (Shakespeare, trans. Simić and Pandurović, 2022: 51), the one mentioned by Hamlet. The dervish's dervishism is not real, it is a lie, a deception, an illusion, a deception, a mirage, a mask that is an anti-mask because he does not yet possess the awareness of his own mirage, but will acquire it. He has appropriated the position of a dervish. Since it is not something immanent to his being, we can call it external.

Hamlet truly believes in God. In the idealized image of a mother, a woman, a natural father, the world. He believes in the torments of

³⁵³ „(...) с в ј е т л о в ј е р е (...)” (Селимовић 2004: 12).

³⁵⁴ *Исџо*.

the afterlife, moreover, in meeting the Ghost of his father, he has also met them. He truly believes in hell, he fears it and therefore hesitates. He believes in the presumption of innocence and doubts his “prophetic soul” (Hamlet, I.5.40). And therefore he hesitates. He is torn between thoughts of life and death, of his life and his death, not only between doing and not doing, but between being and not being. His faith does not allow him to submit to the demands of his time, to the feudal course of blood feud. It is his foundation, it is deeply embedded in his being, his inner being has completely identified with it, as the dervish Ahmed Nuruddin did, believing that he believed with his whole being. Faith in Hamlet is an integral part of him. What is not immanent to Hamlet’s personality is the duty of revenge. That is why we can call the Ghost’s order external.

According to Nietzsche, the difference between the inner and the outer in an individual is a mask. The potentiation of the outer is disguise. It is a consciously chosen weapon with which to achieve some goal: to hide our true position and our true (mostly final) intentions, to protect us from the Dionysian reality that is so contrary to everything we are that we do not have the capacity to deal with it, to fight against it and to separate us from the rest of the community and to achieve some benefit from this distinction.

At the same time, we also find duality in literary heroes. It does not apply exclusively to Hamlet, but to all dramatic heroes, but also to Ahmed Nuruddin, although he is the hero of the novel. Namely, Shakespeare’s heroes can be viewed as types, in which case they inherit the universality of human behavior, or as individuals. Ahmed Nuruddin, of course, is not a dramatic hero, but this observation by Kostić applies to him on the basis of his multidimensionality as a literary character. Neither he nor Hamlet are simple, one-dimensional characters that we can define as heroes or antiheroes, good or evil, who are simply differentiated and constructed as exclusively black or exclusively white. That is why there is both the Apollonian and the Dionysian in them, as Nietzsche defines the two principles. In both, the crucial nuances, the combination of black and white, are crucial, because both have

complex causes for their actions, which cause tectonic moral and emotional upheavals in the essence of both characters. We cannot observe them for themselves, separated and alienated, although they are or try to be so by their behavior, but even their negative attitude towards the world in which they live is still an attitude towards that world. This is not a lack of attitude.

The sheikh once fought against the enemies of faith. The sheikh still fights against the enemies of faith, but he has changed his weapon. Instead of a sword, he uses the Koran, which he uses as a stick on the basis of which he orients himself in life. The dervish order filled his mind with "thoughts – frames" (Egerić 1982: 20) within which there are verses and suras as rules for a humble life dedicated to the service of God.

He is a thinking being who compensates for the lack of doing and justifies the lack of action with contemplation. These thoughts are most often contradictory to each other, as they are to himself. The sheikh of the tekke evaluates events through dogmatic glasses. "Islamist dogma" (Petrović 1981: 42) is the way he condemns the world around him: those who rush towards sin in the night in which Is-haq appears, who may be guilty, who may be a murderer and is not worthy of the dervish's sublime thoughts colored with the general, collective and impersonal, Hasan, who is too... Hasan, a greedy teapot and indifferent townspeople.

The dervish forgot his "I". He surrendered to Islam and became its soldier, literally. Ahmed Nuruddin is not someone, but something. Ahmed Nuruddin is not Ahmed Nuruddin, but a dervish of the Mevlevi tekke who is unsuccessfully trying to become Ahmed Nuruddin, a man. Ahmed Nuruddin is a dervish. Ahmed Nuruddin is also a man. He is "*Light of Faith*"³⁵⁵ (Selimović 2018a: 20) steeped in the darkness of his own "I", split into two parts: "I", Ahmed Nuruddin, his "empirical apperception"³⁵⁶ (Milić 2000: 35) and "I", sheikh Ahmed Nuruddin, his "transcendental apperception"³⁵⁷ (*Isto*: 36), which is

³⁵⁵ „[...] с в ј е т л о в ј е р е [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 12).

³⁵⁶ „[...] empirijska aperpcija” (Milić 2000: 35).

³⁵⁷ „[...] transedentalna aperpcija” (*Isto*: 36).

the same as the Not-”I”. He is not an authentic being. Not yet. He will become one. But in the process of becoming he will rely entirely on hatred. Hence the failure.

Fed up with the ideology imposed on him, without the right to personal choice, independence, the need for freedom and love are incomprehensible categories for the dervish, and he renounces them irrevocably, endangering his own existence. He who defends the word of God is sinful before others, before himself and before the One behind whose skirts he has hidden in the calligraphic lines of the Koran embroidered by the hand of Mullah-Yusuf. Hostage of his own sin, Ahmed Nuruddin is the god Janus. He has two faces and both can be true just as both can suffer from a lack of credibility and integrity in his blood. The sheikh, namely, suffers from a lack of individuality.

Ahmed Nuruddin, losing love, lost his self and agreed to be a slave to faith, burying within himself a man who refuses to die. Complete identification with the acquired dervish function nullifies the human in a man and turns him into a dervish, a former man. Ahmed absolutely renounced Nuruddin and believed even more absolutely in himself – sheikh Nuruddin. The two of them share the same shell within which there is a man, blessed and cursed, deprived of humanity and the possibility of building primordial, deep and unbreakable bonds with others. But also with themselves. Ahmed Nuruddin and sheikh Nuruddin flee from the world because neither of them knows how to cooperate with him and both turn their backs on him, each for their own reasons.

The dervish retreats into the interior of the tekke, thereby establishing his own boundaries. They are not only physical, but also psychological. By withdrawing from others, he increasingly fled into himself. The dervish in the human shell filled the undeniable Islamic truths of which he convinced himself after renouncing love, thus voluntarily ceasing to be Ahmed and inventing a new self in the form of sheikh Nuruddin.

Ahmed Nuruddin is a shooting star whose fall is undeniable and constant. He falls into himself, wanting to rise from himself at all costs

as the bearer of the title. That is why the title of dervish is important. It is a screen. That robe of the defender of the faith is a showcase in which, at first glance, Aladdin's magic lamp of dedication, loyalty and service burns. The supporting pillars, however, are rotten, eroded by the sin of a fallen human being who gave himself the right to renounce the meaning of life. And since then he has been constantly looking for it in all the places where it certainly does not exist, convincing himself that both he and the meaning are equally real. "There is a purpose, I said, shielding myself from terror, yet I could not find it"³⁵⁸ (Selimovic 2018a: 28).

In her book *Philosophy in Hamlet*³⁵⁹, Jasminka Marić argues:

"The tragedy Hamlet moves from a feeling of absurdity, meaninglessness, nihilism (abandonment, absence of being and spirit) towards its antipode, to a feeling of deep religious meaning, the conviction that there is some deeper and ultimate meaning in all these sinister events on the stage, and therefore, the meaning of human existence"³⁶⁰ (Marić 2015: 182).

In *Death and the Dervish*, this process is reversed. The sheikh tries to find himself under the lantern of Hasan's kindness, with which he tried in vain to open Nuruddin's eyes, in whose humanity he believed even when it could not be felt under the layers of painful alienation and the need to be an advocate for one's own and an executioner for the mistakes of others. He, the Orthodox tragedian. That is why he does not understand Hasan's noble motives. Dervish does not understand humanity in its purest and most sublime form. He sinned because he was not illuminated by the light of love, but by the magma of darkness

³⁵⁸ „Има смисла, говорио сам бранећи се од ужаса, али га нисам проналазио” (Селимовић 2004: 19).

³⁵⁹ Marić, Jasminka, *Filozofija u Hamletu*, Alfa univerzitet, 2015.

³⁶⁰ „Tragedija Hamlet se kreće od osećanja apsurdna, besmisla, nihilizma (napuštenosti, odsustva bića i duha) ka svom antipodu, do osećana dubokog religioznog smisla, do ubeđenja da postoji neki dublji i krajni smisao u svim tim zlokočnim događajima na sceni, a samim tim, i smisao ljudske egzistencije” (Marić 2015: 182).

in the labyrinth soul of a man whose heart was bitten and thus his light was darkened.

Ahmed Nuruddin finds himself in a dialogical position, a position based on conflict. Its foundation is the inner conflict in Ahmed Nuruddin that is projected onto his relations with the physical world outside the walls of the tekke, which is not in accordance with the dervish's adopted standards, not so rarely double. He cannot be simultaneously what he is and what he must be. So he decided to be one of the two and put on a mask. The dervish is in conflict with the memory of the woman from his youth, whose loss is the reason why he was missed.

The memory takes on a physical outline in the form of a teapot, which has a disturbing effect on the dervish's senses. Another conflict is the one in which he exists together with his biological family. The dervish "resolved" this conflict by almost completely separating himself from them. He found a replacement for them in a family gathered around the service of the same faith because they were indoctrinated in the same way and put into an identical mold without the right to think about rebellion. The dervish is an anti-Is-haq at heart. The surrogate family became the scenery for a play in which he is no longer Ahmed Nuruddin, but the Sheikh of the tekke.

He renounced the name and the man who existed under him, and cocooned himself in the title, believing that it meant the same to him as to everyone else. That is why he reacts impetuously to the undisguised lack of admiration, perceiving it as a personal betrayal. For he is all he is, a dervish. He is his title. And nothing but it. He perceives the disregard for his title as an attack on his new self. And again, Ahmed Nuruddin does not rebel, but "*Light of Faith*"³⁶¹ (Seli-mović 2018a: 20) in him rebels. The essence of religious education lies in this consistency, a consistency that rejects any improvisation, any personal experience. In this way, the authority of the church as a religious institution remains intact.

³⁶¹ „[...] с в ј е т л о в ј е р е [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 12).

The dervish is in conflict with the authorities, arrogant and repressive, because they have imprisoned his brother, who is innocent, and his every attempt to stand up for him, in the name of blood, is returned to him like a boomerang through poisonous arrows that carry the message that, by standing on his brother's side, the dervish is questioning his loyalty to the faith.

Nuruddin's consciousness is absurd because it generates contradictory thoughts about the same thing that cancel each other out. This is a sign of the struggle between man and dervish in him. Nuruddin, the dervish, thinks some thoughts, and Ahmed, the man, thinks some thoughts. The problem lies in the discord between, the contradiction between these identities, and hence their thoughts. About his brother, Ahmed thinks like this:

“[...] I was bound to help him, if it were possible. It would have been unseemly for me to stand aside; I would have been reproached by everyone”³⁶² (Selimović 2018a: 84).

This thought, although human and brotherly, still contains a component of Nuruddin's narcissism – the opinion of other kasabali. Nuruddin cares about the opinion of the community.

The manipulation of those in power will sow the flowers of evil in Ahmed Nuruddin. Its most luxuriant bud will be hatred. Pure, untainted hatred, conspicuous and strong as the sound of an empty stomach. Directed at them, at individual enemies. And he himself will become his own enemy when he takes up the post of kadi, thereby sacrificing the man under the dervish robe on the altar of power.

The government has achieved its goal – it has completely subordinated the man to itself, dulled his blade, and deprived him of himself, because “all the forces of social repression are directed towards the disintegration of the personality as their primary task”³⁶³ (Petrović

³⁶² „[...] дужан сам да му помогнем, ако је могуће. Ружно би било да останем по страни, свако би ми замјерио” (Селимовић 2004: 80).

³⁶³ „sve sile društvene represije okrenute su prema dezintegraciji ličnosti kao svom osnovnom cilju” (Petrović 1981: 64).

1981: 64). Their repression succeeds when a man disintegrates from within and agrees to be someone he is not, and who, perhaps, secretly, has been all along.

Ahmed Nuruddin is in conflict with the townspeople because he thinks they didn't protest enough when he was locked up in the fortress and going through the hopelessness of feeling alone in the world, that no one is coming, that the light at the end of the tunnel is a lie and that there is nothing sublime in death, nothing comforting, as the holy books present it. There is only blackness, only emptiness and only nothingness. And the fear of dying alone. Another sin on Ahmed Nuruddin's soul. "*Light of Faith*" (Selimović 2018a: 20) has gone out again.

Ahmed also clashes with people who try to get close to him and give him a little of their own humanity with which to melt his dervish heart. But the dogma in him is sown deep and he fails to deceive the quicksand of ideology that has swallowed him up long ago and now only a shell walks around looking like a man. Hasan and Is-haq, two strange beings that he fails to understand. And the only two people who visit him in the fortress the way he did not visit Harun. Hasan and Is-haq, messengers of hope, spotlights at the end of the inner dark tunnel of a man who was forced to renounce the human in himself.

As a contemplative being, the dervish is unable to make a decision and stand behind it. Every thought of his has two parts, what he thinks and its opposite. The dervish analyzes too much, which makes the decision-making process impossible.

"Indecision, elementalism, cowardice – nothing is brought to the end. The true dervish way. There is no enthusiasm, no honest decision: to do or not to do. Everything is ethically indefinite"³⁶⁴ (Lagumdžija 1975: 154).

That is why the environment acts. Sheikh Nuruddin chose to hide in the sacred words from which wisdom oozes like honey from a honeycomb.

³⁶⁴ „Неодлучност, стихија, кукавичлук – ништа није доведено до краја. Прави д е р в и ш к и начин. Нема заноса, нема поштене одлуке: учинити или не учинити. Све етички неодређено” (Lagumdžija 1975: 154).

They refer to all others except for the one who found it easiest to learn them by heart in order to hide behind them until he had completely assimilated their patterns, similar to those created, with the patience of a saint, by Mullah-Yusuf, traitor and savior, spy and benefactor, one of the people, and they could be counted on the fingers of one hand, who in life only wanted Ahmed as a friend, and spent their lives with sheikh Nuruddin, distant and inaccessible, who could not be Ahmed to them, because he could not be Ahmed in front of him either, but always only sheikh Nuruddin, an official of his rank and his humble servant.

That landmark can only be love. By rejecting it, Ahmed Nuruddin became his own victim. Until he mixes hate and love, sheikh Ahmed Nuruddin is disturbingly neutral, skilled at not caring enough about anything to fight for it. If Ahmed Nuruddin once believed in anything other than the religious axioms of Islam, sheikh Nuruddin certainly does not. He fears the freedom to be independent, that the only god Ahmed Nuruddin recognizes is Ahmed Nuruddin. The sheikh has learned to fear the individual, individuality, and action. The thought of freedom is tantamount to sin. Wanting to convince himself and others that he is acting according to the dictates of conscience, he advocates a strict structure and order in which, due to the meaninglessness of his existence resulting from the loss of love, he finds meaning.

Sheikh Nuruddin is deprived of the need to determine the moral categories of good and bad, right and wrong, to weigh and measure several times before cutting according to his own conscience and, in the end, to live with his decision. The dervish order thought for him. It guided him with its strict statute.

“Nuruddin does not live in life but in the illusion of life in which serving the Islamic ritual is called serving the faith”³⁶⁵ (Petrović 1981: 41).

³⁶⁵ „Nuruddin ne živi u životu nego u iluziji života u kojoj je služenje islamističkom ritualunazvano službom veri” (Petrović 1981: 41).

Ahmed Nuruddin is not someone, but something. Ahmed Nuruddin is not Ahmed Nuruddin. He is a dervish of the Mevlevi tekke, “[...] an expression of a doctrine”³⁶⁶ (*Ibid*: 46) who unsuccessfully tries to become Ahmed Nuruddin, a man.

The seeds of absurdity are sown in the dervish’s understanding of the world in which being orthodox means believing only in Allah. In the name of this true faith, he goes to battle against the unbelievers, risking the meaning of his own existence embodied in love. The rank of dervish was supposed to ensure the respect of others. And even more: self-respect and social status. Ahmed Nuruddin is nobody and nothing. Sheikh Nuruddin is a title with which he separated himself from his peasant origin and poverty. In a word, from himself.

The dervish renounced love only because he did not have it himself and did not know what to do with it. He is offended, afraid, sinful, he chooses the wrong steps out of sadness and despair, indecisive, guilty, he betrayed an innocent man, his own brother, and there is no law that will pardon him.

“Dogmatic, rational entrapment does not allow the warm, emotional core of love for his brother to speak out in him and from him, rational discipline is stronger than feelings”³⁶⁷ (Gluščević 1981: 2034).

Beneath the dervish’s robe of a broken, former man on whom life fell as tragically as it could, placing war on his path of life, an orphan who would betray Harun but save Hassan’s life, the dogma of Islam, the arrogant officials of a cruel state apparatus that, like no other government, knows no mercy, beat the heart of one who should have been more of a man and less of a dervish.

Sheikh Nuruddin cannot forgive the fact that his brother, although innocent, was killed with the same bitterness with which he

³⁶⁶ „[...] izraz jedne doktrine” (*Ibid*: 46).

³⁶⁷ „Догматска, рационална учауреност не допушта да у њему и из њега проговори топло, емотивно језгро љубави према брату, рационална стега јача је од осећања” (Глушчевић 1981: 2034).

cannot forgive himself for hiding his suffering from the woman he loved alone. Between defending faith and defending love, he chose faith, wanting to appear a hero in his own eyes. Since then, he has chosen it every time he has had the opportunity to choose. He has wrapped himself in the skin of a man who does not actually exist and believed with his whole being that he is him because it is easier to become a dervish, to have behind him regulations that always and unmistakably concern someone else, not to get involved emotionally and personally, to remain desolate on the inside like a desert island, to run away from the individual, from the risks and responsibilities that life entails, than to be Ahmed Nuruddin in a world in which one word, which does not have to be either false or wrong, on the contrary, and Harun knows this best, can cost one's life.

Not strong enough to face the gambler's challenges on the Russian roulette of fate, Ahmed retreated into his dervish robe and made it a snail's nest into which he could retreat at any time and from anyone. It is the mask of his fear that forced him to surround himself with the impenetrable walls of the tekke in a desperate attempt to escape life, he, the future man of the law, a kadi instead of a kadi. Sheikh Ahmed Nuruddin voluntarily escaped from himself into the collective, into the safety of the tekke that is quasi-security in the name of self-punishment by celibacy.

"It was because of this woman, the only one I ever loved in my life, that I never married. It was because of her, whom I lost, because of her, who was taken away, that I became harder and more closed toward everyone: I remember feeling as if I had been robbed, and I would not give others what I could not give to her. Maybe I was taking revenge upon myself and people, involuntarily and unwittingly"³⁶⁸ (Selimović 2018a: 380–381).

³⁶⁸ „Због те жене, једине коју сам волио у животу, нисам се оженио. Због ње, изгубљене, због ње, отете, постао сам тврђи и затворенији према свакоме: осјећао сам се похаран, и нисам давао ни другима што нисам могао дати њој. Можда сам се светио себи, и људима, нехотице, и не знајући. Бољела ме, одсутна” (Селимовић 2004: 395).

The curse of losing love from Ahmed Nuruddin made sheikh Nuruddin, whose “*Light of faith*”³⁶⁹ (*Ibid*: 20) was extinguished in his own hatred. The arrows that had been fired returned and pierced his already broken heart, in which there was no warmth towards another human being, a young man who could have been his son, and whom sheikh Nuruddin experiences as a reminder of how he became the one he was not, hidden from himself and others for years in a tekke whose walls are huge and strong, like a fortress ready at any moment to repel an attack by the enemy. Or the one he thinks is the enemy. They are the line that divides people into those inside and those outside that line. The others, the rest. Who do not concern him. As long as they are not Harun.

These stone walls are an imaginary boundary between what happens every day on the battlefield called ordinary, everyday life and the intellectual space that celebrates the art of ignoring it. His life takes place in his head. Little outside his mind can be worthy of his attention, much less his action. He does not believe in reality. It is for him a relative category explained by the surahs, verses and other principles of the Koran. And it is valid until the moment of the murder of an innocent young man named Harun, who, by chance, is his brother.

Sheikh Nuruddin will transform himself, in front of everyone, into Ahmed Nuruddin during his speech in the mosque that marks the beginning of his transformation from righteous to rebel due to the death of his younger brother Harun, to whom he remained indebted to visit in the fortress, a comforting, human act, to know that someone is looking for him, that someone asks about him, that he will not die alone. Harun's death freed the dervish's heart from the canonical shackles. Out of nowhere, Ahmed Nuruddin, a man, appeared. And he wept with words. With their sincerity, the suffering of the individual became the suffering of all. The collective became one man. The dervish did this. The sheikh united them with each other and himself with them. He stripped himself, threw off his armor and showed that beneath the stone walls that his chest had become,

³⁶⁹ „[...] с в ј е т л о в ј е р е [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 12).

the heart of a man beats. Ahmed Nuruddin is a Prometheus who failed. But for a moment he was the one who brought fire to people.

Grief did not replace faith. It was embroidered, like a tapestry, by the absolute truths that had blossomed in his head and, at the age of forty, had sprouted into a dogmatic oak tree rooted in the constraining thoughts that someone else had felt, written down, guided by, perhaps assuming in them someone else's fate, someone else's tiny, individual life. And that someone was not Harun. There was only the hopelessness of the world outside the tekke, a safe harbor for a confused ship in human form, which had decided that sailing was a deadly disease and had chosen to rot in the mud of the shallows that tempted it Mephistophelianly in a lily-of-the-valley night pregnant with the wonders of the senses.

The scent of sin is brought by female ivory hands that summon the memory of a beloved woman into the consciousness of a man vowed to live a life without lust, awakening a long-forgotten desire. That is why memory is dangerous for the dervish. Because it reminds him of the human in him, buried alive, undead, completely in the narrow molds of Dogma within which the soul (and even the body) has no room to breathe. He lets even what concerns him most, such as his brother's misfortune, to which, until a certain moment, he determines himself completely disinterestedly, swell beside him. sheikh Nuruddin does not know how to bridge the distance from his rigid faith in Dogma that swallowed Ahmed Nuruddin and spat out a dervish incapable of empathy and compassion for those who suffer. "His service to faith for Nuruddin does not imply an emotional relationship but the erasure of that relationship [...]"³⁷⁰ (Petrović 1981: 40).

Even when Harun is killed, he initially shows no emotion, does nothing, thus completely nullifying himself and becoming invisible in the eyes of others, as if he does not exist, as if he is not a man, but a

³⁷⁰ „Njegovo služenje veri za Nuruddina ne podrazumeva emotivni odnos već brisanje toga odnosa [...]" (Petrović 1981: 40).

thing thrown on the road, and the question rightly arises whether he has them at all or whether the service of faith has managed to bury them with what is hoped to be Harun's bones.

A forty-year-old servant of faith at the crossroads between youth and old age, the *self* he knew, the self he thinks he knows, and the self he will become, has destroyed all the bridges that would lead from him to the other and from the other to him. Inside himself, his mind, and the tekke outside of which every step acts as a danger from which he must hide, flee, and which is best ignored, as if it were not part of the reality in which, at least formally, he lives. For Nuruddin, the doctrine is the only reference point on the basis of which he judges whether something should be done or not. Most often not. It is a weight on his internal moral scale that he did not build himself, but rather adopted and accepted as a transplanted organ that changes the one that is a real part of him.

Without the slightest doubt in the ideology that he represents, the dervish sees himself as a defender of faith, of universal principles above which nothing can be and from which there is nothing more important, not even individual life. Namely, sheikh Nuruddin firmly believes that a single life is less important than rules and principles. With this kind of thinking, due to the lack of elementary humanity, the dervish places the law of religion above family ties. The subject has once again defeated man. He has chosen "[...] confinement in false peace, in an imaginary idea of a well-ordered world, selfishness, self-deception [...]"³⁷¹ (Glušćević 1981: 2054).

The mask of the obedient believer who until then had cared nothing for his own, personal, least of all for his family, for his father and brother, had fallen off. Ahmed Nuruddin, the man, began to emerge. The meaning that until then he had found only and only in dogma began to crown itself like corn. The truth about life was emerging on the horizon of his unwavering illusion that began to collapse into the abyss of reality. Sheikh Nuruddin, who does not

³⁷¹ „[...] затварање у лажни мир, у измишљену представу о добро уређеном свету, себичност, самозаваравање [...]” (Глушчевић 1981: 2054).

exist otherwise than as a member of the dervish order, must face reality in all its cruelty, the one from which Ahmed Nuruddin, the man, fled into dogma. The basic reason for his flight should be sought in the rejection of love. Ahmed Nuruddin and sheikh Nuruddin, however, have one thing in common: they do not allow anyone to humanize them with love.

Rebellion is not his choice. He did not choose it. It was awakened in sheikh Nuruddin. It was a response to the injustice that had befallen his brother, and thus himself. It approached him like a poisonous snake whose venom he could not remain immune to. This is the turning point of the novel in which sheikh Nuruddin realizes that he can no longer hide behind the heavy walls of the tekke that defended him from the outside world whose existence he completely denied, passionate about the sacred truths that he declared universal and the only valid one. The dervish lives dying every day. His life, the pivot of which is dogma, is nothing other than a life in death based on withdrawal and permanent inaction, and not taking action is the worst sin he can commit. Alienated from himself, the dervish is deprived of the right to his own experiences, his own moral principles, an opinion that is not based on the Koran, a view of the world that differs from the view of the world through the lens of Islam. Sheikh Nuruddin overcame Ahmed Nuruddin, because "the source of his judgment of the world is not in himself, but outside of him"³⁷² (Petrović 1981: 49). Without the Order, he does not exist.

Sheikh Nuruddin is the only one who truly exists, because belonging to the Mevlevi dervish order gives him integrity and imposes an attitude towards values. Nuruddin has forgotten who Ahmed is. The sheikh is a thinking being, the embodiment of impersonal and sluggish contemplativeness, terrified by the possibility of setting off into the deep and unknown waters of action in whose waves he would have to swim and swim to the very life that both Ahmed Nuruddin

³⁷² „Izvorište njegovog prosuđivanja sveta nije u njemu samom no je izvan njega” (Petrović 1981: 49).

and sheikh Nuruddin fear. That is, at the same time, all he does. He thinks by assuming the truths of faith to be fundamental human values such as the life and death of a specific person, a person with a name and surname, an individual being, and not a being as a member of a multitude. For him, these are insignificant lives and equally insignificant deaths offered on the altar of sacrifice.

Life will remind him of who Ahmed is through a fugitive, a rebel fleeing from the clutches of the Sejm, a representative of the (quasi) law, to which he has done nothing wrong, but he is not chased, but hunted, like an animal, serving the system of police principles and regulations faithfully and wholeheartedly, just as Sheikh Nuruddin serves the tekke, faith and dogma.

Ahmed Nuruddin is “[...] a boy and a soldier, Nuruddin of one great love, Nuruddin, son and brother [...]”³⁷³ (Pervić in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1975: 26). Nuruddin is a dervish. Nuruddin is also a kadi. After all, he is an avenger. Among other things, Ahmed Nuruddin is also an artist. His soldier, dervish and kadi identities are socially constructed identities, slaves to the principles and voice of an external authority within himself. These identities are based on someone else’s thought. Ahmed Nuruddin is the one who is and who only pretends to be. He is a dogma. That is his mindset. It is his point of view, his perspective, the only truth he acknowledges, the only reality he knows.

He is a conglomerate of identities. His being consists of mutually opposing beliefs that divide his consciousness into two polarities. This is a prerequisite for absurdity. Ahmed Nuruddin is,

“[...] at first a fiery Islamic soldier, nourished by holy faith and rage against infidels, a believer, then an embodied contemplation of powerlessness and [...] a tragic hero of defeat [...]”³⁷⁴ (Egerić 2000: 27).

³⁷³ „[...] dečak i vojnik, Nuruddin jedne velike ljubavi, Nuruddin, sin i brat [...]” (Pervić u: Lagumdžija (pr.) 1975: 26).

³⁷⁴ „[...] на почетку ватрен, светом вером и бесом против неверника храњени исламски војник, верник, затим оличена контемплација немоћи и [...] трагични јунак пораза [...]” (Егерић 2000: 27).

Dogma is not an immanent part of his original being. The identities of son, brother and lover are his personal identity, his true nature. Of these three, the first two are biologically conditioned. Their defense is a *biological imperative* (Ivanov 2017: 384).

In the first part of the novel, the dominant ambivalence of the character of Ahmed Nuruddin is that between him as a brother and him as a dervish.

“The contradiction between what Nuruddin is and what he was as a sheikh becomes more and more intense; it is increasingly difficult to reconcile the urge and authenticity of being with the false consciousness with which it is bound”³⁷⁵ (Pervić in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1975: 28).

There is a split. He is “[...] a rebellion of life within himself, and against his false nature”³⁷⁶ (*Ibid*: 29). Dervishism is an appearance, a manifestation, the external, an illusion, a deception, a deception, an (anti)mask, because until the encounter with a Muslim, the dervish is not aware of the illusion in which he lives.

Dervishism is a form of service to the Islamic religion, and religion itself is a transcendent ideal (Fink 1981: 68) that imposes rigid moral principles and tenets that are, in Nuruddin’s consciousness, greater, more important, more valuable than the individual human being. He is blinded by the ideology of Islam and subordinated to it to the point of self-annihilation. That is why his hesitation is so painful. He hesitates whether to “... save his brother’s life, or to fulfill his moral obligation [...]”³⁷⁷ (Pervić in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1975: 30) by doing what he always does: stay on the sidelines and not interfere, being ethically ambiguous, as he has been until now.

³⁷⁵ „Protivurečnost između onoga što Nuruddin jeste i što je šejhom bio postaje sve intenzivnija; sve je teže usaglasiti poriv i autentičnost bića sa lažnom svešću kojom je ono sapeto” (Pervić u: Lagumdžija (pr.) 1975: 28).

³⁷⁶ „[...] pobuna života unutar njega samog, a protiv njegove lažne prirode” (*Isto*: 29).

³⁷⁷ „[...] da spase život svome bratu, ili da ispuni svoju moralnu obavezu [...]” (Pervić u: Lagumdžija (pr.) 1975: 30)

In doing so, he would betray the biological imperative (Ivanov 2017: 384) but would preserve his dervish dignity and the illusion of the purposefulness of serving the “Islamic dogma”³⁷⁸ (Petrović 1981: 42) at the cost of sacrificing his individual life. That life is the life of his innocently imprisoned and murdered brother. His self-respect, however, would remain intact.

“A dervish wants and must respect himself. That is Nuruddin’s basic starting point. [...] That is the religious aspect of his consciousness”³⁷⁹ (Petrović 1981: 10).

On the other hand,

“to side with one’s brother meant not only opposing the town and imperial leaders, tyranny and bureaucracy, but also oneself – the sheikh [...]”³⁸⁰ (Pervić in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1975: 31).

To oppose oneself as a dervish means to oppose another voice within oneself, to doubt, to question the ideology that shaped one for twenty years, for which one fought against heretical enemies, that would mean to endanger the building built on sand (Milošević 1978: 175) because,

“[...] to leave the realm of general thought is to doubt it”³⁸¹ (Selimović 2018a: 66).

And yet, to do the most humane thing possible, to ask about one’s brother, for a dervish it is humiliation, casting a shadow on the self-respect that is his imperative as a servant of ideological doctrine.

³⁷⁸ „Islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

³⁷⁹ „Derviš hoće i mora sebe da poštuje. To je Nuruddinovo osnovno polazište. [...] To je religijski vid njegove svesti” (Petrović 1981: 10).

³⁸⁰ „pristati uz brata značilo je ne samo suprotstaviti se kasabalijским i carskim prvacima, tiraniji i birokratiji, već i sebi – šejhu [...]” (Pervić y: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1975: 31).

³⁸¹ „[...] изаћи из круга опште мисли значи посумњати у њу” (Селимовић 2004: 60).

Nuruddin refuses to show humility. He seeks to preserve his imagined social superiority as the sheikh of the tekke. More than that, he seeks not to betray the basic principle of religious servility: the will of God. Nuruddin clings to this principle by assuming that God (Allah), a higher power in charge of individual human destiny:

“Doesn’t the Koran determine all relationships between people? We can apply the spirit of its principles to each individual case?”³⁸² (Selimović 2018a: 116)

By prioritizing his position and his blinding doctrine to saving his brother, he betrays *the biological imperative* (Ivanov 2017: 384) and nullifies himself as a human being because he nullifies his belonging to his biological family. The antithesis of Nuruddin’s dervishly rigid stance is Hasan, the embodiment of altruism and humanity. That is why he is a man, not a subject, because he is whole and undivided. He has rejected the position and chosen a personal identity based on freedom. Hasan is free. Nuruddin is not. He is trapped in the shackles of *thought – frames* (Egerić 1982: 20) that do not leave a space for a single human thought.

Nuruddin is not Ahmed, but “*Light of Faith*”³⁸³ (Selimović 2018: 20). Ahmed is the man within him. Nuruddin is a socially constructed identity, an (anti)mask. Ahmed is the substance, content, personal identity, the Self, the original, authentic being, the true nature. Interestingly, in the second part of the novel, both the injured brother and the offended sheikh, the grieving Ahmed and the humiliated Nuruddin, will give in to hatred.

Does Nuruddin believe? Nuruddin thinks he really believes. But in the first part of the novel, by serving faith, he only turns away from life, just as he will use faith as a justification for his revenge in the second part. His loyalty is tied to the institution of the Order, to the law, and not to the essence of faith, which is sincere belief.

³⁸² „Зар Куран не одређује све односе међу људима? Суштину прописа можемо примјенити на сваки појединачни случај” (Селимовић 2004: 113)

³⁸³ „[...] с в ј е т л о в ј е р е [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 12)

“Nuruddin’s faith is the support of a religious institution, but in it the personality does not necessarily find a support on which to build individuality”³⁸⁴ (Pervić in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1975: 35).

And again the split between the authentic personality and the dervish title, the public function, emerges. Ahmed Nuruddin is a Nietzschean subject, because he is a symbiosis of a multitude of identities mixed under his dervish robe that build him as a contradictory personality, as a subject.

Ahmed Nuruddin also hesitates.

“The split of sheikh Ahmed himself in this context, between religion and free choice of decision, norms and instincts, kanna and cognition, are marks and parts of his personal destiny, his private being”³⁸⁵ (Bogićević in: Lagumdžija (ed.) 1975: 52).

He oscillates between himself as a man, a private part of himself, his “empirical apperception”³⁸⁶ (Milić 2000: 35) and himself as a socially constructed identity, between man and title, his “transcendental apperception”³⁸⁷ (*Ibid*: 36).

One of the reasons why Nuruddin hesitates to save his brother is the fact that he does not feel it as what is right, but as a duty, just as Hamlet does not feel it is right to obey the Ghost and take revenge by killing Claudius. For him, it is a duty. An unpleasant, hateful duty, as Nuruddin experiences it.

There is, however, one important difference in the context in which Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin find themselves at that moment.

³⁸⁴ „Nuruddinova vera je oslonac jedne verske institucije, ali u njoj ličnost ne mora naći oslonac na kojem bi gradila individualnost” (Pervić y: Lagumdžija (pr.) 1975: 35).

³⁸⁵ „Raspolučenost samog šejh – Ahmeda u tom kontekstu, između religije i slobodnog izbora odluke, normi i nagona, kanna i spoznaje, oznake su i dijelovi njegove lične sudbine, njegovog privatnog bića” (Bogićević u: Lagumdžija (pr.) 1975: 52).

³⁸⁶ „empirijske apercepcije” (Milić 2000: 35)

³⁸⁷ „transcedentalne apercepcije” (Исцо: 36).

Namely, Hamlet's father, King Hamlet, is dead, quite certainly, as is Harun, but the dervish does not know this. He thinks that his brother is still alive. His imagination again plays an important role in his behavior. If Harun is alive, then asking about him makes sense, and his dilemma is as legitimate as the Hamlet's one about whom Novica Milić says that: "When he talks to himself, two voices speak through him, to be and not to be, but each through the other [...]"³⁸⁸ (Milić 2000: 142). In the dervish, two voices also prevail, the voice of Ahmed, brother and son, and the voice of Nuruddin, the dervish, which is especially emphasized in the scenes with the kadinica and Is-haq in which human life is at stake, Harun's and the fugitive's, and the decision-maker is Ahmed Nuruddin, a combination of both voices in one man, the bearer of both the Apollonian and Dionysian principles, just like Hamlet.

The dervish already demonstrates his kadi nature and his tendency to judge individual lives at his own discretion, just as the authorities did when they captured Harun, whom he asks about thinking he was alive. But since Harun is not alive, it is pointless to ask about a dead man. Then his dilemma disappears. This further means that the dervish's torment with his own conscience is unnecessary because it is too late, nothing can be done.

At the same time, this makes the dervish's position absurd because he will not help his dead brother. He cannot. Except perhaps in the scene with the kadi. He could have made a deal with her for the living brother, for his release, but his (dervish) self-love does not allow him to do so. Ahmed could have saved his brother, but Nuruddin was against it. She needs a favor that involves the dervish talking to her brother to convince him to renounce his inheritance so that he would not be disinherited, because that would socially stigmatize the family. She asks the dervish to intervene, to get involved.

This could be a test ground for asking for a favor in return, for her to obtain Harun's freedom from her husband. He imprisoned him, he

³⁸⁸ „Kad razgovara sa sobom, kroz njega govore dva glasa, to be i not to be, ali svaki kroz onaj drugi [...]" (Milić 2000: 142).

can free him. But he does not do it, aware that it would stain his dervish conscience. And he does not do it because he simply does not love his brother enough to elevate him as a value above his dervishism. That is his tragic mistake. He hesitates between brotherly love as a human principle that Ahmed represents and the dogma that Nuruddin serves.

One end of Nuruddin's hesitation is rooted in his duty as a man and a brother, and the other in his lack of the right to interfere with Allah's plan. His social position, his public office, his title of dervish expressly forbid him from doing so. Nuruddin is less hurt by the fact that Harun is imprisoned. He is offended:

"It was not anger, but insult. [...] I have completely transformed myself into her, she has become my world and my life, nothing exists outside of her" (Selimović, Meša, *Death and the Dervish*, Vulkan, Beograd, 2018: 76).

Just as hatred will overwhelm him in the second part of the novel, so he is now overcome by a feeling of insult. For the dark shadow of Harun's transgression dims his "*light of faith*"³⁸⁹ (*Ibid*: 20). It does not grieve him as a man, but insults him as a dervish, which indicates the Sheikh's narcissism.

Nuruddin tries to save his dogmatism at all costs. To Hasan's remark that saving human beings is imperative, the dervish responds dogmatically: "But I'm saving more: justice"³⁹⁰ (*Ibid*: 123). Hasan in vain thinks that he is talking about the imprisoned Harun with Ahmed, a man, son and brother. But he is talking to Nuruddin, a dervish.

"Nuruddin and his profession are the alter ego of power. Nuruddin is a representative of order"³⁹¹ (Petrović 1982: 21).

As a dervish, Ahmed Nuruddin represents power. The same power that kills his brother. The power that disgusts him when he is on the receiving end of its "mercy". The power, however, in which

³⁸⁹ „[...] с в ј е т л о в ј е р е [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 12).

³⁹⁰ „Ја спасавам више: правду” (Исто: 120).

³⁹¹ „Nuruddin i njegova profesija jeste alter ego vlasti. Nuruddin je predstavnik reda” (Petrović 1982: 21).

he participates gladly as a judge. And, finally, the power from which he suffers.

One of the places in the novel where it is best seen that dervishism is the reason for Ahmed Nuruddin's alienation is the war scene that begins the second part of the book. In that scene we have two types of relationships: one is the relationship between Ahmed Nuruddin and the individual soldier, the soldier as an individual, as a human being, an individual existence, and the other is the relationship between Ahmed Nuruddin and the soldiers – plural, as a collectivity, as a member of a community, as a subject in the sense of belonging to a collective identity. Nuruddin harbors disgust for the soldier in the singular, and loves the collectivity. In both cases, what is common is that both relationships are founded by Nuruddin, the dervish, and not Ahmed, the man. He acts as a representative of the community, he, after all, is fighting for Islam, for his religion, for the doctrine he serves, for the ideal he is a slave to.

Selimović gives us a picture of the whirlwind of war in which the soldiers find themselves. Among them is Ahmed Nuruddin. His isolation is striking. It is based on his dervishism, on the high level of development of his spiritual side as a dervish who cannot accept the mundane individual existence of the people around him who behave like animals, “[...] irritable and dangerous as wolves”³⁹² (Selimović 2018a: 216).

They committed crimes, both against each other and against the blue-eyed boy's mother, who relied on their biological and sinful urges and needs that she satisfied, which made her image pale in Nuruddin's eyes, accustomed to weighing his own and others' actions in accordance with Allah's scales of moral correctness. War extracts the last gram of humanity from a soldier, because the fight for one's own life does not leave much room for polishing one's own moral vertical.

Only Nuruddin took care of this by being visually conspicuously separated from the others, individuals for whom he did not harbor any good feelings, and who belonged to the collectivity in relation to which he uses the word love:

³⁹² „[...] раздражливи и опасни као вукови” (Селимовић 2004: 218).

“I saw them all together as a whole [...]. As individuals they were unimaginably insignificant. I did not despise them when I thought of them as a group, I even liked that hundred-headed creature a little, cruel and powerful as it was but I could not stand them individually. My love [...] was directed at all of them but not at any single one [...]”³⁹³ (*Ibid*: 217).

Feeling love for the collective, he justifies himself as a member of the Mevlevi order, as a cog in the mechanism that was responsible for ensuring that the mechanism functioned and that Islam was protected from the enemy against whom he fought together with the other soldiers. That is why their function as a collective is significant for Nuruddin. It provides him with cover for the idea that a higher goal requires certain sacrifices in both the literal and figurative sense.

The collective evokes a feeling of love in Nuruddin because he himself is part of the collective, where the general is always above the individual, where everyone serves the same ideal, and everyone is a function of their calling. He did not approve of their behavior, because the prism through which he evaluated that behavior was individuality, what each of them did individually in the function of expressing their being. When it came to collectivity, he loved it, as he says, because collectivity could deprive the prism of the individual and see it as a community serving a common goal. While the soldiers were scolding, he was absorbed in his mind, over a book, refusing to interfere, not giving the soldiers a reason to mock him again for pointing out the improper behavior that he himself had guarded against, which was inadequate to his calling and the moral scruples of Islamic exegesis by which he lived. In war, in a reality that showed its cruelty at every turn, Nuruddin was careful not to show that he was in pain, to suffer, and to keep his dervish worldview intact by participating in behavior that was not right by human or Allah's standards.

³⁹³ „Све сам их гледао као целину „[...]”. Појединачно били су не-појмиво безначајни. Нисам их презирао кад сам мислио о њима као о мноштву, чак сам помало и волио то стоголаво створење, сурово и моћно, али појединце нисам подносио. Моја љубав [...] тицала се свих а не једнога [...]” (Исто: 219).

The soldiers were aware of their shameful actions. These actions gnawed at their conscience, even though they had already been done and could not be undone. The military feast was often immoral. Nuruddin spent the time when there was no fighting in the war, “[...] disgusted with the people, feeling sorry for them, because they hid their eyes from each other all day, out of shame”³⁹⁴ (*Ibid*: 237).

He is turned towards himself, separated from the group of individuals with whom he fought by his unwillingness to participate in their inadequacies that were more befitting a herd than humans, and they were made up of humans. The soldiers were simple, arrogant, quarrelsome, and unruly. Nuruddin watched as “[...] the tent turned into a madhouse, into a cage of wild beasts [...]”³⁹⁵ (*Ibid*: 216) hardened by warfare in which life was lost as if it had never been, committing sin, both verbally and physically, in the glory of being still alive, of being among the few who remained. They fornicated with the mother of the blue-eyed boy, swore, used harsh words when addressing each other, and quarreled with each other. Nuruddin did not want to participate in this. That kind of behavior was alien to him. His moral compass, however, did not show him that this was the wrong direction: “[...] I was young and thought that it was part of the sacrifice”³⁹⁶ (Selimović 2018a: 216).

This is what Meša Selimović thought about the price his family paid for supporting the revolution. Here we see the transposition of the author's personal experience into the fabric of his work.

The soldiers behaved like any army, trying to survive the terrible reality that befell them. One way was to vent their fear of what they had been through and what awaited them the next day. For them, morality was not the most important value category in

³⁹⁴ „[...] згађен на људе, жалећи их, јер су цио дан скривали очи један од другога, због стида” (*Исџо*: 237).

³⁹⁵ „[...] се чадор претварао у лудницу, у кавез дивљих звери [...]” (*Исџо*: 218)

³⁹⁶ „[...] био сам млад и мислио да је то дио жртве” (Селимовић 2004: 218).

life, especially not on the battlefield where there were fewer of them every day. It was not known who would be next. But Nuruddin was honored to fight for Islam. He was not troubled by fear. He was troubled by the barbarity of those he fought with, and he did not oppose them enough, unlike Harun, who did oppose people much more dangerous than the crazy soldiers. Nuruddin was prevented from doing so by resentment.

“So most of the time I stayed alone, with a book or with my thoughts. I did not succeed in finding a single one of the men whom I would have wanted to befriend”³⁹⁷ (*Ibid*: 217).

As a dervish, he was accustomed to a philosophically pregnant thought that determines the rightness and wrongness of human action, that limits man and his existence by setting rules and principles according to which one should live, and that most often comes into conflict with man’s personal choice, with his will and effort to gain personal freedom, to ensure autonomy for his integrity. His mind was full of verses from the Koran, Allah’s thoughts are deep, difficult for anyone who does not possess the spiritual breadth necessary for their understanding. Nuruddin is not an ordinary soldier, he is a scholar, a fighter of Allah, a servant of Islam, morally upright, humble like any obedient servant, far from individual prosaism.

Everyday life does not evoke in him the peace that the Holy Book provides him, because it speaks of things that he has learned by heart, that interest him, that do not allow anything personal and individual to be more important than the general and collective, that prohibits the enjoyment of sin, pleasure, lust, excess and much else as an “ordinary” man is a slave to his needs, thoughts, drives and vices. The dervish understands that his profession separates him from other soldiers.

It is his point of strength in the chaos that is all around him, against which he has not raised his voice enough times, experienced

³⁹⁷ „Тако сам најчешће остајао сам, с књигом или са својим мислима, не успијевајући да учим ниједног јединог човјека с којим бих желео да се зближим” (*Исио*: 219).

insult, and stopped raising his voice because his self-love was hurt, and that is all he cares about. It is the basis of his dervish religiosity, his foundation. In several places in the novel, Nuruddin is seen to be offended when someone does not show respect for his title, as neither muslim's guard, nor Ali-hodja, nor musellim himself, as Hassan once did.

The dervish already mentions the defensive function of social position, which is equivalent to the defensive function of a mask. For him, it is a rank. As Nuruddin says, "[...] since, except for my calling, I was no different from them, I had no rank to protect me [...]"³⁹⁸ (*Ibid*: 217). This sentence shows Nuruddin's aspiration for a position that would be his shield, a shelter from the cruelty of the outside world, in which he thought it was pointless to resist its horror, because it was futile and pointless.

It provides protection and status and reduces the possibility of being attacked and oppressed, there are far fewer traps when rank is a support, it is much harder to attack a man in position than someone who is not, like Harun, rank allows power, and power guarantees defense. Nuruddin will testify that the powerful commit crimes and do not pay for them when they do. Rank also provides a nonchalant attitude towards the world which, however threatening, cannot threaten the one who has power with the same force with which he can "a civilian". Power is for Ahmed Nuruddin a prerequisite for protection.

Nuruddin had always been impressed by social status, title, position. He did not have that position, he did not acquire it by birth, but later in life, as a dervish and as a kadi. Nuruddin's fascination with social status is directly related to the fact that he had to acquire it and that he envied all those who held positions such as musellim, mufti and kadi, believing that this position gave them the right to be arrogant and haughty to the point of being able to

³⁹⁸ „[...] јер сам, изузев звања, био што и они, нисам имао чина који би ме бранио [...]" (Исто: 218–219).

show disrespect for him, his knowledge and his brother, as if it were a matter of course.

The war environment was the first environment in which he did not fit in. Already then he was a dervish, and he felt different from the crowd of his peers, even his equals, with whom he shared the fate of warriors. He was united with them by the higher goal with which he went to war, the defense of the faith, his social status, the position he found himself in, a bit of an attacker, a bit of a victim, depending on the luck, or rather lack thereof, of war. Everything else distinguished him from them. In battle and in the truce, when his fellow soldiers showed how much the war had influenced them to act on their biological instincts and give in to them, Ahmed did not do so. He befriended the blue-eyed six-year-old boy in an effort to spare him the horrors of war, and in an attempt to spare himself from the horrors that surrounded him, and against whom he did not raise his voice, whom he chose to ignore, creating a parallel reality that may have initially had the noble goal of protecting the boy from reality, just as he protected himself for the next twenty years.

All he wanted then, besides defending his faith with a knife, was to stand out in the reality he had created by attaching himself to a boy who had been orphaned in the war and had no one but Nuruddin. That orphan would play an important role in the play Ahmed Nuruddin would play in front of the young man he had saved, where it would be best seen why his mask is what it is, a mask, and why the scene in which Nuruddin appears masked can be compared to the “mousetrap” scene in a play. In the boy, Nuruddin first saw himself, then his brother, and finally his son, perhaps the one at the end of the novel. Mullah-Yusuf betrayed Harun. Nuruddin betrayed Hassan. Mullah-Yusuf saved Hassan. Nuruddin saved no one. Least of all himself.

Harsh weather conditions, cold and rain, fallen comrades, attacks and defenses, that was war. Nuruddin was part of the collective, but he tried to keep his distance from the others, and there were not many of them, to create some kind of space for himself in which he would not

share all the horrors of war life from which he could not physically escape. He felt it was his duty to fight for Islam, even at that time the "Islamist dogma"³⁹⁹ (Petrović 1981: 42) was too strong in him, he was proud of being on the side of the orthodox, of protecting the will of Allah, in which he had always believed alone, even when it required the sacrifice of an individual life, always someone else's.

The circumstances of war, the mud from the rain, the spring that looked more like winter than there was anything springy about it, the heat, the vast plain that served as a battlefield, croaking frogs, mosquitoes, umbrellas that revealed the lowest instincts in man, gambling and swearing, all this surrounded Nuruddin. He shared the fate of those around him, trying to escape it, feeling all the torment of his position. "It was a dog's life, which I led with outward calm, in no way showing that it was hard for me [...]"⁴⁰⁰ (Selimović 2018a: 216).

Each of them individually was a pale, invisible shadow for Nuruddin that he did not care about, an individual person did not interest him, he did not want to establish contact with a single person, with any of them.

The dervish is far away, filled with his own thoughts, he sits and reads in the horrors of war, isolated in his spirituality, in what he thinks is moral elevation, aware of his spiritual superiority. In him was born

„At that time, i was struck by the strange, discouraging thought of how a man who is spiritually more developed than others is in a difficult situation, unless he is protected by his position, and the fear that this position instills. Such a man becomes a loner: his standards are different, useless to others but they set him apart"⁴⁰¹ (Selimović 2018a: 217).

³⁹⁹ „[...] islamistička dogma [...]” (Petrović 1981: 42).

⁴⁰⁰ „[...] био је то пасји живот, који сам проводио наоко мирно, ничим не показујући да ми је тешко” (Селимовић 2004: 218).

⁴⁰¹ „[...] чудна, обесхрабрујућа мисао да је у тешком положају човјек који је духовно развијенији од других, уколико га не штити положај, и страх

His lack of care for the individual being is visible in his psychological structure. He is not interested in it as itself, as a being in itself, but only and exclusively as a work of the collective, as a piece, not at all as a whole. He felt nothing towards the man in himself, and the collective pleased him. Nuruddin was already showing idolatry towards Islam, which the collective he was a part of defended. Therefore, it is not surprising that his later attitude, the attitude of a dervish in peacetime conditions, that it is not a shame to sacrifice an individual life if it will contribute to a higher goal.

He had no emotional connection with those with whom he fought. He observed their dark sides, everything that he did not approve of, that was painful to him, that he did not want to participate in. From people who are aware that literally the next moment they could lose their heads, the dervish seemed to expect something better, some behavior that is not inappropriate, some kind of sublimity and decency. Already at the beginning of the second part of the novel, we notice the problem that we have already drawn attention to, which is the difference between his expectations and/or ideals and the reality that does not meet these expectations and ideals. The story of the war is a flashback that provides the basis for understanding the dervish's behavior later in the novel. He is always a part, never one.

He is a dervish, a member of the Order that recognizes him as his own as long as he submits to it, serves it, fulfills the function of a member of the Order and contributes to its reputation. He is a servant of ideology and religious doctrine. Then, he is a power, an authority in a hierarchy in which there is again an authority that transcends him, which he is obliged to serve. He is a member of a social community who is offended by the disrespect he encounters among other members of the community, who challenge the validity of his dervish title. He is never himself, a man, an original, authentic being, an individual.

који тај положај даје. Постаје усамљеник: његова су мјерила друкчија, и никоме не користе, а њега издавају” (Селимовић 2004: 219).

He does not know how to be that. In his relationship with the boy he encountered in the midst of the chaos of war, an attempt at his humanity is noticeable, but, as we will see in the novel, his relationship with Mullah-Yusuf is far from humanity.

It seems that Hassan manages to awaken the human Jan Kot in him, to teach him human emotions that do not hide any calculation, no order from authority, but they exist to make us human, to show us the way to freedom. Nuruddin is aware of the importance of Hassan's friendship not out of selfishness, but a friendship that touched in him what he thought had long since disappeared, the memory of childhood and of his mother. Nuruddin has memorized the surahs and verses of *the Holy Book*, the principles of Allah from which he has not deviated, but he has not learned the art of love.

That is why he failed in life, despite his title of which he was proud, despite his calling, the self-love that he experienced as the most important part of himself as a dervish, because it, in his dogmatically colored opinion, deserved the respect of others and nourished his self-respect. Nuruddin valued his own morality and the sublimity of his thought above all else. By insisting on the general, on collectivity, on the fact that a person is only valuable as part of a community, on distancing himself from anything personal, individual, human, or masculine, Nuruddin paved the way for his own loss in that same world and the loss of the world within himself: "I has been general-izing about the world so much that I began to lose my grasp of it"⁴⁰² (Selimović 2018a: 218).

The way that Nuruddin found to separate himself, to isolate himself from the reality that he perceived as torture, without showing in any way that he was on the verge of tears because of the excessive swearing, because he felt like he was part of the pack, and not the army or what was left of it, because it exceeded the limit of his tolerance, was to immerse himself in himself, in his thoughts and to intellectually alienate himself. This is the attitude of sheikh Nuruddin, who let

⁴⁰² „Толико сам свет уопштавао да сам га губио” (Селимовић 2004: 219).

things, ugly, immoral, cruel, pass him by because they did not touch him personally, until they threatened him. The turn in himself that the dervish makes as a result of his brother's first imprisonment, and then murder, shows his hypocrisy.

The dervish is passive. The dervish is silent. The dervish turns his head. The dervish distances himself from his thoughts. The dervish rebels against the inappropriate language. They laugh at him.

"I rarely tried to bring them to their senses. A few times they ridiculed me so cruelly (...) that, for their sake and mine, I gave up interfering in what they did"⁴⁰³ (Selimović 2018a: 217).

The dervish is offended, as when the musellim's guard disfigured him, disregarding his title, which the dervish took personally, as when none of the townspeople protested his arrest, as when in front of the musellim who had harmed him.

Ahmed Nuruddin utters a sentence that is the point of everything he had said about standing out from the others, from whom only his title separated him: "[...] I wanted to be different than the others, because I was the same"⁴⁰⁴ (*Ibid*: 219). Because, leaving aside the fascination with religion and the attributes of Islam such as the dervish's title, how is he different from any soldier who, if he is not seen as part of a collective, in which case he is a subject, is disgusted?

The constant moral existence on the border between two contradictory possibilities is proof of Nuruddin's moral immaturity. He simply has not grown up to this and such a world, which is for him a moral minefield, and suffering is a matter of the moment. The final suffering is the sum of smaller sufferings. The dervish does not understand that a world based on dogma prevents him from accepting a world that is everywhere outside the tekke, just as such a world is

⁴⁰³ „Ријетко кад сам покушавао да их уразумим. Неколико пута су ме тако свирепо исмијали [...] те сам, и због себе и због њих, одустао од уплитања [...]” (*Исџо*: 219).

⁴⁰⁴ „[...] хтио сам да будем друкчији од осталих, зато што сам био исти” (*Исџо*: 221).

unable to understand the basic concepts of human existence such as integrity, dignity, moral considerations and humanity. These are irreconcilable opposites that the dervish tries to reconcile within himself, but fails to do so because it is absurd. The resolution of the moral inner conflict is a commitment. That is why the act of Nuruddin's personal drama is rebellion.

Ahmed Nuruddin is a dogmatist, a slave to Islamic exegesis, ideologically passionate, with such a well-learned Koran that he can engage in a duel of sacred words with the ruler, who knows it just as well, and come out as a loser, because the kadi uses parts of the Holy Book selectively, so as to serve his interests, and Nuruddin is unaccustomed to relativizing the Koran in the name of vile political practices. Besides, he is no different from the political champions of Kasabali, as will be shown in the second part of the novel. All the answers are found in *the Holy Book*. It is the measure of comfort and truth. His life flows peacefully, like a river, in the truths in which he has been taught to believe as if there were nothing else in the world. And what is not according to the standards of Islam should be attacked with all its might, in the name of the Koran, in the name of religion, in the name of faith that shapes human behavior, laws, moral scruples, nobility, and justifies and explains the absence of the same.

In the dervish, as in the Machiavellian epigones of power, identification with title and rank has taken precedence over Ahmed Nuruddin, the man. That alone makes him the same as those he hates. The man in him has ceased to exist. He has retreated into the dark corners of the being of a spiritual dignitary and allowed that other, religiously fanatic member of the dervish order, a failed man, to take hold within him.

The one who provides comfort to believers in hours when turning to Allah is the only way to endure. They come to him for big, strong words. The dervish is pious, and that is only at the beginning of the novel, and Nietzsche says that "piety is the most wonderful mask of the life instinct! Devotion to a perfect world of dreams, to which the

highest ethical wisdom is bestowed!” An escape from the truth so that it can be worshipped from a distance, from afar and shrouded in clouds”⁴⁰⁵ (Nietzsche 1998: 74). He is completely convinced that there is nothing else in him that can be turned to anything other than religion. His strength of faith is him. And it is nothing else. Ahmed Nuruddin? No. Not Ahmed Nuruddin, but a dervish, a bearer of a social title, a sheikh of a tekke, an orthodox warrior who cuts with his sword in the name of Allah and the Holy Book and what is written in it. One who acts in the name of rules and regulations, general, collective and impersonal, because in this way, by distancing oneself from the personal and human, responsibility is reduced and the need for moral determination is anesthetized. Almost superior to all others because of his day and night, absolute service to religion that has separated him from everything and everyone.

One who believes in providence, in the order of the world preached by the Koran, convinced of the correctness and indubitability of the words that Mullah-Yusuf writes in cursive. A defender of the heavenly law and system who does not know the individual man. An intellectual who looks into something bigger, further and more important than reality. Deprived of the need to participate in life. Not to live. He lives death. But to participate. Completely immersed in the faith in which he finds comfort, and which is a substitute for a real, meaningful life filled with love. Ahmed Nuruddin, sheikh of the tekke, dervish, “[...] spirit, nurtured in the intellectual permeation of Islamic religion and oriental fatalism...”⁴⁰⁶ (Palavestra u: Popović 1988: 84) He is also a loser because he renounced love for the one who may have given birth to his son, because he exchanged blood for like-minded people, indebted to himself, whom he deadened and forgot, to the one

⁴⁰⁵ „pobožnost – najčudesnija maska životnog nagona! Predanost jednom savršenom svetu sna, kojem se podaruje najviša etička mudrost! Bekstvo od istine da bi mogla da se obožava sa odstojanja, iz daljine i obavijena oblacima” (Niče 1998: 74).

⁴⁰⁶ „[...] duh odnegovan u intelektualnom prožimanju islamske religije i orijentalnog fatalizma”... (Palavestra u: Popović 1988: 84).

who will never be because he does not have the courage to become such, and who will catch up with him in the garden of the tekke and respond to the name Is-haq. Completely immersed in the faith in which he finds comfort, and which is “[...] obedience of rules [...]”⁴⁰⁷ (Selimović 2018a: 124), a substitute for a real, meaningful life filled with love.

Ahmed Nuruddin, sheikh of the tekke, dervish, loser. Because he renounced his love for the one who might have given birth to his son, for the blood he replaced with like-minded people, for himself, whom he killed and forgot, left behind, and who will join him in the garden of the tekke and respond to the name Is-haq, for others, because they are different, because they are shenluče. In his glass bell in the shape of a tekke, there is nothing but absolute surrender to the Koran. The tekke, “[...] knows secrets that I have never revealed to anyone, that I have hidden even from myself”⁴⁰⁸ (*Ibid*: 23) is the Great Wall of China behind which he retreats because he is not up to the fight against the dangers that life reinvents every day. It is easier to fight windmills. Then even defeat can be heroic. It often is. Incompetence in anything personal because “Personal matters were too subtle, murky, and vain; we were to keep them to ourselves if we could not surpass them entirely”⁴⁰⁹ (*Ibid*: 66).

Universal principles such as justice and fairness in the dervish's idolatrous mind of dogma are not tied to man as an individual, but exclusively to the Koran, the Order and the dogma. Nuruddin identifies himself with his calling, title, the public function he performs so much that his humanity is immersed in it. Because he neglects the principle above individual existence, above man, he is alienated from others, but his alienation is in fact alienation from himself.

⁴⁰⁷ „[...] слијепа загњуреност у правило [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 122).

⁴⁰⁸ „[...] што зна моје тајне које никоме нисам казивао, које сам крио и од себе” (*Исџо*: 15).

⁴⁰⁹ „личне ствари су сувише танане, сувише мутне, некорисне, и треба их оставити себи ако не можемо да их угушимо” (*Ibid*: 125).

A worshipper of justice, and he himself has imagined what justice is. And what it is not. And what injustice is. A spokesman for the Koranic truths. Loyal to God's plan to the point of absurdity. "I really thought that the will of God was the supreme law, that eternity was the measure of our deeds, and that the faith was more important"⁴¹⁰ (Selimović 2018a: 124). Guardian of dogma. Devoted to a life in accordance with principles to the core. Member of a religious order. Subject. Subordinate. Representative of God's will. He wrapped himself in it like a skin. Over time, it became that. His robe. A mask that hides not an ugly, but a human face. An ascetic who did not bury his dead, but his living. The one who destroyed the bridge between himself and his blood. A fugitive. From himself. And from others. Accustomed to solitude. His Ophelia has no name and did not kill herself but got married.

He is disturbed by sensuality. A being that exists somewhere behind the mask is afraid of the beauty of the lady's hands. Masculine discourse loses to the dogmatic. Because before her he is not a man, not even a man who once, once belonged to someone, but a dervish, a sheikh of a tekke, always at a safe distance from the sensual, which is not dead in him, it is only subordinated to his calling, which is seen in the scene with the teapot. His dervish light does not dim even before the sensual fullness of the St. George's night that tempts to lust. The sensuality of the dervish fills him with restlessness. He is not a person. He is an exponent of order. Apart from whom he has nothing, because he never had any, a poor peasant child who could boast of nothing, neither wealth nor reputation. Poverty made him yearn for recognition, power, and status, which he tried to ask for through Ajni, the effendi's widow, seeking her hand in marriage, aware that in a world divided into dominants and those dominated by dominants, only the strongest have anything to hope for. That is why he valued the dervish title so much that he transformed himself into it.

⁴¹⁰ „Заиста мислим да је божја воља врховни закон, да је вјечност мера нашег деловања и да је вјера важнија од човека” (*Ibid*: 122).

He lived in a world bounded by strict rules outside of which everything was forbidden. Starting with falling in love. He looked at freedom with suspicion, fearing it. Sensitive to humiliation. Separated from people, alienated from himself, a servant of the god he believed in, whom he built a pedestal for within himself and raised above everything that had ever existed: parental affection, brotherly closeness, love ecstasy, individuality. The sheikh of a tekke far enough from the city that life did not flourish at its gates. Spending his life in prayer, Ahmed Nuruddin tried to escape the bitterness of his own wounds.

Who is Ahmed Nuruddin? Or, better yet, what is Ahmed Nuruddin? He is "the dervish Ahmed Nurudin, light of faith, the sheikh of a tekke [...], preacher and scholar, foundation and roof of the tekke, glory of the kasaba master of the world"⁴¹¹ (Selimović 2018a: 196). It is about the multiplicity of identities that make up Ahmed Nuruddin. His contradiction is what makes him a Nietzschean subject (Đurić 1997: 97). It is about his psychological division due to the plurality of identities. These are the personal identity of a man, son and brother, and the socially constructed identity of a dervish. The irreconcilable relationship between them best illustrates the human failing of Ahmed Nuruddin, who makes a distinction between himself as a man and himself as a dervish, not only in the situation with Harun, but also in the one with Is-haq. The identity of a dervish is based on his ethical correctness. As a dervish, Ahmed Nuruddin believes that he is, above all, moral.

Being morally unblemished is the requirement by which Ahmed Nuruddin evaluates his actions. In relation to how an act in terms of action or conduct, his own or that of another, will reflect on him, on him as a dervish, the sheikh of the tekke, he took an attitude towards that act. Moral correctness had more weight for him than anything else. In his perception of himself, the dervish was a beacon of perfect

⁴¹¹ „дервиш Ахмед Нурудин, свјетло вјере, шејх текије [...] ваиз и учењак, кров и темељ текије, слава касабe, господар свијета” (Селимовић 2004: 199).

morality. No shadow was allowed to fall on that part of his personality. And he thought that it had fallen thanks to the act of his brother Harun, for which, as Nuruddin believes, he was imprisoned. When he heard this, he was not worried about his brother, or even himself, but about his reputation. He wanted less to know what Harun had done, and more why Harun had done it to him. This prompted him to think about his brother's actions through the prism of his evaluation of the moral side of his personality, full of:

“[...] restlessness full of black foreboding, that drove me to think about my imprisoned brother will bilious anger: Why had he done this to me. [...] Yes, he is my brother, but this is precisely where the difficulty lies; he's cast a shadow on me as well”⁴¹² (Selimović 2018a: 81).

The foundation of the dervish's submission to Islamism is his identification of himself as a dervish instead of as a man, a brother, and at the heart of this identification and the dervish side of his personality lies sinful moral self-love. His morality consists of unquestioning loyalty to “Islamist dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42). First of all, nothing calls his obedience into question. There is no temptation to test how much his faith is truly faith. Nuruddin is a dervish, the dervish is Nuruddin. He did not want to stain his conscience with sin, not because he was an exemplary and devoted believer, but because it would be a blow to his vanity. The dervish was concerned not only with his reputation in his own eyes, but also with that of the community, which Nuruddin intuitively felt was shaken by Harun's actions:

As a dervish, he confidently wielded “Islamic dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42). It was his shortcut to peace. *The Holy Book* symbolically represented the boundary between two worlds – the real one, outside, from which he shunned, with which he wanted nothing to do, and

⁴¹² „[...] овог неспокојства пуног црне слутње, што ме нагонило да зеленом срџбом мислим на затвореног брата: зашто ми је то учинио. [...] Да, брат ми је, али баш зато је тешко, и на мене је бацио сјенку” (Селимовић 2004: 76).

the world of Islamic doctrine that he felt was his own. That world was his comfort zone, sufficient space for his intellectual capacity limited by Islam. The dervish was quite content in his conformism limited by Islam:

In a world in which *the Holy Book* was not the measure of all things, he felt threatened. That is why he needed protection from everything demonic that lurks outside the framework of Islamic exegesis, in which he could (not) participate in life from a safe distance, in which he could retreat to the solitude of the dervish tekke, which he calls his space, that “[...] was mine, mine according to reason and conscience”⁴¹³ (Selimović 2018a: 72).

The dervish is determined not to let the man in him prevail. His goal was to preserve his dervishism, his faith, his service to Islamic doctrine, his resting place: [...] and that was exactly what I had wanted to avoid; I did not want to lose my bearings or to change my point of view, because I would cease to be what I had been”⁴¹⁴ (*Ibid*). Not **who**, but **what** I am.

These words of the sheikh of the tekke confirm that he identified himself with his function, his socially constructed identity. Ahmed identified with his title. The answer to the question, “Who are you?” addressed to Ahmed Nuruddin in the novel is never just Ahmed Nuruddin, but always Ahmed Nuruddin, dervish, Ahmed Nuruddin, sheikh of the tekke, Ahmed Nuruddin, “*Light of Faith*” (Selimović 2018a: 20).

It would have been a bright moment of triumph of man over the dervish if he had done it of his own free will, overwhelmed by brotherly concern in the name of love for Harun. But, since it is a question of his father’s request, of a task imposed on him, just as it was imposed on Hamlet, in the name of love and obedience to his father’s shadow. Nuruddin says of that task: “[...] [...] burdened by the duty that I had

⁴¹³ „[...] које је моје, моје по разуму и савјести” (*Исџо*: 66).

⁴¹⁴ „[...] баш то нисам хтио, ни да се помјерим из лежишта, ни да мијењам угао гледања, јер не бих био више што сам [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 66).

accepted out of consideration, without knowing how to perform it, oppressed by the careless words that he had blurted in sorrow”⁴¹⁵ (*Ibid*: 80), the dervish did not reach that moment.

With each emphasis on himself as a sheikh, he distanced himself from the man within him until he buried that man alive within himself. No, he did not bury him. Ahmed, the man, was there. His heart beat in Nuruddin’s body, with the same rhythm as Nuruddin’s heart in Ahmed’s body.

Ahmed Nuruddin is a dancer on a tightrope that, with its subtlety, separates two worlds: the world that actually exists, the material world of concrete experiences, the physical matrix of reality, and the world he has built in his head – the world of Islam – a proud wall (*Ibid*: 80) It is a magnificent building whose foundations go back to the postulates of the dervish order and the faith of Allah, a symbol of a world bounded by rules that are unquestionable and above every individuality. They prevail over every individual experience, no matter how human it may be. Calligraphically written dogmatic words serve to pronounce and to hide behind. It is a world whose borders end within the walls of the tekke, behind which dwell people suckled by the milk of dogma. Having accepted dogma as the only truth, they are unprepared for reality, helpless in the real world teeming with tragic truths that they are not prepared to face because they are opposed to the general, collective principles of Islamic exegesis.

The dervish vacillates between two possibilities: that the tragic situations that occur on the other side of the tekke threshold are an exception to the rule, which soothes his conscience, and that they are not, which deeply disturbs him, making him color-blind in a world made of shades. The deep hurt caused by his brother’s death releases within him the juices of evil that overwhelm him with their terror. He is, after all, a man who believed in law and order, who

⁴¹⁵ „[...] под теретом обавезе коју сам преузео из обзира, не знајући како да је извршим, притиснут неопрезном ријечју што је оцу измакла у тузи” (*Исџо*: 75).

surrenders himself to prayer, to words learned by heart, rehearsed through countless repetitions that neither his head nor his heart had ever suspected before. For why should he? Ensconced in dogma, the dervish unhinderedly surrendered to his calling, daily strengthening the function of the dervish within him. A man did not concern him.

Every individuality must be destroyed and adapted to the general and collective, because in doing so, everything personal, human, is hidden, masked, which threatens to swallow the sand from under what that sand is the foundation of in an instant. There is only drowning in quasi-responsibility because the price of responsibility could be, and most often is, too high for someone who, like Nuruddin, suffers from a lack of self in his own being.

Harun's death stirred up the sea on whose shores Ahmed Nuruddin had built a solid wall for himself during his lifetime. That sea was far enough away that, after hours of contemplation and immersion in *the Holy Book*, the vista from a height looked down on him with the dignity of religious authority. Through endless contemplations, he distanced himself from the essence of everyday life: doing. Every doing involves danger. That is why it is always safer to be in the middle, strictly taking care that at no time does the weight tip over to one of the sides. The position of neutrality is an excellent alibi in front of itself. The eternal dead sea does not threaten it because it is dead. Until the weight tips over to the side on which, half-barefoot, Is-haq stands.

Ahmed Nuruddin is unanchored. He dances on a tightrope that, with its subtlety, separates the worlds: the real world, the world that he believed was governed by law, until he realized that the main word in such (and any other) reality is held by power, whose strength rests on the force and solidarity of all those involved in such an apparatus of power, which Ahmed Nuruddin encounters for the first time when he goes to the musellim, through the attitude of the guard who unequivocally shows the dervish his place in such a world, and the world that he has built in his head – a brick in the sand (Milošević 1978: 175)

It is a magnificent building whose foundations are the postulates of the dervish order and the faith of Allah, a world limited by the rules of dogma that are above every detail, that erase individuality as a category, thereby stifling personal autonomy, free will and independence of the individual. Generic words from holy books are an impenetrable screen and serve to hide behind them. They have the form of a form, but not the essence. And dogma, like revolution, eats its children.

This is a world whose borders are the walls of the tekke. Behind them, people fed the same religious ideology retreat from opening their eyes to which the other, real world forces them, in which they feel helpless because it contradicts what they have been indoctrinated to believe. Accepting dogma as the absolute truth, the only and undeniable, they experience everything that contradicts it as a challenge and temptation of their faith and their own beliefs. The world outside the tekke is full of truths that they are not ready to face because they contradict the teachings of the Koran, thus subjecting what should not be questioned to scrutiny.

It is inevitable that the dervish encounters situations outside the walls of the tekke. Then he considers whether they are the exception to the rule, which would mean that the system based on the law is functioning, thereby reassuring himself and depriving himself of all responsibility, or whether they are not, which deeply disturbs him and makes him a moral color-blind man who survives partially and in a world made of nuances.

The misfortune of his own brother's death sowed the seeds of evil in him. A personal tragedy served Selimović as the thematic backbone of his most famous novel. That seed sprouted and flooded him with its poison. Its name is hatred. He is a man who believed in the law and the dervish order because, before Harun's death, nothing had touched him personally, nothing in him had been shaken to the core, and he could live unhindered, one day at a time, immersed in holy books, endlessly analyzing people and situations, but never himself, surrendered to prayers that for him, however, were just words, a

text learned by heart and rehearsed with colorless reproductions that neither his head nor his heart had ever suspected before. The dervish is unaccustomed to introspection and alienated from himself, withdrawn into his isolation, philosophical approach to life, and seemingly morally superior attitude.

Shrouded in dogma, the dervish freely surrendered to his intellectual radicalism, daily strengthening the function of the dervish within him. He does not care for the man within himself, for his father, brother, friend, which he confirms with his deeds. And, even more so, with his deeds.

There is only the general, the collective, every individuality should be destroyed and adapted to the general, because this nullifies everything human: dilemmas, doubts, pains, moral values, metaphorical water that threatens to swallow the sand from under the wall in an instant.

Blind faith in the law and holy books minimizes the possibility of taking responsibility and chooses "fate" as something that cannot and does not make sense to fight against. There is only quasi-responsibility because the price of responsibility could be, and most often is, too high for someone who suffers from a lack of self and an excess of the general law.

"If the general dominates over the individual, if nothing can be done without the will of Allah, then any behavior that would forcefully accelerate the inevitable is pointless and provocative"⁴¹⁶ (Petrović 1981: 27).

However, Harun's death stirred up the sea on whose shores Ahmed Nuruddin had built a sandcastle for himself during his lifetime. That sea was far enough away that, after hours of contemplation and immersion in the letters of the Koran, he would observe him from the height of the sandcastle with the dignity of a religious authority, a small man who had forgotten that he was small (Selimović 2018a: 85), whom a guard would remind of it.

⁴¹⁶ „Ako opšte dominira nad pojedinačnim, ako ništa ne može biti učinjeno bez Alahove volje, onda je bespredmetno i izazovno svako ponašanje koje bi da silom ubrza neumitnost" (Petrović 1981: 27).

Through endless contemplation, the dervish distanced himself from doing because every action represented a potential danger. It is always safer to be in the middle, between being and not being, doing and being and doing and not doing, an unlucky weight on the scale that must not tip to either side because the position of moral neutrality is an excellent alibi in front of itself. The eternal dead sea does not threaten the wall because it is – dead.

“Life is larger than any principle. Morality is an idea, but life is what we live”⁴¹⁷ (Selimović 2018a: 118).
as an engagement, which “[...] is more a moral, human, than a political obligation” (Selimović 1983: 272).

The constant moral existence on the border is proof of Nuruddin’s moral immaturity. He simply did not grow up to that and such a world, which is for him a moral minefield, and suffering is a matter of the moment. The final suffering is the sum of smaller sufferings. The dervish does not understand that a world based on dogma prevents him from accepting a world that is everywhere outside the tekke, just as such a world is unable to understand the basic concepts of human existence such as integrity, dignity, moral considerations and humanity. These are irreconcilable opposites that the dervish tries to reconcile within himself, but fails to do so because it is absurd.

Trying in this way is tantamount to Sisyphus pushing a stone up a hill.

“Nuruddin’s moral immaturity is reflected in this refusal to approach the world in which only real issues can be resolved. But Nuruddin is not yet capable of crossing the line that separates the material from the spiritual, act from thought, intention from action. In order to achieve this, he must deeply transform himself”⁴¹⁸ (Petrović 1981:17).

⁴¹⁷ „Морал, међутим, није мислена категорија; морал је животна категорија. Он постоји само као дело, као одлука” (Селимовић 2004: 17)

„[...] je više moralna, ljudska, nego politička obaveza” (Selimović 1983: 272).

⁴¹⁸ „Moralna nezrelost Nurudinova ogleda se u tom odbijanju da se približi svetu u kojem se jedino i mogu rešavati stvarna pitanja. Ali Nurudin

The resolution of the moral internal conflict is a decision. The first act of Nuruddin's personal drama is rebellion.

Although at first Nuruddin's motives were pure and human, to save Harun, his own blood, to be a man, a son and a brother, Ahmed deviated from that path and plunged into the dirty paths of revenge and the struggle for political power, becoming part of the real world from which he had always fled into the peace of the tekke and a spiritual way of life that excluded any participation in the outside world and lulled him into a sense of personal security. The dervish surrenders to postponing decision-making so that he would not have to face the consequences.

But first, he must come down from his dervish pedestal and become a man who begs for mercy from those who have no mercy and who wait for the opportunity to enjoy the humiliation of the one who for so long and so strongly wanted to pass by him what has no direct connection with him (Selimović 2018a: 26), isolated on the balcony of his dogmatic sand castle, morally superiorly assessing both worlds through the dervish telescope.

After visiting the musellim, however, "a dilemma begins in Nuruddin's consciousness that has this form: one of these worlds is false"⁴¹⁹ (Petrović 1981: 34).

The question arises which one. Were the hours of (self-)isolation in the dervish tekke spent in peace over books and the secrets of faith just a defense against what the dervish did not want to see? Or is what he saw outside just a random set of unfortunate circumstances, the devil's Bermuda Triangle, testing the dervish's faith and self-respect for the sake of strengthening them? The answer could force one of them, either Ahmed Nuruddin or the sheikh of the Mevlevi tekke, to question, to doubt, which is the root of the latter's actions, and the former the root of gaining independence.

još nije sposoban da prekorači liniju koja odvaja materijalno od duhovnog, čin od misli, nameru od akcije. Da bi to postigao, on mora da se duboko preobrazi" (Petrović 1981: 17).

⁴¹⁹ „u Nurudinovoj svesti začinje se dilema koja ima ovaj vid: jedan od ovih svetova je *lažan*." (Petrović 1981: 34).

Nuruddin is torn between these two possibilities, divided again, between two possibilities that cancel each other out. This question sharpens the internal conflict within him because for the first time he has allowed himself to ask the question at all. Nuruddin has already rebelled, at least in thought.

“If the musellim is just an accident, if his cruelty is an exception in an otherwise harmonical reality, his faith and peace are saved and secured for a long time; but if he is not an accident but an expression of a system of relations, then Nuruddin’s faith and a hard path of prayer are just an illusion and spiritual blindness”⁴²⁰ (Petrović 1981: 34)

Ahmed Nuruddin is unaccustomed to a world in which the Koran does not provide answers to all questions and comfort in every suffering, a world devoid of the humanity that exists in the dervish world at least in the sacred words that regulate the world as it should be, not as it is. In that world, he is a religious authority, at the top of the social ladder, on the basis of which he believes that he has rights that do not belong to him in the real world, because that world and the dervish have very different standards.

“Nuruddin’s consciousness is inhibited by confusing knowledge. Is all this a coincidence, an incident caused by the matrix of reality, or is it a system of relations to which he has been blind and deaf all his life?”⁴²¹ (*Ibid.*)

The duality of worlds is present in this way in *Death and the Dervish*, and not only in the connection between the worlds of the living and the dead, as in *Hamlet*.

⁴²⁰ „Ako je muselim samo slučajnost, ako je njegova surovost izuzetak u inače skladnom poretku stvarnosti, njegova vera i mir su sačuvani i trajno obezbeđeni; ali ako muselim nije slučajnost nego izraz jednog sistema odnosa, onda su Nurudinova vera i tvrda staza molitve samo iluzija i duhovno slepilo” (Petrović 1981: 34).

⁴²¹ „Nurudinova svest je inhibirana zbunjujućim saznanjima. Je li sve to slučajnost, incident izazvan maticom stvarnosti ili je posredi sistem odnosa za koji je on bio slep i gluh celog života?” (*Исџуо*).

The world treats Nuruddin not just like any other dervish, but like anyone else, which Ahmed finds unprepared to accept because in his microworld he is the sheikh of the tekke and that carries weight. Perhaps in a world that would be based on justice and law, but in one that is based on repression, this is not the case. Ahmed Nuruddin does not see this until he visits the musellim and what he only experiences as a verbal clash with the guard who indifferently throws reality in his face. Namely,

“addressing the guard, Nuruddin counts on a hierarchy that comes from social prestige; answering him insolently and ignoring him, the guard counts on a hierarchy that rests on power and force”⁴²² (Petrović 1981: 30).

The dervish sees here the difference between two worlds that exist in parallel, but do not touch each other. The hand of one of these two worlds, the world of power, personified in Ajni-effendi, wrote the order for Harun's imprisonment (Selimović 2018: 26).

And Nuruddin, who lost him, will become one of them. A man for whom honor came first will become a mindless avenger and thereby seal his moral downfall. In a circle of violence, the victim will become the executioner. What Ahmed Nuruddin cannot understand is that the guard's attitude towards him is not personal.

“There is not a single bit of personal color in his attitude towards Nuruddin; on the contrary, he only expresses prerogatives essential to the essence of power”⁴²³ (Petrović 1981: 30).

In this way, power makes it known that it is itself an authority and that its decisions are motivated by far dirtier motives than those to which the dervish is accustomed in the peace of his tekke, and that its decisions are the law above the law.

⁴²² „obraćajući se stražaru, Nurudin računa na hijerarhiju koja potiče od društvenog ugleda; odgovarajući mu drsko i zanemarujući ga, stražar računa na hijerarhiju koja počiva na moći i sili” (Petrović 1981: 30).

⁴²³ „U njegovom odnosu prema Nuruddinu nema ni truni lične boje; naprotiv, on samo iskazuje prerogative bitne za suštinu vlasti” (Petrović 1981: 30).

The only thing left for any member of society is unquestioning respect for these decisions and the absence of thoughts of rebellion, because such will be cruelly drowned in prison or suffocated by *ca-tul-ferman*. It is a ruthless mechanism of intimidation and repression that is based on insisting on the obedience of individuals, and not on the law, as the dervish naively believed. Harun was imprisoned because he exposed the uses of power. He was innocently guilty and yet killed because he knew what the government did not want him to know. His sacrifice is all the greater, and the dervish's efforts to ask about him are all the more absurd because at that moment he had already been executed.

7. DIONYSIAN AND APOLLONIAN ELEMENTS IN *HAMLET* AND *DEATH AND THE DERVISH*

Nietzsche's preoccupation is Hellenic art, the art of the Hellenic people. The key concept that defines and decisively determines his understanding of it is unity. But unity of what? The unity of two types of art, two creative impulses from which these two types of art arise, one of which is Apollonian, while the other is Dionysian (Đurić in: Nietzsche 1998: 8). Both of these principles have their roots in Hellenic history, since Apollo and Dionysus, after whose names these two principles are named, are gods belonging to the Hellenic pantheon. "The deities Apollo and Dionysus have a very great significance for the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche – He is the creator of a system based on these two deities. Within this system, they are more than mere gods"⁴²⁴ (Terzić 2023v: 498).

What Nietzsche insists on is their unity despite their individual differences. He claims that although mutually opposed, these two principles, tenets, and deities cannot be, cannot be resolved into separate opposites, but rather should be viewed as a unity, in their mutual interaction from which, according to Nietzsche, artistic creation arises (Đurić in: Nietzsche 1998: 11). Nietzsche says that: "It is not a question of tragedy as a poetic form [...]. It is also a question of tragedy as

⁴²⁴ „Божанства Аполон и Дионис за филозофију Фридриха Ничеа имају веома велики значај – Он је творац система који се темељи на ова два божанства. У оквиру тог система она су више од пуких богова” (Терзић 2023в: 498).

a harmonious union of the Apollonian and Dionysian elements”⁴²⁵ (*Ibid*). We find the harmony of these two elements in Hamlet. It is hidden in his reconciliation with death. In Nuruddin, the thirst for life remains. The two elements in him are not harmoniously united. They are disjointed, contradictory.

In this unity of contradictions, in the unity of irreconcilable extremes, there is a confluence, a core in which the work of art is hidden. Nietzsche seeks to prove that ancient tragedy grows out of the union of the Apollonian and Dionysian principles (principles) and that precisely because both act to restrain the other in its dissolute fullness and thus represent a counterbalance to each other on imaginary scales that strive for perfect balance. Balance is harmony, agreement, coincidence, a sign of equality between two scales, two weights that would otherwise weigh to one side or the other, disrupting the balance. “The hub of the antinomy of these two deities is the phenomenon of measure”⁴²⁶ (Terzić 2023v: 500). By exceeding it, the balance in the minds of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin is disturbed.

One side is dominant over the other. One of these sides is “empirical apperception” (Milić 2000: 35), and the other is “transcendental apperception” (*Ibid*: 36), which is the embodiment of internalized principles of externally imposed authority that exerts a profound influence on the consciousness of the subject, shaped and conditioned by ideology. These are Apollo and Dionysus, the Apollonian and Dionysian, the unity of what cannot be reconciled, the reconciliation of the irreconcilable, like ice cubes that do not melt in the flame, but water extinguishes some sparks so that the fire that has broken out does not flare up, but becomes fire that warms the ice. The two, united, create art. It is born from their agreement, like Athena from Zeus’s head, not Apollonian or Dionysian, but Apollonian and Dionysian, because

⁴²⁵ „Није реч о трагедији као песничком облику [...]. Реч је и о трагедији као хармоничном споју аполонског и диониског елемента” (Исто).

⁴²⁶ „Чвориште антинимичности ова два божанства јесте феномен мере” (Терзић 2023в: 500).

„both Apollonian art, which hides the essence of what exists from us with its veil, and Dionysian art, which reveals to us the true nature of things, have an equally healing effect on man“⁴²⁷ (Milošević 2009: 443).

Both are Nietzschean subjects and tragic heroes whose tragedy lies in their internal division. What is outside is not identical to what is inside. In the Nietzschean terminology of masking, concepts that stand in opposition to each other as binary oppositions prevail, the main one being that between

„[...] essence and its manifestation, inner and outer, about the relationship between the thing in itself and the appearance“⁴²⁸ (Vattimo 2011: 14).

Essence, that is the content of essences, the core. Form, that is the external representation, the representation before others, in a social context.

In the examples of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, this means that, in order for them to be complete heroes in a psychological sense, for their “I” to be indivisible and unique, there must be a correspondence between their being and their social representation, between what they think, say, and do, between their authentic personality and their calling, public function, their empirical apperception (Milić 2000: 35) and transcendental apperception (*Ibid*: 36). These two “I” should coincide, and not be in a relationship of contradiction that leads to the splitting of being.

They are divided within themselves. There is a split between what they are in themselves, what they think they are, and what they pretend to be, consciously or unconsciously. In Hamlet it is conscious, because he is acting crazy, while in the dervish Nuruddin it is not at

⁴²⁷ „и аполонска уметност, која нам својим велом скрива суштину постојећег, и диониска уметност, која нам открива праву природу ствари, једнако лековито делују на човека“ (Милошевић 2009: 443).

⁴²⁸ „[...] суштине и њене манифестације, унутрашњег и спољашњег, о односу између ствари по себи и појаве“ (Vatimo 2011: 14).

first. This gap between essence and what it is not, its mimicry, is what Nietzsche defined as a mask. He also calls it the principle of masking or disguise. The being of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin is divided into empirical experience and a transcendence that is grounded in ideology and idealism as understood by Louis Althusser. It is crucified between two contradictory realities. Being and mask are in an interdependent relationship of concealment and revelation.

The German philosopher was concerned with and was particularly impressed by the god Dionysus. He carries with him an excessive, heightened affective intensity and a high degree of excitement thanks to which he transforms, changes his form and falls into the abyss, whereby he does not glorify the destruction of himself and disappearance, but according to Nietzsche, he presents joy as an integral element of that disappearance, which, according to Nietzsche, is “[...] the eternal joy of existence – that joy that also contains within itself the joy of decay”⁴²⁹ (Đurić in: Nietzsche 1998: 7).

We will be particularly interested in the comparison of Dionysus and Hamlet as a Dionysian man whose similarity, according to Nietzsche, is based on the Dionysian state whose building elements are lethargy and disgust (Nietzsche 2003: 39). We will also be interested in the dark side of the world, reality, the affective excess that we observe in Hamlet’s acting of madness as well as in Nuruddin’s passion of hatred.

Apollo is the deity who was supposed to protect Helen from gaining Dionysian insight (Milić 2000: 135), just as dervishism protected Nuruddin from reality. For gaining that insight is the cornerstone of participation in the real world and, consequently, taking sides, attitudes, ethical determination at the expense of a position of neutrality and perpetual ethical indeterminacy. We can connect him with Ahmed Nuruddin’s dream world, with his dervishism, as well as with his understanding of performing the duty of a judge, which is

⁴²⁹ „[...] večna radost postojanja – ona radost koja u sebi sadrži i radost u propadanju” (Đurić u: Niče 1998: 7).

based on the illusion that he will only respond to the law in his own conscience by performing that duty.

The higher truth for him is “Islamist dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42). It is an Islamist dogma, a dogma of Islamic religious doctrine beyond the boundaries of which Ahmed Nuruddin does not know how to position himself in relation to the world in which he (does not) live. Interpersonal relationships are confusing for him because the rules of the worlds on this and that side of the tekke gate are as opposed as Apollo and Dionysus, the Apollonian and Dionysian principle. The collision of these two types of rules, two value systems, two completely different worlds that occurs due to the death of Nuruddin’s brother Harun gives rise to a tragedy of revenge, a personal tragedy of one man that fits into one word. That word is failure.

Dervishism is an (anti)mask because it is an illusion, Nuruddin’s illusion that persists until the encounter with the musellim. Nuruddin wants to live in a world of Islamic doctrine and tekke in which the locked door is just that – a locked door. He refuses to understand that it is a metaphor that not only divides two worlds, but also two in the dervish: the sheikh of the Mevlevi tekke, Nuruddin, and Ahmed, son, brother, and lover. This is the division of their “I” into transcendental and empirical (Milić 2000: 35–36). The moment of realization occurs when meeting a musellim, when dervishness ceases to be an (anti) mask and becomes a mask because he becomes aware of the illusion. Thus, the illusion also becomes aware of itself.

The word that connects Apollo, the Apollonian principle, the principle, the illusion, and Nuruddin’s dervishism is dedication. Nuruddin is dedicated to serving dogma to the point of self-annihilation, or at least to the point of self-annihilation of masculine identity, a man within himself who emerges from the depths of the dervish for a moment before the kadin, who is not only a beautiful woman but also Gertrude from *Death and the Dervish*, a bearer of social status, from a wealthy house, in one part of the novel a widow after the death of her husband Aini-efendi, for which Ahmed Nuruddin will be held guilty upon assuming the duty of kadi, which suggests his similarity

to Claudius. However, unlike Gertrude, she does not remarry after the death of her husband, the kadi, the exponent of power, the one whose signature was Harun's death warrant, despite Nuruddin's offer, which was (and is) beneficial.

In a state of Dionysian rapture, "[...] a cry of horror resounds, longing voices of mourning for some irreparable loss resound"⁴³⁰ (Nietzsche 1998: 65).

This is Hamlet's grief for his father, which he conspicuously expresses at the beginning of the play with his attitude and the blackness he carries about him, with harsh words that echo his resentment towards Gertrude and Claudius for their indecently hasty wedding celebrations. This is the resentment of a moral idealist imbued with humanistic ideals, directed against his mother Gertrude, who is at best superficial and at worst an accomplice in murder, and Claudius, who is a Machiavellian hero, a usurper, fratricide and regicide, hypocritical beyond all measure and bounds of good taste. Isn't Ahmed Nuruddin's struggle against the political apparatus in *Death and the Dervish* also a struggle of the bearers of moral ideals and scruples against Machiavellian rulers?

His brother has become a symbol of the struggle for Nuruddin. He feels obliged to continue this struggle, just as Hamlet feels obliged to obey the Spirit, but he still doesn't do so until the end of the play. Hamlet is calculating because of his fear of God. He doubts. Ahmed does not doubt. Hamlet is not yet ready for everything. He needs proof that the spirit is telling the truth. Ahmed was not ready for everything while he was protected by the (anti)Apollonian mask of dervishism. Ahmed is now ready for everything.

Dionysian horror is revealed in the moral fall of Ahmed Nuruddin, a former moral idealist, at the Olympic heights of Islamic exegesis, who organizes a plot for Hadji-Sinanuddin, which leads to his arrest, to the imprisonment of an innocent man, such as

⁴³⁰ „[...] odjekuje krik užasa, provejavaju čežnjivi glasovi tugovanja zbog nekog nenadoknadivog gubitka" (Niče 1998: 65).

Harun was, as was King Hamlet, for that matter. This plot of his can be compared to Hamlet's "mousetrap". Both the plans of the two protagonists were realized in such a way that both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin had ulterior motives – the realization of their own interests. In this way, they came very close to the Machiavellian limit of utilitarianism, which was crossed by those against whom the plots were directed – the rulers in *Hamlet* and in *Death and the Dervish*.

The Dionysian in Hamlet's call madness is its intensity, the power of the god Dionysus, who, according to Nietzsche, breaks all boundaries and goes beyond measure. The problem of madness and hatred is the problem of the inner in Hamlet. The problem of the inner is, namely, internal conflict. It is a problem of mask and internal division. The Dionysian in Nuruddin's hatred is its destructiveness, the role that hatred plays in Ahmed Nuruddin's self-destruction. At the beginning of the novel, Ahmed Nuruddin is a dervish to whom affects, senses, emotions and passions of any kind, especially physical ones, are forbidden. Due to an identity metamorphosis, he becomes an avenger, which leads him to death.

An important element of his role as an avenger is hatred, a feeling that he did not know, and in which he found peace and comfort, such as he once found in the Koran and Allah. Just as once the surahs and verses were all that existed for Nuruddin, so their place was taken by hatred. He adopted it with equal submission and was ready to serve it as he served the "Islamic dogma" (Petrović 1981: 42). Hatred filled him with peace as prayer once did. "I would be soothed by the music of familiar sentences that I trusted, that I did not even think about but carried inside myself like the flow of my blood" ⁴³¹ (Selimović 2018a: 56). Hamlet believes that Gertrude desecrates the memory of King Hamlet by marrying him. Apart from the fact that she does this, Hamlet is also pained by the speed with which she does it. It is the pain

⁴³¹ „[...] музика познатих реченица којима вјерујем, о којима чак не мислим, носим их у себи као крвоток” (Селимовић 2004: 49).

of a soul that is unable to cope with death, and at least is able to grieve someone with that speed and to decide to continue life, which is, in a way, starting life from scratch. It is also the pain, or rather, the insult of someone who has had something taken from him. Hamlet has had his throne taken from him by Claudius. This is an important turning point in the play because Hamlet feels like the king of Denmark.

Hamlet is also a story about a subjective, exaggerated reaction to pain, to the injustice inflicted on him personally by his mother's behavior and, as Hamlet will later learn from the Ghost, the murder of his father. This is one of the threads that connects *Hamlet* to *Death and the Dervish*. In both literary works, the protagonists insist on their own subjectivity, on a personal, idealistic view of the world, on a reality that is not repulsive, until they are forced not only to become acquainted with such a reality, but also to come to terms with it. To begin with, they must participate in it, and in order to do so, they must first abandon their position of neutrality and ethical ambiguity.

In *Death and the Dervish*, Ahmed Nuruddin experienced pain. A relatively young man of 40 years lost his brother, whom he brought to the town and separated from the home without taking responsibility for finding him, as he did with Mullah-Yusuf. It is a story about the pain of a man whose dervish illusion was shattered by reality, showing him that ideals are nothing more than his personal view of the world, which has nothing in common with reality. This is the moment when it turns out that there is a contradiction between reality and what is in sheikh Nuruddin's head.

Staying on the sidelines and living in environments where reality did not actually happen, where thought was the only event, such as the dervish tekke and the university, is no longer an option for either Ahmed Nuruddin or Hamlet. Ahmed Nuruddin has the same problem, who does nothing when he should do everything. They must therefore determine themselves ethically.

Both hatred and madness have their roots in exaggerated affects, in exaggerated, explosive reactions, which is the basis of the Dionysian

mask according to Nietzsche. But, since Ahmed's hatred is not a mask, but his real reaction, we can say that the intensification of affects is the Dionysian element of his hatred. Ahmed's hatred is real, Hamlet's madness is false.

This is the similarity between Hamlet's alleged madness and Nuruddin's hatred. It is a subjective reaction to a boundary situation that leads Ahmed to a transformation. It is a sincere, unadulterated emotion, which he could not have planned, which makes it spontaneous. It was born in his heart as Athena was born from the head of Zeus. It freed him from obedience to the order, to political and religious constraints that he had not suspected until then, which is why he becomes a subversive element, a threat.

In contrast, with Ahmed Nuruddin we have a gradual increase in emotions throughout the novel. At the very beginning he is calm in the tekke, within the claustrophobic molds of Islamic exegesis, his life is in accordance with the Koran, his personal identity coincides with his socially constructed identity. Nuruddin does not understand his subjugation and the lack of freedom. He chooses to be a slave to Islam. Ahmed's perspective is changed by the situation of his brother's murder.

Until his encounter with the musellim in the first part of the novel, he lacks the "[...] Apollonian element, by which the Hellenic consciousness rises to self-consciousness"⁴³² (Đurić in: Nietzsche 1998: 14), that is, the insight that he attached greater value to his dervishism and dervish act than his calling really carries. He really believes in dogma, only and only in dogma, to the very limits of his subordinate consciousness until that encounter, and after that he begins to doubt everything he believed in. The relationship between Apollo and Dionysus is, according to Nietzsche, a relationship of opposites. These two principles are mutually conflicting in what they mean, symbolize, and represent. These are two Greek deities, of which Apollo is the original

⁴³² „[...] apolonski elemenat, kojim se helenska svest uzdiže do samosvesti" (Đurić u: Niče 1998: 14).

Hellenic god, the one who is the founder of the Olympic world of many gods, the world of beauty that Helen opposed to the ugliness of reality in order to survive it (Vattimo 2011: 22). These two gods are opposed to each other, as are Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin in their attitude towards interpersonal relationships and self-knowledge, but who exist side by side, thereby building a unity, the one that Nietzsche embodied in ancient tragedy.

His field of action is human ecstasy. Dionysus is a god who exceeds the measure. He breaks down boundaries with barbaric force. Dionysus represents excess, he is the messenger of the tragic and the frenzied. Dionysus breaks all limitations. His destructive potential is enormous. He breaks down the barriers within man, removes boundaries by demonstrating his disruptive power. Dionysus is free in himself because he does not care about other people's eyes, and in his eyes the terrible Dionysian reality that Apollo chooses to ignore is revealed. Dionysus is uninhibited. He is a valiant in his debauchery, the god of trance, an altered state of consciousness in which the senses dominate the mind, completely subjugating it to its debauchery. Dionysus is the god of liberation from shackles. He is the god of revealed hidden drives of an individual man. He reveals the horror deeply hidden in being. Dionysus, with his intensity, leads man into his own abyss. Dionysus symbolizes the stupor of drunkenness. The Dionysian principle generates, "[...] the horror and rapture of losing oneself in chaos"⁴³³ (Ivanov 2017: 382).

The world of Olympic illusion that Nietzsche wrote about is a world of dreams and illusions that hides the world of Dionysian reality. It is a real world filled with horrors, injustice and evil. The role of dreams, illusions and apparitions is to provide protection from such a reality, which threatens with horrors and disgust (Vattimo 2011: 22). It is a world steeped in monstrosity, in crimes, a world in which the guilty are not punished, a world of suffering and human despair. The individual, Helen, like Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, is disgusted by

⁴³³ „[...] ужас и усхићење губитка самог себе у хаосу” (Иванов 2017: 382).

such a morally compromised world that contradicts his lofty ideals, a world in which injustice is permitted, in which human life is worth nothing, a world that turns a blind eye to the murder of an innocent person. That world is corrupted and rotten in its essence.

In that world, ideals no longer have any meaning. They are questioned by a few self-aware individuals who have difficulty coming to terms with a reality that is for them a metaphor for ugliness. They are disgusted by it, by reality. It disgusts them, and this disgust inhibits their action, as is the case with Nietzsche's Dionysian man (Nietzsche 2003: 39). It is a world that has accepted pretense, masking, disguise as a sign of coping, as a requisite for swimming in the murky waters of decadence – moral decline and decay at the level of an entire civilization.

To "[...] have truly seen to the essence of things [...]" (*Ibid.*), as Nietzsche formulates it, means to confront such a world. It is a vision, primordial, essential and sudden, horrified. Knowledge is acquired despite not wanting it. But it is necessary because it leads to transformation. And transformation leads to liberation or to failure, depending on whether we are talking about Hamlet or Nuruddin. Failure is a consequence of the Apollonian illusion.

Ahmed Nuruddin's (anti)Apollonian (anti)mask implies persistence in his own, artificially created, vision of the world, many times embellished, which allows him to survive a world that is in discord with his idealistic moral worldview. It protects him from reality and ensures his mere survival in a world he has not grown up with. The Apollonian mask implies hiding and withdrawing into its construct, an illusion, thereby fulfilling its protective role.

We find an element of lethargy in Hamlet's postponing of taking revenge, and what he expresses towards his decadent mistress Gertrude, who has not fulfilled his moral ideal of a woman whose life essentially (and why not literally) ends with her husband's death, but has begun another life, with another man, her husband's brother, his murderer and usurper of the throne, who has taken away from her son, is disgust.

Their antagonistic characters do not serve to describe them as two opposites that have nothing in common with each other. The only way to show the contrasts that resemble each other is to show them as different parts of the same whole, which simply could not be complete without each other.

„[...] that the opposition Apollonian-Dionysian is in no way reduced to the opposition rational-irrational. Neither is the Apollonian characterized by rational features alone, nor is the Dionysian hopelessly steeped in the irrational”⁴³⁴ (Đurić 1997: 302).

And that would diminish the element of building unity in which both Apollo and Dionysus participate equally, in all the splendor of their mutual difference. The self needs both elements to be in balance, without any of them dominating thus creating chaos.

“The Apollonian needs the Dionysian as excess in order to be able to resist it with its measure and thus confirm itself as a force that is restrained”⁴³⁵ (*Ibid*).

In order for Dionysus to be inferior, he must have Apollo, and vice versa, in order for Apollo to be Apollo, he must have Dionysus. Their unity and overflow of one into the other rests in Apollo’s respect for the measure, and continues at the point where Dionysus oversteps it. That point between respect and transgression is the balance between these two deities that build ancient tragedy.

“First I noticed her hands. While she held the veil with prescribed, fixed gestures that restricted their possibilities, they were separated and unexpressive, hardly perceptible. But when she let go of the fabric and

⁴³⁴ „[...] да се супротност аполонско-дионизијско никако не своди н супротност рационално-ирационално. Нити се аполонско одликује само рационалним цртама нити је дионизијско безнадежно огрезло у ирционалном” (Ђурић 1997: 302).

⁴³⁵ „[...] дионизијском је потребно аполонско како се не би расплинуло у необузданости и тако отуђило од себе, то јест како не би постало „одвратна мешавина похоте и свирепости” (Ниче у: Ђурић 1997: 303).

put them together, they suddenly came to life and became a single entity. They would not begin their movements rashly or move briskly, but in their silent motionlessness and slow wandering there was a strange meaning and so much power that they drew my attention again and again. It seemed that at any moment they might do something important, something decisive. Thus an air of expectation arose, constant and exciting. They rested together on her lap, in an embrace, as if smothering each other in quiet yearning or keeping each other from wandering off, from doing something unreasonable. They remained motionless in an incessant, barely perceptible rippling, like a restless shiver, or a light spasm of excessive energy. Then they parted, without haste, as if by agreement. They hovered for a moment, looking for one another, and then alighted tenderly on a satin knee like amorous birds, embracing again, inseparable, happy in their silence together. This lasted for a long time, then one moved and began to stroke the satin under it, and the skin under the satin, with fingers that contracted slowly and passionately. The other lay nestled on top of it, silent, listening to the smooth silk rustle inaudibly on her round, marble knee. Only occasionally would they tear themselves away, and one would embark upon a journey of its own, to brush softly the earring on the edge of an ear hidden timidly under black hair with a reddish tinge. Or it would pause in the air as if to hear a word or two, and then withdraw without much interest for the conversation to meet the other, which was silent, offended at that small lapse in attention⁴³⁶ (Selimović 2018a: 33)

⁴³⁶ „Прво сам запазио њене руке. Док је придржавала јашмак, при-силном кретњом, која је одређена, без много могућности, биле су раз-двојене и неизразите, једва су се примјећивале. Али кад је пустила тка-нину и саставила руке, оне су одједном оживјеле. Нису у поход полазиле нагло нити су се кретале живо, али је у њиховом стишаном мировању, или лаганом лутању, било толико снаге и неког необичног смисла, да су непре-стано прикивале моју пажњу. Изгледало је да ће сваког часа учинити не-што важно, нешто пресудно, стварајући тако напетост очекивања, сталну и узбудљиву. Мировале су у крилу, састављене, обгрљене, као да се даве у тихој чежњи, или чувају једна другу да не одлутају, да не учине штогод не-разумно, непомичне у непрестаном таласању што се једва видјело, слич-но немирно дрхату, лаком грчу од преобиља снаге. Онда су се без журбе раздвајале, као да су се договориле, и само тренутак лебдјеле, тражећи се, па њежно падале, попут заљубљених птица, на атласно кољено, опет

In this scene, Selimović plays with balance, with the point where the Apollonian and the Dionysian intersect. The atmosphere oscillates between the impression created by the dim light and the slow, refined movements that have a dose of subtle eroticism in them, her withdrawal from the conversation, the withdrawal of her hands, the “constant undulation” that the writer mentions transforms this scene into a scene of tides, where two opposing forces outwit each other. The gentle movements contribute to the impression of disembodiedness and a limit that is about to be crossed. Her hands awaken a Dionysian feeling of delight in the dervish:

“I followed them, surprised by the expressiveness of their independent existence. They were like two small creatures that had their own realm of life, their own needs and love, their own jealousy, longing, and lewdness. At one moment I was delighted, at the next frightened by the crazy thought of the isolation and senselessness of that petty life, so similar to every other. But that was a quick and harmless thought, a single, momentary beat of another life in me, which I did not want to awaken”⁴³⁷ (Selimović 2018a: 33–34).

загрљене, нераздвијне, нераздвојне, срећне у свом састављеном ћутању. Дуго је тако трајало и, и једна се помакнула, прстима што су се споро истрасно грчили почињала да глади атлас испод себе, и кожу испод атласа, а друга је лежала на њој, приљубљена, утишана, послушкујући нечујно пуцкетање глатког кумаша над округлим мермерним кољеном. Само понекад би се откинуле и једна би пошла у самосталан поход, да овлаш додирне минђушу на крају уха стидљиво скривнеог испод црне косе црвенкаста одсјаја, или би се зауставила у ваздуху, да чује неку ријеч, па би се повлачила, без много занимања за разговор, идући у сусрет оној другој што је ћутала, увиријена том малом непажњом” (Селимовић 2004: 24–25).

⁴³⁷ „Пратио сам их, изненађен изрзитошћу њихова осамостаљеног живота, као два мала створа што имају своју властиту животну путању, своје прохтјеве и своју љубав, своју љубомору, чежњу, блуд, у једном тренутку одушевљен, у другом уплашен, због луде мисли о затворености и бесмислу тог ситног живота, сличног сваком, али је то била брза и безопасна мисао, тренутни откуцај друкчијег живота у мени, који нисам желио да будим” (*Истио*).

This is the moment when Dionysus awakens in Nuruddin, the one to whom lust is no stranger. Đurić says:

“[...] the Dionysian needs the Apollonian so that it does not dissolve in unbridledness and thus become alienated from itself, that is, so that it does not become a „disgusting mixture of lust and cruelty”⁴³⁸ (Nietzsche in: Đurić 1997: 303).

Cruelty came much later, hand in hand with hatred. The game of Dionysus and Apollo continues with Nuruddin continuing to look at her hands.

I also watched them for their beauty. They began at her wrists, which were enclosed in bracelets and the embroidered cuffs of her silken shirt. Their joints were tenderly oval and inconceivably slender, their knuckles limpid. Most beautiful of all were her fingers, long and supple; their fair skin was perfectly smooth, with shadows at the joints. They seemed strangely alive as they slowly opened and closed into a transparent calyx, like petals. But if at first I paid attention to those two little creatures, two small animals, two octopi, two flowers, they were not the only thing I noticed, not even at the beginning when I had been mostly watching them, nor later on as I discovered her like an unknown land. Everything about her was harmonious and inseparable: the look of her eyes, lightly shaded with kohl, which merged with the gestures of her arm, barely hidden by the transparent fabric of her shirt; the slight tilt of her head and the glimmer of an emerald set in gold on her brow; the unconscious quiver of her foot in its silver-embroidered slipper; her smooth, even face, along which a tender light effused from somewhere within, from her blood, which changed into a warm glow; the moist flash of her teeth behind seemingly lazy, full lips. She was only a body; everything else was supplanted by it⁴³⁹ (Selimović 2018a: 34).

⁴³⁸ „[...] дионизијском је потребно аполонско како се не би расплинуло у необузданост и тако отуђило од себе, то јест како не би постало „одвратна мешавина похоте и свирепости [...]” (Ниче у: Ђурић 1997: 303).

⁴³⁹ „Гледао сам их и због љепоте. Почињале су од зглавака, оивичене халхалама и везеним рубљом свилене кошуље, њежно облих и непојмљиво танких зглобова, прозрачних чланака. Најљепши су били прсти, дуги, гибљиви,

He notices her beauty, enjoys it, but still remains Apollonianly calm, does not cross the line, controls himself, and resists the masculine discourse within himself:

“She did not awaken desire in me; I would have not allowed myself that. I would have stifled it at the very beginning, with shame, with the thought of my age and title, with the awareness of the danger that I would have exposed myself to, with the fear of an unrest that could be more serious than disease, with my habit of self-control”⁴⁴⁰ (Selimović 2018a: 34).

The Apollonian principle as the Greeks understood it is confirmed by Nuruddin himself according to Nietzsche. This philosopher was captivated by them and followed their experiences with the two gods which were crucial to his way of thinking. According to them the primary attribute of Apollo is self-control the suppression of all excess the restraint of one's own nature and a poise that overcomes agitation and inner fire.

“He was the symbol of restraint” and self-mastery, a sublime calm will in the face of every wild impulse [...]”⁴⁴¹ (Đurić 1997: 301).

свијетле коже саливене у правилне чуњеве са сјенкама претиба, зачудо живи кад су се полако ширили или скупљали у прозирну чашу, као латице. Али ако сам прво обратио пажњу на та два мала створа, двије жживотињице, двије сипе, два цвијета, нисам их примећивао саме, ни у почетку док сам највише у њих гледао, ни послје када сам је откривао као непознату земљу. Све је на њој било складно и нераздвојиво: поглед очију лако оивичен црном бојом, што се спајао с покретом руке једва скривене провидном тканином кошуље: меки нагиб главе; кад би затрептао златом обухваћени смарагд на челу, и несвјестан трзај ноге у сребрној папучи; лице без неравнина, по коме се разливала блага свјетлост некуд изнутра, из крви што се преобраћала у топле одсјаје; влажан бљесак зуба из привидно лијепих, пуних усана. Имала је само тијело, све друго је њиме потиснуто” (Селимовић 2004: 26).

⁴⁴⁰ „Није у мени пробудила жељу, не бих то себи допустио, удавио бих је у самом зачетку, стидом, мишљу о годинама и звању, свијешћу о опасности којој бих се извргао, страхом од немира који може да буде тежи од болести, навиком да владам собом” (*Isto*).

⁴⁴¹ „Сам Нурудин потврђује присуство аполонског начела у себи онако како су га, по Ничеу, схватили Грци. Опчињен њима, овај филозоф је

But in Nuruddin we also notice Dionysian traits, such as his submission to dogma imbued with a “[...] mystical feeling of belonging to a higher community”⁴⁴² (Đurić 1997: 301), a community of orthodox believers. In addition, he resembles Dionysus who “[...] marked the outbreak of a relentless passion [...]”⁴⁴³ (*Ibid.*) such as hatred. [...] the Dionysiac states ecstasy where the typical boundaries and barriers of existence are destroyed contains for as long as it lasts a lethargic element in which all past personal experiences are forgotten. This gap between the worlds of daily existence and the Dionysian experience is known as oblivion. However the moment everyday reality returns to consciousness it is viewed as such with disgust the result of those states is a desolate will-negating attitude.

In this way Dionysiac Man and Hamlet are alike: both have seen the true nature of things have learned about them and find action disgusting because it cannot alter the eternal nature of things they find it absurd or shameful that they should be expected to put a world so out of balance right. Hamlet’s lesson is not that cliché about Jack the Dreamer not acting because he reflects too much out of an excess of possibilities as it were but rather that knowledge kills action and that action necessitates being cloaked in a veil of illusion. In both Hamlet and Dionysian Man cases it is not reflection but rather true knowledge and insight into the terrible truth that surpasses all other motivations for action. There is a desire for a world beyond death and the gods themselves but there is currently no solace that can be found. Existence and its perilous reflection in the gods or in some immortal Beyond are denied. The awareness of truth causes man to

следио њихов доживљај два божанства, тако значајна за његов мисаони систем. За њих, доминантна карактеристика Аполона је лимитирање самог себе, кочење сваке прекомерности, зауздавање сопственог бића, сталоженост која тријумфује над устрепталошћу и унутрашњим пламом. У грчкој култури, „био је симбол обуздавања” и самосавлађивања, узвишене мирноће насупротив свакој дивљој побуди [...]” (Đurić 1997: 301).

⁴⁴² „[...] мистичним осећањем припадања вишој заједници” (Ђурић 1997: 301).

⁴⁴³ „[...] је обележавао провалу бесомучне страсти [...]” (*Исџо*).

see after it has been witnessed, only the horrible or ridiculous things in the world he now recognizes the meaning of Ophelia's fate and the wisdom of the wood-god Silenus: he is repulsed. Here art steps in as a healing sorceress who can save the will at this point of extreme peril. Art alone has the power to transform those disgusting ideas about the terrible or absurd nature of life into representations that humans can live with. These representations are the sublime which uses art to tame the terrible and the comical which uses art to release disgust at absurdity. The salvation comes from the chorus of satyrs in the dithyramb. Greek art the attacks of disgust mentioned above were absorbed in it, reflection on these Dionysiac companions intermediate world. Dionysian art also aims to persuade us of the eternal lust and joy of life but we must look for this joy behind appearances rather than in them. We must acknowledge that everything that exists must be ready for agonizing devastation we must look into each persons personal horrors, life – and yet we are not to freeze in horror: its philosophical comfort lifts us briefly from the chaos of shifting figures. The struggle the pain the destruction of appearances all of this now seems necessary to us given the uncountable excess of forms of existence thrusting and pushing themselves into life given the exuberant fertility of the world – will we are pierced by the furious sting of these pains at the very moment when as it happens. [...] Despite fear and sympathy we are contentedly alive – not as separate beings but as the single living creature whose lust for reproduction we have united with. We can now clearly and definitively understand the origins of Greek tragedy and how the tragic art form of the Greeks was genuinely inspired by the spirit of music. This idea in our opinion is the first time we have adequately captured the choruss unique and startling significance. Nevertheless we must acknowledge that the tragic myths meaning as we have said was never transparent and conceptually clear to Greek poets much less Greek philosophers to some degree their heroes talk more surface-level than they do myth is undoubtedly not sufficiently objectified in spoken language. Shakespeare's Hamlet for instance speaks more superficially than he acts so the aforementioned lesson

of Hamlet cannot be drawn from the words of the play but rather from intense contemplation and reflection on the whole. Similarly the scenes' structure and the vivid images reveal a deeper wisdom than the poet himself can put into words and concepts (Nietzsche in: Bloom 2008: 195–196).

That is “under his auspices, man gained supernatural strength in song and dance, forgot about himself, identified with the divine”⁴⁴⁴ (Đurić 1997: 301). Nuruddin's strength was given by hatred. “Obsessed with Dionysian ecstasy, the individual man transcends the boundaries of his individuality, experiences a complete inner transformation”⁴⁴⁵ (*Ibid*). Isn't this the case with Nuruddin, who lost his humanity and experienced a Machiavellian downfall of his being? A metamorphosis did occur in him: from a withdrawn and humble man dedicated to serving God, “*Light of Faith*”⁴⁴⁶ (Selimović 2018a: 20), and “Nuruddin's conviction that he was the light of faith indicates the depth of his subjugation”⁴⁴⁷ (Petrović 1981: 46), he became a liar, hypocrite, traitor and murderer (Delić (ed.) 2014: 10).

Unlike Apollo in Greek mythology, who “[...] timely reconciled with his powerful opponent and thus happily curbed his titanic-barbaric tendencies”⁴⁴⁸ (Đurić 1997: 303) Ahmed Nuruddin did not do so. He crossed the line. But, in him, despite everything, there is still “[...] the basic principle of life [...]”⁴⁴⁹ (*Ibid*: 310), symbolized by Dionysus. Nietzsche says of this god: “His suffering is not an accusation

⁴⁴⁴ „Под његовим окриљем човек је у песми и игри добијао природну снагу, заборављао на себе, поистовећивао се са божанским” (*Исџо*).

⁴⁴⁵ „Обузет дионизијским заносом, појединачни човек прекорачује границе своје индивидуалности, доживљава потпуни унутрашњи преображај” (*Исџо*).

⁴⁴⁶ „[...] с в ј е т л о в ј е р е (...)” (Селимовић 2004: 12).

⁴⁴⁷ „Nuruddinovo ubeđenje da je on svetlo vere ukazuje na dubinu potčinjavanja” (Petrović 1981: 46), постао је лажов, лицемер, издајник и убица (Делић (пр.) 2014: 10)

⁴⁴⁸ „[...] благовремено помирио са својим моћним противником те тако срећно обуздао титанско-варварску тенденцију (Ђурић 1997: 303).

⁴⁴⁹ „[...] основно начело живота [...]” (*Исџо*: 310).

against life, but a true affirmation of life. It is precisely as a sufferer, as one who has felt the suffering of individual existence, that Dionysus celebrates and glorifies life”⁴⁵⁰ (*Ibid*).

Can't the same be applied to Ahmed Nuruddin? He is a sufferer, who has lost his brother, love, connection with his parent, a potential chance for time with a potential son, but, nevertheless, he utters the sentence: “I want to live!”⁴⁵¹ (Selimović 2018a: 372). Are there simpler, yet greater sentences in praise of life? It is simultaneously a cry for mercy for the imminent death announced by the roosters, as when the rooster crows in Hamlet, the Ghost of his father disappears, returning to death by returning to purgatory, and defiance, showing the teeth of death, which is confirmed by these lines of Nuruddin:

“I want to live! No matter what happens, I want to live. I must! I'll fight, I'll bite with my teeth, I'll run until the skin falls off the soles of my feet, I'll find someone to help me, I'll put a knife to someone's throat and demand that they help me – I helped others! – and even if I didn't, it doesn't matter, I'll run from the end and from death”⁴⁵² (Selimović 2018a: 372)

In this scene, Nuruddin transforms into Is-haq from the scene in the darkness of the tekke. The obvious allusion is part of the sentence about the leather falling off the sole, because Is-haq's shoe fell off his sole. This is the second and last designation of Ahmed Nuruddin in the novel. The first was to give in to hatred. Yes, to give in, as a vice.

⁴⁵⁰ „Његово страдање није никаква оптужба против живота, већ истинска потврда живота. Управо као страдалник, као онај који је на себи осетио патњу појединачне егзистенције, Дионис слави и велича живот” (Исто).

⁴⁵¹ „Хоћу да живим!” (Селимовић 2004: 386).

⁴⁵² „Ма шта да се деси, хоћу да живим, на једној нози до смрти, на уској литици до смрти, али хоћу да живим. Морам!” Она је и одлука да се бори против неминовног краја: „Борићу се, зубима ћу грести, бјежаћу док ми кожа не отадне са табана, наћи ћу неког да ми помогне, нож ћу ставити под врат и тражићу да ми помогне, и ја сам пмагао другима, свеједно и ако нисам, побјећи ћу од краја и од смрти” (*Исџо*).

In that sentence, as in Dionysus, "... an elemental instinctive force has accumulated"⁴⁵³ (Đurić 1997: 310).

As for Dionysus and Hamlet, when he speaks of the prince's disgust, it is as if Nietzsche is speaking, who says:

"I had always sensed *hostility to life*, a furious, vindictive distate for life itself: for all life is based on appearance, art, deception, point of view, the necessity of perceptive (...)"⁴⁵⁴ (Nietzsche 2003: 8).

For Hamlet, that point of view, the perspective Nietzsche mentions, is Christianity.

Hamlet is cowardly because he is a Christian. Hence his peace. He is a Christian to the core, and if we interpret Christianity and its function in the play in the way Nietzsche interprets it, which is, according to him, based on moral and moral values (*Ibid*), then this is the key to Hamlet's hesitation to kill the one who killed his father, but what remains is not silence, but the question: if everything is so, why does he kill Polonius and his former comrades, the spies? Does this mean that Nietzsche is wrong? If so, what else is he wrong about? And if he is not wrong, the circle does not close, but opens again, for new analyses and new interpretations of this drama. The ring-shaped structure of Selimović's novels (Delić (ed.) 2014: 23) is meaningfully present in this analysis of Hamlet, against the background of Nietzsche's thinking about Christianity.

We also find lethargy and hesitation, Hamletism (Klein 1964: 63) in Ahmed Nuruddin. Namely, he does not rush to help his brother whom he thinks is trapped in the fortress. He wishes he did not have to do that. His lethargy is caused by his awareness of his social position, to which he gives too much importance. And the hatred that overwhelms him after his brother's murder is an intensified affect that is characteristic

⁴⁵³ „[...] нагомилана елементарна нагонска снага” (Ђурић 1997: 310).

⁴⁵⁴ „[...] ja sam oduvek osećao i ono protivživotno, onu pritajeni, srditu i osvetničku odvratnost prema životu samom: jer svekoliki život počiva na prividu, umetnosti, obmani, optici, na neophodnosti perspektive (...)" (Niče 2020: 11).

of Dionysianism, his Dionysian mask, which is not a mask, but his originality in those moments. In Selimović's novel, Ahmed Nuruddin is, therefore, torn between his original being, his social function as a dervish, which is his Apollonian (anti)mask, and between the Dionysian elements within himself, lethargy, indecision, hesitation in situations in which he should be at most human and help his brother, and the hatred after Harun's death that has completely taken hold of him, nullifying the (spiritual) sobriety that had adorned him until then.

Hamlet thinks all the time as a legitimately elected king who cares about the well-being of his compatriots. He is turned towards the collective and the general in a healthy way worthy of a good ruler guided by the virtue of correctness. Ahmed Nuruddin, on the other hand, is guided by personal hatred, a subjective feeling of hurt and insult before the power structures that have wronged him. Unlike Hamlet, he does not want justice, but revenge. Hamlet's motives are honorable and moral, Ahmed's motives spring from his vanity. The murder of his brother is not just a wound in the soul of a grieving man, but an unforgivable insult to the dervish, the sheikh of the tekke. Ahmed Nuruddin's transformation is a metamorphosis of a man who is initially turned to the general with the intention of escaping from the personal that overtakes and devastates him.


They start from different centers: at the very beginning, Ahmed Nuruddin is the Sheikh of the tekke, and, as such, a participant in power, whose actions he does not question until he himself is made miserable by them. Hamlet is the heir to the throne who has become convinced of what Ahmed Nuruddin did not (want to) until the murder of his brother: that law and power have little in common, if anything at all. Hamlet's delay and reflection distinguish him from a tyrant and suggest that he would be a better choice for the state than Claudius, who is a tyrant. As Greenblatt says in his book *The Tyrant*:

"Impatience is another trait that, in Shakespeare's view, inevitably accompanies the tyrant's experience of power. He expects his wishes

to be carried out even before he utters them aloud. However, new, often alarming, news constantly arrives, and time ceases to be the tyrant's ally. Procrastination is dangerous: everything must be done in a hurry. There is not enough time for reflection"⁴⁵⁵ (Greenblatt, trans. Stojanović, 2020: 98)

This could explain why Shakespeare emphasizes so much the fact that Hamlet does not act with a given obligation, that he waits, and that he always has a reason and justification why it is not a good moment to take revenge. On the other hand, he had to base his reluctance on something else in order to be able to "justify" spontaneous actions such as the murder of Polonius.

⁴⁵⁵ „Nestrpljenje je još jedna osobina, koja, po Šekspirovom mišljenju, neizbežno prati tiraninovo iskustvo vlasti. On očekuje da će njegove želje biti izvršene i pre nego što ih glasno izgovori. Međutim, stalno stižu nove, većinom alarmantne vesti, pa vreme prestaje da bude saveznik tiraninu. Odlaganje je opasno: sve mora da se radi u žurbi. Ne ostaje dovoljno vremena za razmišljanje (Grinblat, prev. Stojanović, 2020: 98).



8. THE ROLE OF KING HAMLET'S GHOST AND IS-HAQ, THE FUGITIVE, IN HAMLET AND DEATH AND THE DERVISH

The space in the drama occupied by the Ghost, first one, then the other, can be observed through one of the key, if not the key word from his address to Hamlet at the very beginning of the play. That word is purgatory, the meaning of which can be deconstructed through the relationship that Catholicism and Protestantism had towards it at and around the time of the creation of Hamlet, which took its place, that is, Catholicism preceded the emergence of Protestantism in England.

One of the two works that Milica Spremić most often refers to in the part of her monograph in which she deals with the figure of King Hamlet's ghost is Stephen Greenblatt's book *Hamlet in Purgatory* (Spremić 2011: 57). The study opens with a kind of admission by the author that the delight that the figure of the ghost in the play Hamlet arouses in him lasts for several years. He applies a neo-historical analysis to it, seeking to peer deeper into the text and into what lies beyond it, to deal in more detail not only with its textual interior and literary and artistic layer, but also to scratch beneath the surface and see what lies on the other side of the text.

Its population both accepted and did not accept the new faith, some people were still firmly rooted in the Catholic faith (*Ibid.*: 61). These two doctrines, Catholic and Protestant, appeared very early in Shakespeare's life, already at his baptism, since he came from a Catholic family, but was baptized by a Protestant priest (*Ibid.*). They did not bypass his father, John Shakespeare, then in his late years:

“John Shakespeare, the former mayor of Stratford, like many other civil servants during the Protestant persecution of Catholics, led a double life: he was a Catholic, but in public he behaved as a Protestant. [...] The death of Shakespeare’s father in 1601 was another blow, and these tragedies can explain what Greenblatt calls „the explosive power and depth of Hamlet”. He even suggests that, at the time he was writing Hamlet, Shakespeare was visited by the spirit of his Catholic father, begging for help to save his soul [...]”⁴⁵⁶ (*Ibid*: 62-63)

If one accepts the view that Greenblatt himself advocates, according to which the roots of Hamlet not only reach deep into but also penetrate deeply into the private life of William Shakespeare (*Ibid*: 62), it can be argued that the purgatory that echoes the spirit of Hamlet’s father reflects the religious division of the people in England at that time, and not just the boundary between the soul’s transition from this world to the next. Greenblatt interprets Hamlet through the lens of “Catholic doctrine” (*Ibid*: 60). This type of reading results in such a deconstruction of the appearance of the Ghost for the first time in the play, with reference to the fact that the use of the ghost is not present, and therefore not recorded, in the earlier drafts of *Hamlet*, i.e. the texts that served as its source (*Ibid*).

In her interview with Stephen Greenblatt “The Paths of New Historicism”, Radojka Vukčević raises the question of diverse implications of New Historicism.

He was interested not only in his literary contributions, but also in his character as an individual navigating a turbulent and dangerous era. Unlike many of his theatrical contemporaries who often found

⁴⁵⁶ „Džon Šekspir, bivši gradonačelnik Stratforda, kao i mnogi drugi državni službenici u doba protestantskih progona katolika, vodio je dvostruki život: bio je katolik, ali se u javnom delovanju ponašao kao protestant. [...] Smrt Šekspirovog oca 1601. godine bila je još jedan udarac, i tedve tragedije mogu objasniti ono što Grinblat naziva „eksplozivnom snagom i dubinom Hamleta”. On čak sugerše da je, u vreme dok je pisao Hamleta, Šekspira pohodio duh njegovog oca katolika, moleći pomoć za izbavljenje duše [...]” (Grinblat in: Spremić 2011: 62–63)

themselves in precarious situations, Shakespeare skillfully kept his distance from such dangers. He possessed an extraordinary awareness of the limits he could cross without risk. I am particularly fascinated by this aspect of his character and the way he managed to operate within the framework of his time. It is important to note that Shakespeare lacks any form of protection or significant social position; he was not related to figures such as Francis Bacon. This makes his life story extremely complex. Despite his humble origins, he thrived in a very complicated environment in England. I am interested in what the cost of this had been (Greenblatt in Vukčević 2007: 133).

In her question, Radojka Vukčević outlines the elementary premises of the New Historicism. She argues that the revival of the New Historicism reflects the modern desire to integrate art with politics, as well as language with culture and power. Culture is assumed to be both defined and articulated through the various discourses it includes, such as art and politics, where power dynamics shape narrative. The relationship between art and criticism is so closely tied to the frameworks of power that there seems to be little opportunity for them to challenge or critique these structures. In what ways did Shakespeare navigate these same dynamics, when viewed through the lens of the New Historicism? (*Ibid*: 133–134).

Greenblatt says that Shakespeare in his work, he relied predominantly on materials that were not original, “he had the skill to take whatever he found useful. One way to characterize his style is to compare it to that of a magician, who appropriates everything that seems no longer in use, including culturally erased deities. This theme is explored in the study *Hamlet in Purgatory*, which deals with the cultural devastation of the era, and the resistance of Protestants to accept Catholicism and the doctrine of purgatory. This doctrine is not only intricate, but also reflects the social framework. Cultural artifacts were devastated, but Shakespeare masterfully collected these damaged and lost goods, and used them effectively, ensuring their re-use” (*Ibid*: 134).

He adds *Hamlet in Purgatory* explores the intriguing case of a playwright seeking to creatively engage with elements that his culture

had renounced or criticized. Shakespeare's approach could not have been conventional; such a method would not have been permissible, even if it had been his desire. However, Greenblatt believes he had no such inclination. It is important to note that theater was subject to censorship at the time. This was the reason why he simply could not directly portray the doctrine of purgatory. Such a representation would have been forbidden. However, I argue that Shakespeare was more fascinated by what would happen if Hamlet, as a ghost returning from that inexplicable, immaterial, intangible realm, asked to live (*Ibid*).

It is a place where the souls of sinners are imprisoned and allowed between heaven and hell. Puritans had a big social and economic impact on Catholic Europe. This is because injured status and adhesion to the public were a valuable product that could be purchased for the saints or for them. This purchase was considered to reduce pain and reduce time until the soul was cleaned. Such help was intended only for souls who had reached purgatory; the blessed souls in heaven did not even request help, and the damned souls – those condemned to hell – could not receive it. The imperfect souls in purgatory were the souls of those who had sinned during their earthly lives and were subjected to suffering. But their ultimate fate was determined; they would eventually enter heaven (Greenblatt in: Spremić 2011: 58).

Fear of what happens after death was the root cause and as a result the Catholic Church began to profit greatly from the doctrine of purgatory. From royalty and nobility to common people people from all walks of life were inspired to assist their departed loved ones and themselves when confronted with the horrifying prospect of suffering in purgatory. Protestants primarily argued that the doctrine of purgatory was unsupported by Scripture. The Catholic Church they claimed created the idea of purgatory persuading believers of its existence and urging them to significantly contribute to the salvation of both their own and other peoples souls (*Ibid.*).

According to the Catholic Church, ghosts are the souls of the deceased imprisoned in purgatory, who occasionally return to this realm to ask their relatives for intercession to alleviate their suffering,

often through the payment of a mass or donations. Belief in purgatory was a fundamental aspect of life in England from the late twelfth century, when it was established, until the mid-sixteenth century, when Protestantism emerged as the state religion, which led to the abolition of the entire system of prayers, offerings, funeral masses, and other rituals intended to help the deceased. Belief in ghosts became unacceptable and was later excluded from everyday life, relegated to the realm of the theater (*Ibid.*).

The opening scenes of the play *Hamlet* are laden with the presence of a ghost, a specter that looks exactly like the deceased King Hamlet, who wears his clothes from the last battle he fought with the deceased King of Norway, whom he defeated, killed, and conquered his lands. The ghost walks like the deceased ruler of Denmark. The play *Hamlet* opens with a scene of the night on the terrace of Elsinore, where the guards Francisco, who is a soldier, the officers Marcellio and Bernardo, and Horatio, a friend of the heir to the throne Hamlet, to whom the ghost of his father will address in the fourth scene of the play, are located.

“The supernatural, otherworldly tragedy *Hamlet* begins at night, with a scene on the terrace of Elsinore castle and the appearance of the Ghost of Hamlet’s father, exactly at midnight” ‘when hell spreads its plague over the world’⁴⁵⁷ (Marić 2015: 192).

Horatio explains that there was the King that appeared in front of them:

Our last King
Whose image even but now appeared to us,
Was (as you know) by Fortinbras of Norway,
Thereto pricked on by a most emulate pride,
Dared to combat; in which our valiant Hamlet
(For so this side of our known worrld esteemed him)

⁴⁵⁷ „Natprirodna, nadsvetovna tragedija *Hamlet* počinje noću, scenom na terasi dvorca Elsinor i pojavom Duha Hamletovog oca, tačno u ponoć” ‘kad pakao razvejava zarazu svetom’ (Marić 2015: 192).

Did slay this Fortinbras, who by a sealed compact,
Well ratified by law and heraldry,
Did forfeit (with his life all those his lands)
Which he stood seized of, to the conqueror [...]" ⁴⁵⁸
(Hamlet, Act I, scene I, lines 81–89)

Marcelo says that this is not the first time that the ghost has appeared, but that this has not been the first time but the second. According to him,

"[...] thus twice before, and jump at this dead hour,
With martial stalk hath he gone by our watch"⁴⁵⁹.
(*Ibid.*, lines 65–66)

He may be announcing danger, given that:

"[...] this portentous figure
Comes armed through our watch so like the King [...]"⁴⁶⁰
(I. 2. 109–110)

⁴⁵⁸ „[...] наш покојни краљ,
Чија нам се сад баш појавила сен,
Био је – то знате – на борбу изазван
Од Фортинбраса, краља норвешког,
Ког горда зависат на то подстаче.
У борби тој наш Хамлет јуначки –
Тако га овај назва свет –
Убије тог Фортинбраса.
Овај запечаћеним једним уговором,
И овереним на начин витешки,
Победнику даде, сем живота свог,
Све земље којима беше владао“
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев.. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 12)

⁴⁵⁹ „Двапут већ тако, у глуво доба све,
Он прође страже ратничким кораком“
(*Исто*).

⁴⁶⁰ „[...] тај страшни лик
Оружан иде кроз наше страже
Толико сличан краљу“
(*Исто*: 13)

He does not speak to any of the guards who have seen her for the second night in a row, as Horatio says:

Two nights together had these gentlemen,
 Marcellus and Barnarrdo, on thir watch
 In the dead waste and middle of the night,
 Been thus encountered. A figure ike your father,
 Armed at all points exactly, cap-a-pie,
 Apears before them, and with solemn march
 Goes slow and stately by them; thrice he walked
 By their oppressed and fear-surprised eyes⁴⁶¹ [I. 2. 198–203]

He asks his felllow soldiers whether they agree that they should inform Prince Hamlet of the Ghost's presence since it is: "As needful in our loves, fitting our duty"⁴⁶² (I, I, 173.)

The Ghost, while often a challenge and even an embarrassment to modern producers, is a remarkable embodiment of ambiguity during its appearance. This ghost has only one notable counterpart the Ghost of Banquo in Macbeth unlike any other ghost figure in earlier Elizabethan drama or Shakespeares works prior to Hamlet. The atmosphere that surrounds the Ghosts appearance – the chilly nights the agitated guards and Horatio – contributes significantly to its persuasiveness. Upon arrival, he and the soldiers repeatedly refer to it as "it", emphasizing the striking resemblance of "it" to the deceased king. Horace, representing the conventional Protestant view of ghosts, accuses 'it' of 'usurping' the physical, apparitional form of

⁴⁶¹ „Две ноћи устоце ова су господа,
 Марцело и Бернардо, стражарећи,
 У мртво, пусто доба поноћи
 Имали овај сусрет. Неки створ
 Ко отац ваш, од главе до пете сав,
 У оклопу се јављао пред њима;
 Свечаним кораком, тих и достојанствен
 Прошао је крај њих; [...]"
 (Исто: 22)

⁴⁶² „То љубав тражи, а дужност налаже" (*Исџо*: 15).

the dead king, suggesting that the ghost is the embodiment of evil. The next time “it” appears, the crowing of a rooster interrupts the scene, making it seem as if “it” has fled “as the culprit.” The existence of the Ghost is firmly established, but its true nature remains ambiguous. Hamlet wonders where the ghost comes from. When it finally speaks, it claims that it is indeed the ghost of his father, and that it comes from purgatory or some similar realm. But if so, why does it demand revenge, which is forbidden by Christian doctrine? Given that the Ghosts main function in the story is to inform Hamlet of the truth about his own murder its nature is still mysterious and unclear. The Ghosts humanity is revealed in the plays opening dialogue with Hamlet. He expresses genuine concern for the queen at several points in the play (Hibbard 2008: 38–42).

This spirit harbors a sense of bitterness and sorrow for his brother’s actions. His demand for just revenge is not only understandable, but also compassionate. Although his call for revenge may be considered vindictive and unchristian, he nevertheless belongs to a more virtuous and wholesome kingdom than the corrupt Denmark ruled by King Claudius (*Ibid*: 42).

“There is a distinct set of issues regarding the Ghost. It could be argued that it combines the awe and the ridiculous. The Ghost appears to become a source of amusement for Hamlet during the remarkably extended moment of the oath of secrecy even though the apparition undoubtedly causes fear and awe in the guards and even in Horatio. For short he is referred to as the old mole the worthy pioneer (or sapper) and even this lad in the cellar. As a result the once-wonderful character turns into a clumsy performer who lurks in the dusty shadows beneath the Elizabethan stages boards. The term cellar evokes a dim backstage space that contrasts sharply with Elsinore Castles tall walls.” (Watts 1902: 12–13) this return from Purgatory serves a divine purpose because the ghosts in Shakespeares plays typically have the identities they claim to have and this apparition does indeed resemble the former Danish warrior king. But there is a clear contradiction: is he the devil in disguise or is he actually a ghost from Purgatory as he claims?

Purgatory exists because this Ghost confirms the existence of Heaven, Hell and of course the Christian God. In order to achieve violent retribution which God forbids in both the Old and New Testaments he gives Prince Hamlet instructions to carry out an overtly anti-Christian mission⁴⁶³ (Watts 2002: 12–13).

Horace's report of the Ghost's presence to Hamlet has a charging effect. He decides to join the guards on guard duty that night. He is aware of the risk, but does not hesitate. He now seems to think that life is not meaningless. Through the operation of universal law, justice is satisfied and the crime is exposed. Hamlet has two sides, as evidenced by this one scene alone. In addition to the soldier, Horace embodies everything that an aristocratic Renaissance prince should be. Ophelia describes him as the epitome of a scholar, elegant in his bearing, curious and precise as befits an academic, and strong and decisive in his decision-making. Yet he is distrustful, resentful, and above all demoralized in the courtly setting. Both sides of Hamlet

⁴⁶³ „Постоји јединствен скуп проблема око Духа. Могло би се рећи да су у њему отелотворени и апсурд и страхопоштовање. Иако привиђење свакако изазива страх и страхопоштовање код стражара, па чак и код Хорација, изгледа да Дух постаје извор хумора за Хамлета током необично дугог тренутка заклињања на тајност. Накратко га зову „стари кртица“, „достојни пионир“ (или сапер), па чак и „овај момак у подруму“; тако, фигура која је некада изазивала страхопоштовање постаје неспретан глумац који се шуља у прашњавим сенкама испод дасака елизабетанске сцене. Реч „подрум“ дочарава слике сенковите бекстејџ области која је у оштрој супротности са високим зидинама замка Елсинор. (Вотс 2002: 12–13). Будући да духови у Шекспировим комадима обично имају идентитете које и тврде да имају, а ова појава заиста личи на бившег данског краља ратника, многи од нас вероватно долазе до закључка да овај повратак из Чистилишта служи божанској сврси. Али да ли је он заиста дух из Чистилишта, како тврди, или је прерушени ђаво? Међутим, појављује се очигледна недоследност. Овај Дух потврђује постојање Раја, Пакла и, наравно, хришћанског Бога потврђујући тиме и постојање Чистилишта. Он даје принцу Хамлету упутства да изврши мисију која је отворено антихришћанска: он тражи насилну одмазду, коју забрањује Бог и у Старом и у Новом завету” (Вотс 2002: 12–13).

are revealed by his encounter with the Ghost according to Hibbard (Hibbard 2002: 47). The plays final instance of the ghost is when Hamlet addresses Gertrude in her chambers. According to Greenblatt the ghost in this scene is wearing a nightgown rather than the military armor he wore when he first showed up on Elsinores walls. Hamlets conversation with Gertrude in her chambers is the plays final instance of the ghost. Greenblatt points out that the ghost in this scene is dressed in a nightgown instead of the military gear that he wore when he first appeared on Elsinores walls.

In this scene, only Hamlet can see him. The change of clothes, as Greenblatt says, not only alludes to an atmosphere that carries a personal dimension, but, for those familiar with the doctrine of purgatory, signifies the progress of the process of purification of the soul (Greenblatt 2002 in: Spremić 2011: 61).

Isaac symbolizes rebellion with his determination not to fall into the hands of the guards.

The counterpart to King Hamlet's Ghost in *Death and the Dervish* is a fugitive, who has certain characteristics of a ghost, which he shares with the specters in *Hamlet*. The question, however, is whether these are ghosts in themselves or ghosts of Hamlet and Nuruddin's minds that represent projections of their indecision that have decided for them that the hour of their ethical determination has come.

The symbol of rebellion in *Death and the Dervish* is the fugitive Is-haq. Andrić's reflection on invisible guilt, embodied in Čamil, resonates with Selimović's portrayal of the fugitive as the predecessor of Is-haq or another dervish identity (Milošević 2005: 228). He is the weight that tips to one side of Nuruddin's moral scale, the one for which the dervish in the first part of the novel lacks the courage and constantly finds excuses for his postponement of taking revenge. Is-haq is an exponent of life, and the sword with which he fights against authority, fully aware that authority and law are two different things, which Nuruddin is not yet aware of at that moment, is rebellion, a strange word that Ahmed Nuruddin

did not have the courage to look into its eyes until the dead Harun encouraged him to do so with his sacrifice.

Is-haq is what a dervish could be if he threw off the shackles that bind him to being a man, not a function. He is all that is accumulated and repressed under the dervish robe, near the place where the living heart of a man who leads a life in death still beats. The dervish feverishly thinks about whether Is-haq is guilty in order to justify himself to himself. Because, if he is, everything is fine with the dervish's worldview and he can continue to hide without deviating from ethical uncertainty. "The fugitive's presence in the garden has the meaning of a difficult moral challenge"⁴⁶⁴ (Petrović 1981: 20). It forces the dervish to decide. He must do something, to act, and first he must make a decision. "Nuruddin stands before the risk of a decision, before the risk of responsibility"⁴⁶⁵ (*Ibid.*: 21) which he wants someone else to make in his place. This scene in the novel is the beginning of his role as a judge, because it is up to him to decide whether to hide the fugitive or to hand him over to the guards. Is-haq brings Nuruddin before a fait accompli. He does not give him any room for hesitation. Nuruddin must make a decision and choose in an instant.

On the one hand, "Nuruddin is a representative of the Order. As such, it is his duty to hand over the fugitive"⁴⁶⁶ (*Ibid.*). On the other hand, the fugitive is someone he knows nothing about, although he is very interested in whether he is guilty and it is his human duty to help the unfortunate. But, since the dervish has a conflict between his personal and dervish way of perceiving reality, this choice is not easy.

⁴⁶⁴ „Begunčevo prisustvo u bašti ima značenje teškog moralnog izazova” (Petrović 1981: 20).

⁴⁶⁵ „Nurudin stoji pred rizikom odlučivanja, pred rizikom odgovornosti” (*Ibid.*: 21).

⁴⁶⁶ „Nurudin je predstavnik Reda. Kao takvom, njegova je dužnost da izruči begunca” (Исцо: 21).

“Nuruddin doubted the principles that obliged him as a priest to believe in, precisely on the night when angry soldiers chased the escaped convict, who had taken refuge in the courtyard of the tekke”⁴⁶⁷ (Tomović 1980: 139).

The fugitive represents the watershed between his two ways of being: the common human and the dervish, the point of contention between the two existences.

“Nuruddin knows: to stand on the side of the fugitive, to help him, means to rise up against the entire life up to that point, to put the question above the entire existence up to that point”⁴⁶⁸ (Petrović 1981: 22).

The dervish has once again fallen into the trap of duality, the split between doing and not doing. He does not know what the fugitive did or did not do, nor is it mentioned in the novel, which is why there is a veil of mystery around Is-haq.

We do not know who he is, where he comes from, what happened before, so the guards are looking for him. We only see the consequence – he is trapped and needs help, which he asks from a man who hesitates to give it to him not because Is-haq does not deserve help but because the dervish is not clear with himself in the given situation. As always, he hesitates, looking at the man he thinks must be guilty as soon as he is chased. Because, if he is guilty, it is an excuse not to help him without blaming himself and to take all responsibility for the unfortunate incident off himself and leave Is-haq to his fate.

“The dervish thinks about Is-haq’s guilt in order to disqualify him more easily. For the same reason, he makes the assumption that

⁴⁶⁷ „Nuruddin je posumnjao u načela koja ga kao sveštenika obavezuju da u njih vjeruje, upravo one noći kada su rasrđeni vojnici gonili odbjeglog robijaša, koji se sklonio u dvorište tekije” (Tomović 1980: 139).

⁴⁶⁸ „Nuruddin zna: stati na stranu begunca, pomoći mu, znači što i ustati protiv celokupnog dotadašnjeg života, staviti pitanje preko celokupne dotadašnje egzistencije” (Petrović 1981: 22).

Is-haq is the murderer from the khan. Is-haq – the guilty one and Is-haq – the murderer cannot be a reason for moral hesitation”⁴⁶⁹ (Petrović 1981: 25–26).

Nuruddin did not ask himself who Is-haq was, but only whether he was guilty. The writer does not give us an explanation of this character. We do not know who he is. What we do know is that

“if Is-haq is the murderer, Nuruddin is freed from any responsibility for the denunciation. And not only would the compromised Ishak free Nuruddin from responsibility, but also from the problem he had imposed on him with his extraordinary independence and confusing self-awareness”⁴⁷⁰ (*Ibid.*: 26).

Is-haq is everything that the dervish must not be and an indication of what the dervish will later in the novel unsuccessfully try to be, because he will be swallowed up by hatred and vengefulness.

“The dervish recognizes in him the dark, unknown side of his own character”⁴⁷¹ (*Ibid.*: 24).

Is-haq surrenders to rebellion because it is the only way for a person to survive in it. By defending the fugitive, sheikh Nuruddin would risk his false self, a dervish of the Mevlevi order. Is-haq did not withdraw into a tekke from the world. He did not push it away and retreat into an absurd illusion of peace, like sheikh Nuruddin. Unlike the dervish, who completely separates himself from the world, as well

⁴⁶⁹ „Derviš razmišlja o krivici Ishakovoј da bi ga lakše disvalifikovao. Sa istog razloga on pravi pretpostavku da je Ishak ubica iz hana. Ishak – krivac i Ishak – ubica ne mogu biti povod moralnog kolebanja” (Petrović 1981: 25–26).

⁴⁷⁰ „ako je Ishak ubica, Nuruddin je oslobođen svake odgovornosti za potkazivanje. I ne samo da bi kompromitovani Ishak oslobodio Nurudina odgovornosti, nego i problema koji mu je nametnuo svojom izuzetnom samostalnošću i zbunjujućom samosvešću” (*Исцūо*: 26).

⁴⁷¹ „Derviš u njemu prepoznaje tamnu, nepoznatu stranu sopstvenog lika” (*Исцūо*: 24).

as from himself, Is-haq coexists with the world. Hence the figure of Is-haq is important. Because, "Is-haq is, above all, rejection. The rejection of personal security in the first place"⁴⁷² (*Ibid*:25).

And the acceptance of all the consequences that conflict with the system entails. Is-haq's main characteristic is the non-acceptance of reality as imposed by the authorities. "A dervish, however, cannot reject reality because rejecting reality would be the same as rejecting the previous existence [...]"⁴⁷³ (*Ibid.*) and questioning everything that makes up his existence. Becoming aware of this would require action and rebellion, which sheikh Nuruddin is not capable of at that moment (*Ibid*: 29).

And here is the point of differentiation between him and Ahmed Nuruddin. Is-haq is ready to fight at any cost, while the dervish is not because "as long as he believes that a way out is possible, rebellion is a presumption forced into silence"⁴⁷⁴ (Petrović 1981: 25). He surrenders to postponing the decision so as not to have to face the consequences.

„The fugitive is a character who exists in absurd circumstances. He is constantly on the run – that is his fate – which he accepts without grumbling. With his rebellion, he is inseparable from the world. They stand to each other in a relationship of complete negation. The world does not acknowledge Isaac; Isaac does not acknowledge the world. His rebellion grows out of his moral personality. It grows out of rebellion, equal to it. Without resistance, Isaac would cease to exist. By opposing the world, Isaac renounces everything else – except opposition. What does Ishak bewitch Nuruddin with? With his moral self-awareness. His ethical rebel. Existential determination to be one's own at any cost. Ishak is constantly taking risks. And no matter what and not for a certain

⁴⁷² „Ishak je pre svega, odbacivanje. Odbacivanje lične sigurnosti u prvom redu” (*Исхак*:25)

⁴⁷³ „Derviš, međutim, ne može da odbaci stvarnost jer bi odbacivanje stvarnosti bilo što i odbacivanje dosadašnje egzistencije [...]" (*Исхак*).

⁴⁷⁴ „sve dok veruje da je izlaz moguć, pobuna je pretpostavka prinuđena na mirovanje” (Petrović 1981: 25).

time. Ishak's attitude towards his own life resembles madness; putting life in danger every moment does not seem like the wisest philosophy. However, it is not Isaac who constantly questions his own existence, but rather the world into which he is thrown without a choice. Isaac is not able to choose the world, but he is able to determine his attitude towards value. It is the focal point of Isaac's character. What is Is-haq defending? He defends what was given to him at birth and which constitutes an essential part of his being – he defends his humanity⁴⁷⁵ (Petrović 1981: 35).

The Ghost of King Hamlet and Is-haq share two important characteristics. The first is that the nature of both is enigmatic. The ghost of Hamlet's father is a ghost, an element of the supernatural that is common in revenge tragedies, but Hamlet sees him not in a corpse's clothes, but in warrior's clothes, and not just once but twice. The first time, the guards see him, and the second time, only Hamlet. Both protagonists encounter fluid figures at night. And both come as heralds of the end of the protagonist's ethical indeterminacy. King Hamlet's Ghost is fluid, as is Ish-ac in *Death and the Dervish*. We cannot be sure whether they are real.

⁴⁷⁵ "Begunac je lik koji posoji u apsurdnim okolnostima. On neprestano beži – to je njegova sudbina – ali koju on prihvata bez roptanja. Svojom pobunjenošću on je neodvojiv od sveta. Oni stoje jedan prema drugom u odnosu potpune negacije. Svet ne priznaje Ishaka; Ishak ne riznaje svet. Njegova pobunjenost izrasta iz njegove moralne ličnosti. Ona izrasta iz pobune, jednaka s njom. Bez opiranja Ishak bi prestao da egzistira. Suprotstavljajući se svetu, Ishak se odriče svega drugog – osim suprotstavljanja. Čime Ishak opčinjuje Nuruddina? Svojom moralnom samosvešću. Svojom etičkom potpunošću. Egzistentnim određenjem da po svaku cenu bude svoj. Ishak neprekidno rizikuje. I ne makar šta i ne za određeno vreme, nego život sam i to u svakom trenutku. Ishakov odnos prema sopstvenom životu liči na ludost; svakog trenutka dovoditi život u opasnost ne izgleda kao najmudrija filozofija. Međutim, nije Ishak taj koji neprekidno dovodi u pitanje vlastitu egzistenciju nego to čini svet u koji je on bačen bez mogućnosti izbora. Ishak nije u mogućnosti da bira svet, ali je u prilici da određuje stav prema vrednosti. To je centralna tačka Ishakovog lika. Šta Ishak brani? Ishak brani ono što je rođenjem dato i što čini suštinski deo njegova bića – on brani svoju ljudskost" (Petrović 1981: 35).

“These figures, due to the duality they embody within themselves by constantly merging the human into the inhuman, the ghostly, the otherworldly, the phantom, serve as a mirror to Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin in which they see a part of themselves hidden in the darkness of the subconscious in Hamlet’s case and the ideological in Nuruddin’s case, whose metaphor is (mid)night⁴⁷⁶ (Terzić 2023a: 271).

First he appears as a rebel, and then, later, as a prisoner. In prison, Is-haq is no longer a fugitive. He is now arrested. His spirit is broken. They have subdued him and thereby killed the will in him. The proud “one-legged one”⁴⁷⁷ (Selimović 2018a: 53) who values life is chained in prison like Prometheus, which tames his rebellious natural fighter who resists, who does not agree to be subjugated, who does not obey, which impresses the ideologically trained Nuruddin, who in prison was neither Ahmed nor Nuruddin. By killing the will, only a shell of a man remains, a shadow of that Is-haq from the tekke garden who tempted Nuruddin to (not) define himself. He is no longer Is-haq. He is not a fugitive either. Now he is just a prisoner. And the question is who he really is: is he a fugitive, is he Is-haq or is he Lucifer, the wicked one?

Hamlet’s actions or inactions depend on the nature of the Ghost. Hamlet only meets the Ghost in the chambers of his mother, a traitor, an adulteress, and a harlot. Are the Ghost and Is-haq really seeking reconciliation or is it Hamlet and Nuruddin seeking it through them?

The Ghost of King Hamlet first appears in warrior’s garb, and then, in Gertrude’s chambers, in a suit, but only Hamlet can see him, not his mother. Is-haq and the Ghost of King Hamlet are elusive entities.

⁴⁷⁶ „Ове фигуре, услед двојности коју оваплоћују у себи сталним претаканњем људског у нељудско, аветно, онострано, фантомско, служе као огледало Хамлету и Ахмеду Нурудину у ком виде део себе сакривен у мраку подсвесног у Хамлетовом и идеолошког у Нурудиновом случају чија је метафора (по)ноћ (Терзић 2023а: 271).

⁴⁷⁷ „неки једноноги дух” (Селимовић 2004: 45).

“Their fluidity is reflected in the constant hovering between their human and non-human (ghostly, ghostly) attributes. The most noticeable human characteristic of the ghosts of King Hamlet and Is-haq is their human form, human appearance, while their reality certainly has the characteristics of something that does not belong to the ordinary and everyday. Phantom images are fluid figures, which have the properties of both the human and the otherworldly and which can embody both good and evil within themselves. They can be decoded as phenomena from another world, another reality, one of which is on the other side of the rainbow, and the other on the other side of the tekke threshold. The ghosts of King Hamlet and Is-haq call on the heroes to rebel against the previous cultural, ideological, moral and psychological order within whose framework, through tradition and ideology, Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin moved. The ghosts, or rather what they symbolize, of which they are a metaphor, which is an instance of moral self-determination, which is in contradiction with the previous coordinate system of ethical conformism of the two protagonists [...]”⁴⁷⁸ (Terzić 2023a: 269).

Is-haq is completely different from sheikh Nuruddin. He refuses to be a sacrificial lamb on the Ottoman spit. Is-haq surrenders to rebellion because it is the only way for a man to survive in it. By defending

⁴⁷⁸ „Њихова флуидност огледа се у константном лебдењу између њихових људских и нељудских (аветних, сабласних) атрибута. Најучљивија људска карактеристика духа краља Хамлета и Исхака је њихов људски лик, људско обличје, док њихова утварност засигурно има одлике нечега што не припада обичном и свакодневном. Фантомске подобе су флуидне фигуре, које имају особине и људског и оностраног и које у себи могу оваплотити и добро и зло. Оне се могу декодирати као појаве из неког другог света, друге стварности, од којих је једна са оне стране дуге, а друга са оне стране текијског прага. Дух краља Хамлета и Исхак јунаке позивају на побуну против дотадашњег културолошког, идеолошког, моралног и психолошког устројства унутар чијих оквира су се, посредством традиције и идеологије, Хамлет и Ахмед Нурудин кретали. Авети, односно оно што симболишу, чега су метафора, а то је инстанца моралног самоодређивања, која је у супротности са дотадашњим координатним системом етичког комформизма двојице протагониста [...]” (Терзић 2023а: 269).

a fugitive, sheikh Nuruddin would risk his false self, a dervish of the prestigious and powerful Mevlevi order, while “Is-haq defends what was given to him by birth and which constitutes an essential part of his being – he defends his humanity”⁴⁷⁹ (Petrović 1981: 35).

Is-haq did not withdraw from the world into a tekke. He did not push it away and retreat into an absurd illusion of peace, like sheikh Nuruddin. Unlike the dervish, who completely separated himself from the world, as well as from himself, there is a relationship between Is-haq and the world. The metaphor for this relationship is the guards.

“Both figures, the ghost of King Hamlet and Ishak, place the protagonists in a position to fight against themselves and the cowards within themselves, whether it is Hamlet or Ahmed Nuruddin”⁴⁸⁰ (Terzić 2023a: 272).

Is-haq does not agree to the role of victim that is imposed on him. He is a fugitive, a man of flesh and blood whom Nuruddin meets on a St. George’s night in which the senses gain supremacy over reason. He is a small man, like the dervish’s brother Harun, who was captured by the authorities. The persecuted one fights for his life. He is a rebel against the system that hunts him. He is just a human being on the run who materialized one night in the tekke garden, challenging the Other in Ahmed Nuruddin to either hand him over or keep him until morning. The Other, that is the man in the dervish. The Other, that is Harun.

If it had not been the night of the lily of the valley and if he had not found himself in the tekke garden, a space of spiritual authority, but still authority, and if he had not met Ahmed Nuruddin who, on that very night, is not only a dervish, but also the brother of the

⁴⁷⁹ „Ishak brani ono što mu je rođenjem dato i što čini suštinski deo njegovog bića – on brani svoju ljudskost” (Petrović 1981: 35).

⁴⁸⁰ „Обе фигуре, и дух краља Хамлета и Исхак протагонисте доводе у позицији да се боре против самих себе и кукаваца у себи, било да је реч о Хамлету или Ахмеду Нурудину” (Терзић 2023а: 272).

man he thinks is imprisoned and will be released, but his brother's imprisonment still disturbs him in the hitherto undisturbed peace of a man who has chosen the Olympic heights of spirituality over the prosaicness of human existence, the fugitive would have been just a fugitive, deprived of the metaphorical dimension he gained by meeting Ahmed Nuruddin in the darkness of the night (Selimović 2018: 52-63).

If Ahmed were more Ahmed and less Nuruddin, it would be a meeting of two men, one of whom is in trouble. Human laws would require the other to help him. But, in the pitch-black night, the fugitive met a man who is not only a man, but also a dervish, who has assumed the "Islamist dogma" (Petrović 1981: 42) over the significance of individual life. First his own, then Harun's. Why not the fugitive's? He, the persecuted, is the dervish's moral crossroads between Ahmed and Nuruddin.

"The insistence on his inhuman qualities makes Is-haq resemble the figure of the ghost of King Hamlet with whom Hamlet communicates intimately, privately, alone, away from the others present in that scene. Nuruddin also enters into a dialogue with Is-haq, just as Hamlet does with the ghost of his father [...]"⁴⁸¹ (Terzić 2023a: 276-277).

Before the dervish's eyes, Is-haq does what Nuruddin never did: he fights for himself. That is why Is-haq is not only subversive, but also a metaphor for subversion towards the centers of power, towards the authorities that are pursuing him. His subversiveness is motivated by the instinct for self-preservation. Half-barefoot, he runs away to save his head, not even knowing why his pursuers want him. All he knows is that he will not fall into their hands. He resists with his whole being, not asking for a price, because he knows that the price of

⁴⁸¹ „Инсистирање на његовим нељудским одликама Исхака чини сличним фигури духа краља Хамлета са којим Хамлет комуницира интимно, приватно, насамо, мимо осталих присутних у тој сцени. Нурудин, такође, ступа у дијалог са Исхаком, онако како то чини Хамлет са духом свог оца [...]" (Терзић 2023а: 276-277).

opposing repressive authorities is certain death. Despite this, he does not recognize the arbitrariness of the authorities, he does not want to be an accomplice in such a reality in which life is lost because the generator of power has decided so and is ready to fight.

“To be human – for Is-haq – does not mean simply existing, but resisting everything that violates human integrity. To live without conflict is to accept defeat in advance. Socially sanctioned law is always mediated by interpretation. Mediation authority is imposed as law. Isaac controls every mediation of power and authority by means of his own indicator, i.e. principles of humanity – and it is nothing more than a doubt about the correctness of mediation. That is why Isaac is an eternal fugitive, a man outside the law, a victim of the authorities”⁴⁸² (Petrović 1981: 36).

Is-haq rebels against being presented with a *fait accompli*. Is-haq is not submissive and conciliatory. He shows the firmness of his determination not to bow down to the tyrannical Ottoman regime, which (like any government, for that matter) chooses its victims based on its own arbitrary criteria. In the conditions of absolute repression established by the ossified state apparatus, which is based on oppression, force and injustice, Is-haq becomes a hero because he does not renounce his right to humanity. On the contrary, he fights for it.

He acts, fully aware that he is risking his own life. He is what he is, a nameless fugitive whom Nuruddin calls by the name of his uncle. Is-haq is christened Ahmed Nuruddin, the man. This memory belongs to the man beneath the uniform and connects him to childhood, the age of innocence and a pure, untainted soul before he became sheikh Nuruddin, to his authentic “I”. The encounter with Is-haq forces sheikh Nuruddin to make a decision, to choose a side, to act.

⁴⁸² „Biti čovek – po Ishaku – ne znači prosto postojati već se odupreti svesmu što narušava ljudski integritet. Živeti bez sukoba znači unapred pristati na poraz. Društveno sankcionisano pravo uvek je posredovano interpretacijom. Autoritet posredovanja sile i vlasti kontroliše pomoću sopstvenog indikatora, tj. načela humanosti – a ono nije ništa drugo do sumnja u ispravnost posredovanja” (Petrović 1981: 36)

The dervish takes on the role of a moral judge whose task is to judge whether Is-haq, or whatever his real name is, is guilty or not, so that he can act in accordance with his decision, and not in accordance with the humanity that would prompt him to help a man in need who may be innocent.

Is-haq's role in the novel is to represent everything that sheikh Nuruddin is not, and thus to highlight his dogmatism and moral indoctrination. To stand up for the unfortunate man, who may be just as innocent as his brother, means to stand up for Harun, to throw off the dervish shackles, to be Ahmed Nuruddin, Harun's brother, and to move towards humanization. That would mean rebelling in the name of Good, for which sheikh Nuruddin remained silent about the suffering of others only because it was someone else's. To decide, to choose a side, that is what sheikh Nuruddin does not have the courage for. He is eternally between doing and being.

“[...] in meeting Is-haq, the advocate of disobedience, rebellion and “rejection of personal security”, he begins to doubt himself, the world around him. And while the fugitive Is-haq takes root in rebellion and the vision of a new possibility of living, Dervish only in what is certain, known and strictly defined”⁴⁸³ (Đorđević 1996: 869).

Ahmed's decision must not be Ahmed's, it must be based on dogma, and he will not make it until he finds a cover for it, not in his conscience, but in the Koran. To do otherwise would be to reject his own reality, which is only his but not the true reality, and to question everything that makes up his existence. Becoming aware of this would require action and rebellion, which sheikh Nuruddin is not ready for. In return, he would get back his life, freedom, and independence, which in the novel are represented by Is-haq and Hassan because

⁴⁸³ „[...] у сусрету са Исхаком, заговорником непокорности, побуне и „одбацивања личне сигурности”, почиње да сумња у себе, у свет око себе. И док се бегунац Исхак укоренује у побуну и визији нове могућности живљења, Дервиш само у ономе што је извесно, познато и строго дефинисано” (Ђорђевић 1996: 869).

they refuse to submit to a higher authority and not live their own, authentic lives.

While Sheikh Nuruddin regresses like a being in no man's land, which is the boundary between doing and being, lost in his contemplations verbally objectified in his mind, and invents morally credible excuses for why he should not do anything. "Is-haq appeared as a reflex of the act of rebellion, and not only as a reflex of the word rebellion"⁴⁸⁴ (Lagumdžija 1988: 108) and showed him that debating boils down to doing or not doing. This choice is announced by the Ghost of King Hamlet and Is-haq.

The fugitive is

"[...] an epiphany of the transcendent, the divine, the hitherto unsuspected, which will lead to the awakening of consciousness to what is and is not, to what is present, existing, and what could have been and was not"⁴⁸⁵ (Đorđević 1996: 867),

just as the Ghost of Hamlet's father could only have been a way for the Dishonest to tempt him, but it is not.

He is a metaphor for not accepting defeat, retreating, fleeing, fighting life's challenges, even those that seem hopeless, the embodiment of defiance of injustice and persecutors. Is-haq values his own life because he cares about living it, not spending it in death, as Ahmed Nuruddin does, spending his professional life in blind faith in a lie, as a prominent but dehumanized dervish to whom everything human was alien.

Harun's death exposed Ahmed's failure and revealed that he had been living in an illusion all along, which, in its collision with reality, was defeated by its brutality and the interests of the rulers who stand

⁴⁸⁴ „Исхак се појавио као рефлекс чина побуна, а не само као рефлекс ријечи побуна” (Lagumdžija 1988: 108)

⁴⁸⁵ Бегунац је „[...] епифанија трансцедентног, божанског, дотад неслућеног, а што ће довести до полућења свести на оно што јесте а није, на њега садашњег, постојећег, и оно што је могао бити а није” (Ђорђевић 1996: 867).

behind the murder of an innocent man, one who, thanks to their merit, suffered, despite the fact that he was not guilty. The appearance of Is-haq indicates “[...] apostasy and rebellious thought, an individual act that rejects fear and the entrenched nature of duration for the sake of personal security”⁴⁸⁶ (Đorđević 1996: 871)

which is embodied in the Order, dogma, principles and rules. He did not only punish the innocent Harun, he also punished his own naivety, his complete detachment from the world in which he lived.

Death and the Dervish is the story of a man who thinks he is protecting the principles of faith and morality, and who persists in this until he is convinced that he was blind in his eyes and that what he believed in does not exist. Everything is a soap bubble in which he felt alienated enough not to have to interfere in the real world and its vileness that he was not up to.

At first glance, it is the story of a man who has cocooned himself in the dogmatic world of Islamic exegesis. He replaced his primary family, distanced himself from Johovac both physically and emotionally, locked himself in a tekke and in his idea of serving Allah, his principles, and his principles, diligently performing his dervish duty, increasingly distancing himself from his human essence, each day one pedal closer to his dehumanization „[...] revealing all the absurd and cruelty of the mechanism that decides on the lives of people”⁴⁸⁷ (Егерић 2000: 42).

His human form was lost in the rules of the Koran, and he did not notice it. He did not want, would or could not. Death did not touch him with its icy tentacles. He did not face it as a mourner, until he was left behind the deceased, to feel the pain of loss. That loss was never his. There was nothing personal there. He always remained at the safe dervish distance of one who only reads a prayer for the dead.

⁴⁸⁶ „[...] отпадништво и побуњену мисао, на појединачан чин којим се одбацује страх и укупаност трајања зарад личне сигурности” (Ђорђевић 1996: 871).

⁴⁸⁷ „[...] откривајући сву апсурдност и суровост механизма који одлучује о људским животима.” (Егерић 2000: 42)

And then it caught up with him. Harun was killed. He did not die, they killed him. Those whom he believed were enforcing law and order. Whom he begged for mercy and realized did not know or recognize the same. The compact image of dervish life in consciously imposed isolation and absolute tekke peace disappeared. Behind her was Harun's grave and the candle that burned on it to constantly remind him that he had not visited him in the fortress, that he had not fulfilled his brotherly or human duty, that he had remained dervishly distant, alienated to the end. The sheikh was a failure because he had allowed the man in him to die by never breaking away, never rebelling in the name of life, which might have given him a second chance for love.

Up until that moment, he had believed in Order, dogma, principles, tenets, and rules. He believed that these were life's landmarks, without which a person would easily get lost on the path of life. And then all of that betrayed him. He discovered that this is not the structure of the world of which he is a part and that reality does not function that way, but is created by those in power in accordance with the needs of the regime they are at the helm of, along the way. The sacrifice of an innocent individual is not considered forbidden by the government, but is organized and carried out, like Claudius in Hamlet.

This is the identity that Ahmed Nuruddin gave him. By christening him with the name of the uncle he loved in childhood, he gave him a positive sign. The ghost presents himself to Hamlet as the shadow of his father. The fugitive does not present himself to the dervish. Nuruddin determines his identity, and thereby binds to him the emotional relationship he gave him. The fugitive's decision in the first scene in the novel in which he appears is to defend himself, not to surrender, to do everything he can to save himself, to do everything Nuruddin should do for Harun according to unwritten human laws, and the laws of "the biological imperative" (Ivanov 2017: 384).

Is-haq and the king call for a rebellion. Hamlet will become Daedalus in it and soar to the aristocratic heights of his position, showing that he is worthy of the unjustly taken throne because it was not Hamlet the man who took revenge, but Hamlet the ruler, thereby curing the disease from the Danish body and bringing him healing. Nuruddin will become Icarus. His wings will be melted by the sun, the fire of his hatred. He will plunge into the abyss.

9. HAMLET: MADNESS AS AN INSTRUMENT OF SUBVERSION

Hamlet is a nobleman. He belongs to the social class of the aristocracy. By birth, he was given the social status of a member of the monarchy. He is the heir to the throne. Hamlet is a prince, a member of royalty, a future ruler, with a duty to Denmark. He should be the legitimate leader of his subjects. He is not a man, but a highness. This is his social identity based on belonging to a social class. The highest one. The one that Polonius and Laertes warn Ophelia about. Because of which Hamlet the man suffers. He is tied to the family structure by the same threads. He is the son, not only of his dignified father, whom at the beginning of the play he pities with all his heart, although a little too much, but also of his mother, weak in her lust and need for a man, who disgusts him. His royal family is the group to which he belongs and which also shapes his social identity. As he himself says: “[...] As in their birth, wherein they are not guilty Since nature cannot choose his origin”⁴⁸⁸ (I, 4, 56).

One of the opening scenes in *Hamlet* is at court, in which the young prince is dressed in black, and in obvious mourning for his father, which the new king and now his queen consider to be exaggerated and unnatural for a man:

“Tis sweet and commendable in your nature, Hamlet,
To give these mourning duties to your father;
But you must know, your father lost a father;

⁴⁸⁸ „[...] човек своје не бира порекло” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије* прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 32).

That father lost his; and the survivor bound
In filial obligation for some term
To do obsequious sorrow. But to persever
In obstinate condolement is a course
Of impious stubbornness. 'Tis unmanly grief."⁴⁸⁹
(I. 2. 77–94)

Regarding Hamlet's persistence in mourning for his murdered father, Claudius claims that:

"It shows a will most incorrect to heaven,
A heart unfortified, a mind impatient,
An understanding simple and unschooled.
For, what we know must be, and is common
As any the most vulgar thing to sense,
Why should we in our peevish opposition
Take it to heart? Fie, 'tis a fault to heaven,
A fault against the dead, a fault to nature,
To reason most absurd, whose theme
From the first corse till he that died today,
Is death of fathers, and who still hath cried,
'This must be so'"⁴⁹⁰
(I. 2. 95–106).

⁴⁸⁹ „Нежно је то и похвално у вашој
Природи, Хамлете, што ви оцу свом
Жалости овај одајете дуг.
Ал' морате знати да ваш отац свог
Изгуби оца, овај опет свог;
И наследник је дужан неко време
По обавези синовљој пазити
Посмртну жалост. Али истрајати
Тврдоглаво у тузи, то је пут
Безбожног упорства и немушки бол.”
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев.. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 18)

⁴⁹⁰ „И разум врло прост и непросвећен
Јер кад се зна да нешто бити мора,
Да је обична, најпростија ствар,
Што бисмо то у пркосном отпору
Узели к срцу? То је грех спрам неба,

Claudius' rhetoric in this verse reveals his hypocrisy. This speech would make sense if it were about the natural death of Hamlet's father, which the son would mourn in the way Hamlet does. However, it is not about natural death and the inheritance of power according to legitimate principles, but about violent death, about murder, which the murderer verbally treats in front of the grieving heir as a biological law of the end of the human age, and not as what it actually is – murder. It implicitly refutes the claim that "it must be so" because in the case of Hamlet's father, as well as Nuruddin's brother, neither nature nor God decided this, but man.

Madness will be just a prop for him to convince himself that there is a basis for revenge that goes beyond his personal animosity towards Claudius, whom he will not find not only in the "mousetrap" scene but also in Claudius' letter, which unequivocally states that Hamlet should be liquidated, which convinces Hamlet of Claudius' evil intentions on the basis of which he, according to his own conscience, gains the right to act.

Claudius's reaction during the play, his demonstrative getting up and leaving it, as well as the aforementioned letter, are the basis for Hamlet's revenge as a statesman, thus diverting attention from his great grief for his father, which is evident at the beginning of the play, but which recedes into the background during its duration until it completely loses its significance, when the murdered king ceases to exist in his son's thoughts.

In Hamlet's case, madness is simulated. It is "[...] a release, the speech of the unconscious or repressed, Pandora's box of the entire play"⁴⁹¹ (Šofranac 2013b: 97). Hamlet is an extremely intelligent hero. He carefully plans and carries out his madness. He uses it as a mask to

Грех спрам природе, грех спрам покојника,
Лудост за разум, чија стална тема
Смрт је отаца, и он опомиње
Од првог леша до тог што данас мре:
„То тако мора бити.”⁴⁹¹
(Исто: 18)

⁴⁹¹ „[...] je oslobađanje, govor nesvesnog ili potisnutog, Pandorina kutija celokupne drame” (Šofranac 2013b: 97).

hide his intentions and monitor the behavior of Claudius, Gertrude, Polonius and others whom he does not trust. However, he does not give them even a shred of doubt that he is really a person. Hamlet calculates that madness can be justified by circumstances, the death of his father, whom he loved, whom he regrets and more than Gertrude considers appropriate, then Ophelia's rejection, all of which can be considered reasons for the prince to go mad in the eyes of others. From Hamlet's conversation with Horatio and Marcellus in which he warns them not to betray him in any way if they witness his strange behavior, we learn that dissimulation is just a tactic that Hamlet uses. Hamlet says:

“As I perchance hereafter shall think meet
To put an antic disposition on – [...]”⁴⁹²
(I. 5. 170–171)

Hamlet's plan succeeds. The mask of madness he puts on himself has an effect on the court. Everyone sees his change and, since he is a prince, it is not only a family problem, but also a political one, because the country cannot be ruled by a ruler who is mad. Although Hamlet is clearly not, or at least not yet, the question remains to what extent he can actually control it, because his grief for his father and disgust at the incest between Gertrude and Claudius are very real. In Nuruddin's case, we find disgust in the scene with the muslim when, at the beginning of the novel, he comes to inquire about his brother, and finds before him not a man, but a function: “Finally the muslim spoke, in a voice as dead as his silence, but I no longer cared. [...]. I felt slightly nauseated”⁴⁹³ (Selimović 2018a: 88).

⁴⁹² „[...] можда ћу за сходно наћи кад
Да узмем на се држање чудака [...]”

(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 37).

⁴⁹³ „Напокон је муселим проговорио, а било ми је већ свеједно, мртво као што је и ћутао, годинама навикнут на тај став непробојности и строгог презира, али ми је и то било свеједно. Мало ме мучило гађење” (Селимовић 2004: 83–84).

Hamlet wants everyone to perceive him as mentally ill. He puts on a mask to benefit from being viewed that way by others. It is a metaphor for his psychosocial identity to make everyone around him perceive him that way.

The mask of a person who has gone mad due to too much and too strong emotional trauma serves Hamlet to hide his real intention – to find out if the Ghost told him the truth. Hamlet is also double-minded here. He promises his father's Ghost that he will listen to him, but he is tormented by whether the Ghost is telling him the truth. He wants to believe him, but he looks for proof. In psychological terms, Hamlet "[...] possesses a functional persona: one that he easily activates or deactivates without identifying with it"⁴⁹⁴ (Stein 2007: 130). Hamlet never behaves strangely, unusually or mysteriously when he is alone, but always when he is surrounded by people from his immediate environment. "The madness that he hinted at to his friends, Hamlet called strange behavior or the mask of a freak – "antic disposition" (Hamlet, I.v.), where "antic" means strange, grotesque"⁴⁹⁵ (Šofranac 2013b: 97).

He needs the audience to see the play, so that no one doubts his character, starting with Ophelia, who is horrified by his lost gaze of a man on the border between two worlds, a man who has truly lost his mind.

We learn about Hamlet's madness from Ophelia:

"My lord, as I was sewing in my chamber,
Lord Hamlet, with his doublet all unbraced,
No hat upon his head, his stockings fouled,
Ungartered and down-gyved to his uncle,
Pale as his shirt, his knees knocking each other,
And with a look so piteous in purport
As if he had been loosed out of hell

⁴⁹⁴ „[...] poseduje funkcionalnu personu: onu koju lako aktivira ili deaktivira, a da se ne poistovećuje sa njom" (Stajin 2007: 130).

⁴⁹⁵ „Ludilo koje je nagovestio svojim prijateljima, Hamlet je nazvao čudnim ponašanjem ili maskom čudaka – „antic disposition" (Hamlet, I.v.), gde „antic" označava čudnovato, groteskno." (Šofranac 2013b: 97).

To speak of horrors – he comes before me.
[...]
He took me by thze wrist, and held me hard,
Then goes he to the length of all his arm,
And, with his other hand thus oër his brow,
He falls to such perusal of my face
As he would draw it. Long stayed he so.
At last, a little shaking of mine arm,
And thrice his head thus waving up and down,
He raised a sigh so piteous and profound
That it did seem to shatter all his bulk
And end his being. That done, he lets me go,
And with his head over his shoulder turned,
He seemed to find his way without their help;
He seemed to find his way without his eyes,
For out adoors he went without their help;
And to the last bended their light on me⁴⁹⁶
(2. I. 75–81, 86–97)

⁴⁹⁶ „У својој сам соби седела шијући,
Кад у прснику кнез Хамлет, раскопчан,
Без капе на глави, с прљавим чарапама,
Неподвезаним, палим до чланака
Ко окови, и као кошуља му блед,
А колено му куца о колено,
И с једним тако тужним погледом
Ко да из пакла побеже да прича
О ужасима – дође преда ме.
[...]
За руку, и тако чврсто држаше,
Па затим стукну за дуж једне руке,
А другом руком преко чела пређе,
И тако ми се унесе у лице
Ко да га црта. Дуго је осто тако.
Најзад затресе мало моју руку,
И трипут главом климну горе – доле
Уздахну тако тужно и дубоко
Ко да му уздах руши целу грађу

The impression left by this scene is that he is truly ill, because his movements betray a man who has no control over himself, a man trapped in his own mind, tormented by his demons who have captured his sanity. His appearance before Ophelia carries the whiteness of a ghost and the horror it evokes, which leaves no room for doubt that his madness is real. Hamlet looks as if he has emerged from the grave. This is precisely the space of the Nietzsche's mask, between reality and representation. Her father, Polonius, believes in Hamlet's madness, just as he believes that the heir to the throne is ill because Ophelia is denying him her attention and love. He confirms this before Claudius with the words:

“And he, repulsed – a short tale to make –
Fell into a sadness, then into a fast,
Thence to a watch, thence into a weakness,
Thence to a lightness, and, by this declension,
Into the madness wherein now he raves [...]”⁴⁹⁷
(2. 2. 146–149)

Rosencrantz asks Hamlet what is causing his madness: “Good my lord, what is your cause of distemper? You do surely bar the door upon

И односи цео живот. И најпосле
Без речи ми пусти руку, па са главом
Ко окренуто преко рамена
Изгледао је да је без очију
Нашао свој пут – јер из куће оде
Не гледећ очима, док је све до краја
На мене њихов упирао сјај”
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022:
41–42)

⁴⁹⁷ „А он, одбијен – да укратко свршим –
Паде у тугу, па у пост, а отуд
У несаницу, па затим у немоћ,
Потом у растројство, и са падом тим,
У лудило у коме бесни сад [...]”
(*Истио*: 2022: 48).

your own liberty, if you deny your griefs to your friend”⁴⁹⁸ (3. 2. 24–26). Hamlet replies: “Sir, I lack advancement”⁴⁹⁹. And Rosencrantz replies: “How can that be, when you have the voice of the King himself for your succession in Denmark?”⁵⁰⁰ (*Ibid.*). Hamlet expresses his distrust of Claudius’s promise: “Ay, sir, but ‘While the grass grows’ – the proverb is something misty”⁵⁰¹ (*Ibid.*). In Gertrude’s chambers, Hamlet sees his father’s ghost again:

Why, look you there: look how it steals away:
My father in his habit as he lived!
Look where he goes, even now, out at the portal”⁵⁰²
(3.4. 133–135).

Gertrude insinuates that Hamlet is merely hallucinating and that his hallucination is a consequence of his mental disorder, telling him:

“This is the very coinage of your brain.
The bodiless creation [...]”⁵⁰³
(3.4. 136–137)

⁴⁹⁸ „Добри мој кнеже, шта је урок вашем растројству? Одбијајући да своје јаде поверите својим пријатељима, ви свакако пречите пут својој властитој слободи. Хамлет му одговара: „Господине, мени је потребно унапређење” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев.. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 78)

⁴⁹⁹ „Господине, мени је потребно унапређење” (Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев.. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 78)

⁵⁰⁰ „Како то кад имате реч самога краља да ћете га ви наследити на престолу Данске?” (*Исто*)

⁵⁰¹ „Да, али „до зелене траве” – је пословица мало застарела” (*Исто*: 78)

⁵⁰² „Ха! Погледајте како се открива
Мој отац, у оделу, као жив!
Гледајте, ено, излази на врата!”
(*Исто*: 88)

⁵⁰³ „Ово је само мозга твога створ,
А лудила самог изум је то вешт,
То бестелесно биће”
(*Исто*)

Hamlet refuses to accept her claim:

“Mother, for love of grace,
Lay not that flattering unction to your soul,
That not your trespass but my madness speaks”⁵⁰⁴
(3,4, 143–145)

Gertrude is convinced of Hamlet’s madness and says that he is:

“Mad as the sea and wind when both contend
Which is mightier”⁵⁰⁵
(4, I, 7–8).

She calls this madness “brainish apprehension”⁵⁰⁶ (4, I, 11). Hamlet himself says: “His madness is poor Hamlet’s enemy”⁵⁰⁷ (5, 2, 224). Claudius thinks that Hamlet’s madness is a threat. He wants to send him to England accompanied by Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, to whom he informs her:

“His liberty is full of threats to all,
To you, yourself, to us, to everyone.
Alas, how shall this bloody deed be answered?
It will be laid to us, whose providence
Should have kept short, restrained and out of haunt
This mad young man; but so much was our love,
We would not understand what was our love,
We would not understand what was most fit,

⁵⁰⁴ „Мати, тако вам вечне милости,
Не мећ’ те на душу лажни балсам тај,
Да је ово моја лудост, не ваш грех”
(Исто: 90).

⁵⁰⁵ „Луд као ветар и ко море кад се
Сударе о превласт”
(Исто: 92).

⁵⁰⁶ „заносом његовог мозга” (*Исѣо*).

⁵⁰⁷ „Лудост је душман сиротог Хамлета” (*Исѣо*: 131).

But, like the owner of a foul disease,
To keep it from divulging, let it fed
Even on the pitch of life. [...] but we will ship him hence;
for England; [...]“⁵⁰⁸
(4, I, 15–23)

By disguising himself and pretending, establishing the (false) identity of madness, the prince caused a change in the king's attitude towards him. Until then, the king had not seen Hamlet as a threat. “[...] now one powerful opponent (Hamlet) is forced to simulate madness, and the other (Claudius) to search for what is hidden behind that madness”⁵⁰⁹ (Bajić in: *The Scene* 1967: 330). However, Hamlet's tactics have the consequence that the illegitimate king becomes disturbed and curious about the reasons for Hamlet's “apparent” change. He constitutes a strategy on how to do it to find the cause. He decided to find out by sending Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to rely on friendship with Hamlet. With the mask of madness, Hamlet manages to frighten his enemy. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern enter, and at the king's behest, they make every effort to solve the riddle, only to be easily thwarted by him (Bradley 1978: 110–111).

The king tries to determine whether unrequited love is indeed the cause of his nephew's madness. Unexpectedly and without warning, he goes to Ophelia. His behavior leads her father and Ophelia herself to believe that unrequited love has driven him mad. [...] However, this strategy only works partially, as the king is not convinced, although

⁵⁰⁸ „[...] по нас је опасно
Пустити лудости његовој ту власт,
Зато се спрем' те. Пуномоћ за вас
Написаћу одмах, и он ће отићи
У Енглеску са вама. Наше достојанство
Не може трпети ту блиску опасност
Што из лудила му напредује тако сваког часа”
(*Исџо*: 80).

⁵⁰⁹ „[...] sada je jedan moćan protivnik (Hamlet) prisiljen da simulira ludilo, a drugi (Klaudije) da traži šta se krije iza tog ludila (Bajić u: *Scena* 1967: 330).

Polonius is. It is therefore agreed that the two will secretly watch Ophelia and Hamlet meet. The unfortunate Ophelia is instructed by her father to walk around while reading her prayer book. Polonius and the king hide behind a tapestry. Then Hamlet enters, so lost in thought that he initially believes he is alone. The scene of Hamlet's conversation with her reveals that Hamlet's procrastination is increasingly dangerous to the king. He is convinced that, whatever the reasons for Hamlet's apparent madness, love is not one of them. In fact, Claudius is not entirely sure that Hamlet is mad at all. Having heard his angry and threatening proclamation, he is quite disturbed. Therefore, he decides not to waste any time sending Hamlet to England (*Ibid*: 112–113).

Natasa Šofranac tackles Hamlet's madness in her doctoral dissertation:

“The mask of a madman, i.e. feigned madness, is a device from ancient times. Let us recall Odysseus (Ulysses) who did not want to go to the Trojan War, so he feigned madness by plowing the field and sowing salt instead of wheat, revealing his insanity only at the risk of “modeling” his own son. Hamlet feigns his madness, and sometimes the boundary between appearance and reality is not clear, i.e. it is shifted. These are the moments when, alone and voluntarily isolated, the hero struggles with difficult cognitions and mixed feelings, with an imposed task and a moral code that is directly contrary to that task, with metaphysical and archetypal questions. Then his mask of a “freak” (“antic disposition”) merges with the one who wears it”⁵¹⁰ (Šofranac 2013a: 9).

⁵¹⁰ „Maska ludaka, tj. glumljeno ludilo, sredstvo je iz antičkih vremena. Setimo se Odiseja (Uliksa) koji nije htio u Trojanski rat, pa je glumio ludilo oruči njivu i sejući so umesto žita, razobličivši svoju neuračunljivosti tek pred rizikom da „uzore” i sopstvenog sina. Hamlet svoje ludilo glumi, a ponekad granica između privida i stvarnosti nije jasna, tj. pomerena je. To su trenuci kada se, usamljen i dobrovoljno izolovan, junak bori sa teškim spoznajama i pomešanim osećanjima, sa nametnutim zadatkom i moralnim kodeksom koji je direktno protivan tom zadatku, sa metafizičkim i arhetipskim pitanjima. Tada se njegova maska „čudaka” (“antic disposition”) stapa sa onim ko je nosi” (Šofranac 2013a: 9).

By disguising himself as a madman, Hamlet protects his true intentions to find out if the Ghost is telling the truth so that he can act on his orders and take revenge. On the other hand, dervishism is Ahmed's mask. It allows him to hide his identity as a peasant born in a poor family, who started from the bottom of the social ladder, it provides a refuge from the outside world with which he fails to establish a relationship because there is a gap between two worlds that Nuruddin does not want to acknowledge: the world of dervishism symbolically bordered by the tekke doors and the real world that takes place in front of them. The metaphor of dervishism is the tekke, full of like-minded people until Is-haq falls into it, as if from heaven, who seems to announce the dervish's metamorphosis from sheikh to avenger who, like Hamlet, will pay for his revenge with his head.

In *Hamlet*, the inner conflict in the heir to the throne arises from the discord of two worlds. One world is personified in Hamlet, and the other is the world that surrounds him, a world of false relationships and artificiality in interpersonal relationships, a world focused on gaining interests, a world of utilitarianism and Machiavellianism, a stale and conventional world of rigid social norms and patterns of behavior whose purpose is to hide true intentions, in a word, a world that is disgusting and evil. This is the world of eating and drinking from the beginning of the play, the world of debauchery because of which the Danes as a people are labeled decadent, a world in which an individual focused on his ideals and transcendental illusions in his mind cannot find his way, as is the case with Hamlet.

He is disgusted by evil and injustice, by the moral degradation he witnesses at the moment of his most powerful life turning points: his mother's insult of a hasty remarriage to his father's murderer, to a usurper of the throne who dared to threaten the moral order. By killing his brother, he subordinated the order and placed it in his own hands, literally, in the form of a bottle of poison that he poured into his brother's ear in order to achieve his own lucrative goals. Hamlet, especially at the very beginning of the play, is inclined to show his true

feelings of grief, sorrow and pain for his father. On the other hand, his behavior is colored by resentment towards his mother and the court that the death of the king, his father, is passed over lightly. He considers such behavior as a denial of respect for his late, adored father that reveals all the immorality and inhumanity of the Danish court in feudal times. Hamlet places great value on humanity as an ethical category. He does his best to protect himself from anything that might taint him on a moral basis. Isn't Hamlet's inclination to preserve his polished moral image identical to Ahmed Nuruddin's fanatical need to preserve the moral dimension of his dervish character?

"The central question, which fills almost the entire plot, is Hamlet's madness. Everything revolves around his strange behavior or condition. Hamlet alludes to this when he tells his friends that his uncle and mother are mistaken, because "I am only mad when the northwest wind blows" (II.ii.). The king expects his friends to speak about the cause of this "negligent and dangerous madness". They tell him that he "admits that he feels distracted", but he "covers himself with skillful madness" whenever they try to get him to admit his true state. The king concludes that it is not about love, "and his speech, although a bit irrelevant, / It does not look like madness". Hamlet will tell his mother "I am not mad, / But I am only mad from cunning." Laertes, on the other hand, will say "... that I am punished with a painful disorder / Folly is poor Hamlet's enemy." Everyone, including Hamlet, feels that there is both. If not madness, then some strange transformation – "transformation", some state – "distraction", "lunacy". Polonius, who is the only one who considers him simply mad, says "Although it is madness, there is still method in it". It is not incoherent madness, but profound insanity. This madness is sometimes deeper than reason, and Polonius feels it too. Horacio says that the apparition has him in a frenzy. Ophelia mourns that wonderful, stumbling spirit. Therefore, "madness" exists, and "pretense" is only a consequence, a special expression of that new state of Hamlet's soul after the second birth. Only if it is determined, it is possible to understand the meaning of his madness. He lives a double life because he lives in two worlds at the same time. His consciousness is also double, on the threshold of

sleep and wakefulness, understanding and insanity – between them⁵¹¹
(Šofranac 2013a: 231–232).

Hamlet is not skilled in courtly backstage games. In his case, “disguise is a barrier [...], it is an instinct of distance” (Vivarelli in: Radojčić 2017: 82). Hamlet was a student in Wittenberg, who, for his father’s funeral, returns home to Elsinore, a palace with walls that hide crimes, debauchery, and disorder.

The academic environment was his natural environment, unlike the court, which is hostile and custodial, to the point that he himself must become one in order to survive, if by survival we mean the fulfillment of the imposed duty and respect for the values of the two systems between which he fights for moral and religious correctness.

Small things are Gertrude’s lust that wounds Hamlet as a son who inherits in his mind the ideal of a heroic mother, her libido that disgusts the heir to the throne, her vile need for physical satisfaction that frightens him,

⁵¹¹ „Središnje pitanje, kojim je ispunjena gotovo cela radnja, je Hamletovo ludilo. Sve se vrti oko njegovog čudnog ponašanja ili stanja. Hamlet aludira na to, kad kaže prijateljima da su se njegovi stric i majka prevarili, jer „ja sam lud samo kad duva severozapadni vetar” (II.ii.). Kralj očekuje da njegovi prijatelji izmame reč o uzroku tog „nemarnog ludila opasnog”. Odgovaraju mu da „priznaje da se oseća rastrojeno”, ali se „ludilom većim zaklanja” kad god bi pokušali da ga navedu na priznanje o pravome stanju. Kralj zaključuje da se ne radi o ljubavi, „a govor mu, mada pomalo bez veze, / Ne liči na ludost”. Hamlet će majci reći „Nisam lud, / Već sam samo lud iz lukavstva”. Laertu će, pak, reći „.. da sam kažnjen bolnim rastrojstvom / Ludost je dušman sirotog Hamleta.” Svi, pa i Hamlet, osećaju da postoji i jedno i drugo. Ako ne ludilo, onda neki čudan preobražaj – „transformation”, neko stanje – „distraktion”, „lunacy”. Polonije, koji ga jedini smatra jednostavno ludim, kaže „Iako je to ludilo, ipak ima u njemu metode”. To nije nesuvislo ludilo, nego duboko bezumlje. To je bezumlje ponekad dublje i od razuma, i to oseća i Polonije. Horacio kaže da je on zbog priviđenja mahnit. Ofelija žali za tim divnim, posrnulim duhom. Dakle, „ludilo” postoji, a „pretvaranje” je samo posledica, naročit izraz tog novog stanja Hamletove duše posle drugog rođenja. Samo ako se ono odredi, moguće je shvatiti smisao njegovog ludila. On živi dvostrukim životom jer živi u dva sveta istovremeno. Njegova svest je takođe dvostruka, na pragu sna i bdenja, razumevanja i bezumlja – među njima” (Šofranac 2013a: 231–232).

“With such dexterity to incestuous sheets!
It is not (nor it cannot come to any good”⁵¹² (I. 2. 157–158).

Polonius’ use of Ophelia, who is manipulative in nature, to verify the cause of the prince’s madness, Claudius’s plots aimed at Hamlet’s elimination, the lack of loyalty of Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, whom he thought were his friends, Laertes’ naivety that made him Claudius’ puppet, are exploited in a morally unworthy game of chess with tragic consequences.

The animalistic impulses of soldiers in war that the dervish knew about are small, Mullah-Yusuf’s lack of loyalty to Nuruddin, who betrayed his brother to the kadi, but also the other way around, because he was the one who created the illusion of friendship with the boy who had the (mis)fortune to survive the war, by being his friend in the chaos of war that turned him into an orphan, and then abandoning him when he brought him to the tekke, Nuruddin’s naivety from the beginning of the novel in which, dogmatically blinded, he believed that Harun would be released

In order to parry the vile world that has jumped on his neck, Hamlet puts on the mask of a madman because it is a way to fight against the court in which all are actors, and the court itself is a stage, a stage in which the most wrong attitude is the right one. This applies especially to Queen Gertrude, because she “[...] did not, like the great women of myth and legend, commit suicide after the death of her husband, but continued to live, and even married”⁵¹³ (Hristić in: *The Scene* 1967: 381). And in doing so, she irreversibly degraded herself in Hamlet’s eyes, to the point of disgust that, in psychological terms,

⁵¹² „[...] са таквом хитњом јурити
У родоскрвну постељу! То није,
И не може на добро изићи – [...]”

(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 20).

⁵¹³ „[...] nije, poput velikih žena iz mita i legende, izvršila samoubistvo posle smrti svog muža, već je nastavila da živi, štaviše, udala se” (Hristić u: *Scena* 1967: 381).

he projected onto the entire female gender and disgust towards it, starting with Ophelia, thereby paving the way for himself to a failure based on the rejection of love.

Hristić insists that the members of the Danish royal family, Gertrude, Hamlet, and Claudius are public figures, public roles (*Ibid*: 372). In this sense, Ahmed Nuruddin, the dervish, the sheikh of the tekke, as well as the rulers who killed his brother, are also figures. Their mutual relations shift from the plane of personal relations to “[...] the relationship of one public figure to another”⁵¹⁴ (*Ibid*: 372), thereby abolishing the personal “I”⁵¹⁵ (Bečanović Nikolić 2013: 100). Only masks remain.

Hamlet’s actions or inactions depend on the removal of the masks of others, and the motivation for that action or inaction is what made him put on the mask of a madman in the first place. Hamlet wants to know the truth about the words of his father’s Ghost, who claims that he was killed by his brother, the usurper, and he hopes to find out the truth thanks to his mask. He believes that it will give the others a room for maneuver in which, due to the underestimation of Hamlet on the basis of his disorder, which they cannot know is an act, they can sneak the mistake of revealing their true face, and not just a mask, in order to protect themselves from shedding the blood of an innocent man, which would be a sin against God after death. The God-fearing Hamlet wants to save himself from committing a sin.

“His irony is fused with sadness – this is what predominantly creates false madness: it is only an expression of another existence, he cannot speak otherwise. This is what is considered his false madness. This is “madness in craft”. In irony there is always an element of “craft”, cunning, a final thought. But all the sad background of this irony is clearly manifested. Hamlet’s madness is in his sadness. The ugly dreams that he constantly sees make him unhappy, his madness is dreams. The sadness in him comes from death; sadness is that ingre-

⁵¹⁴ „[...] однос једне јавне фигуре према другој” (*Ibid*: 372).

⁵¹⁵ „приватно биће” (Бечановић Николић 2013: 100).

dient of dying, the reflection of death that exists in life⁵¹⁶ (Vygotsky in: Šofranac 2013a: 232).

Polonius' use of Ophelia, which is manipulative in nature, to verify the cause of the prince's madness, Claudius's plots aimed at Hamlet's elimination, the lack of loyalty of Guildenstern and Rosencrantz, whom he thought were his friends, Laertes' naivety that made him Claudius' puppet, are exploited in a morally unworthy game of chess with tragic consequences.

The animalistic impulses of soldiers in war that the dervish knew about are small, Mullah-Yusuf's lack of loyalty to Nuruddin, who betrayed his brother to the kadi, but also the other way around, because he was the one who created the illusion of friendship with the boy who had the (mis)fortune to survive the war, by being his friend in the chaos of war that turned him into an orphan, and then abandoning him when he brought him to the tekke, Nuruddin's naivety from the beginning of the novel in which, dogmatically blinded, he believed that Harun would be released

In *Hamlet*, the mask of madness is used as a way of exceeding psychological boundaries and using emotions to subvert the current order. The madness of the Danish crown prince is simulated, while the hatred of the dervish is not. The purpose of the mask in *Hamlet* is protection. He believes that in this way, the courtiers, not taking him seriously or not recognizing his true intentions, will more easily betray themselves and that the people around him will thus remove their masks. This is best seen in the "mousetrap" scene, which aims to provoke a reaction in Claudius, if he is guilty, that will unequiv-

⁵¹⁶ „Njegova ironija je stopljena s tugom – to je ono što pretežno stvara lažno ludilo: to je samo izraz drugog postojanja, on drugačije ne može da razgovara. To je ono što se smatra njegovim lažnim ludilom. To je „madness in craft”. U ironiji uvek postoji element „craft”, lukavstvo, zadnja misao. Ali, jasno se ispoljava sva tužna podloga te ironije. Hamletovo ludilo je u njegovoj tuzi. Nesrećnim ga čine ružni snovi koje on neprestano vidi, njegovo ludilo su snovi. Tuga u njemu potiče od smrti; tuga je onaj sastojak umiranja, odsjaj smrti koji postoji u životu” (Vigotski u: Šofranac 2013a: 232).

ocally show that he is guilty and prove his guilt to Hamlet, who will no longer have reason to hesitate in carrying out revenge, because it will not be based on his personal injury, but will become a mission: to remove the fratricide-usurper from the throne and thereby brighten the future of Denmark.

Hamlet was also betrayed by his mother Gertrude with her shameful act of marrying a strong man, accepting death too logically, coldly, rationally and above all quickly for a grieving widow. The prince experiences this as an act of betrayal towards his father, whom he highly respected, and draws a conclusion that binds the entire female gender: "(...) frailty, thy name is woman – (I. 2. 146) thereby punishing Ophelia, but also himself. By denying himself love, he condemned himself to "always suffers loss" (Selimović 2018: 387).

Until that crucial moment, the prince lived his life, spared from crime, death, supernatural forces, incestuous relationships, and court intrigues. With his father's murder, he is thrown into it and the two worlds become intertwined. What is a problem is that the difference between them is too great. The world he is used to is simple and pure, devoid of human malice and corruption.

"The difference between Hamlet's inner world and the world that surrounds him is enormous. It is not noticed until the moment when the connection between these two worlds is established, and that is by an incestuous act. Only then is the immense abyss that separates these two worlds revealed. Hamlet must stop with horror and fear on the edge of this abyss"⁵¹⁷ (Marić 2015: 37).

It is the world he finds himself in, which has happened to him and in which he is forced to live, although he does not know how, because the differences he encounters are irreconcilable and he does not know how to bridge them.

⁵¹⁷ „Razlika između Hamletovog unutrašnjeg sveta i sveta koji ga okružuje jeste ogromna. Ona se ne primećuje sve do onog trenutka kada je uspostavljena veza između ta dva sveta, i to jednim incestuoznim aktom. Tek tada se otkriva ogromna provalija koja razdvaja ta dva sveta. Hamlet mora sa užasom i strahom da zastane na ivici te provalije" (Marić 2015: 37).

Until he learns that his father has been murdered, Hamlet has lived in a world that he has forged according to his own standards, a world of an inner being inclined to reflection, turned towards himself, far from the world that was within his reach all the time, and with which he had nothing to do.

“Hamlet’s world was still untainted, a world of youth, beauty and great ideals, from which he was rudely thrown onto another stage of life, which is much more complex. More complex in the sense that it carries within itself all the small and large human corruptions, a dense weave of the most diverse interests, motives, complexes and desires. A world that, when measured by Hamlet’s yardstick, is unacceptable and alien and does not deserve to continue living”⁵¹⁸ (Marić 2015: 36).

However, the awareness of what really happened does not allow him to continue living in his own head. Hamlet is, therefore, a hero who finds himself at the crossroads between the familiar world and a world that is foreign to him, that he does not know and in which he does not find his way. Overwhelmed by grief and sorrow for his deceased father, he defends the memory of the old king and the act of his mother’s marriage to the murderer of her deceased husband, calling it a betrayal. Many critics believe that this is actually the hub of his later madness.

“Hamlet seems to be almost completely in the otherworld, and his problem is to return from the time of the ghost (it is a time out – of – joint, a time out of joint) and do something, quite specific, on earth: to decide on an act”⁵¹⁹ (Milić 2000: 114).

⁵¹⁸ „Hamletov svet je bio još neukalljan, svet mladosti, lepote i velikih ideala, iz koga je grubo izbačen na jednu drugu pozornicu života, koja je mnogo složenija. Složenija u tom smislu što nosi u sebi sve sitne i krupne ljudske pokvarenosti, jedno gusto tkanje najrazličitijih interesa, motiva, kompleksa i želja. Svet koji je, kada se meri Hamletovim aršinom, neprihvatljiv i ne zaslužuje da i dalje živi” (Marić 2015: 36)

⁵¹⁹ „Hamlet je, čini se, skoro sasvim u onostranosti, i njegov problem je da se vrati iz vremena sablasti (to je vreme out-of-joint, vreme izvan spoja) i učini nešto, sasvim određeno, na zemlji: da se odluči za čin” (Milić 2000: 114)

Instead, Hamlet is always searching for answers to questions pregnant with metaphysics, for the Holy Grail of moral meaning.

“And for Hamlet, the moral sense is inseparable from the metaphysical, from the question of man’s role on earth. Moreover, for Hamlet, these most sublime questions are inseparable from the psychological support they have or do not have in his soul, as well as from the political context that permeates him to the core”⁵²⁰ (Koljević 1981: 174).

Hamlet, therefore, pretends to be mad, in order to hide his true intentions with this mask. The mask of a jester and comedian conceals his attempts to survive in the moral and spiritual toadstool of Elsinore, from which many dangers threaten. The generator of all is Claudius, who assigns Hamlet’s former friends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to spy on him on his behalf in order to find out the origin of Hamlet’s strange behavior. However, Hamlet’s duty imposed on him by the Ghost of his father is far more serious than his farcical pretense, for which the entire court seeks a cause.

“So why does Shakespeares Hamlet play a madman? It has long been known that the traditional justification for feigning insanity in other dramas is that pretense does not serve to dispel suspicion. Claudius does not pose a threat to Hamlet until he begins acting strangely. An actor must be aware of the motive even if a critic claims not to. I would use Horaces response to his hysteria as the inspiration for Hamlet if I were the plays director: Yes strange words prince confused! Knowing himself Hamlet understands that he can act strangely and is conscious that he has chosen a perilous route. Hamlet uses the phrase antic disposition in a very important way. The word antic did not imply madness in Shakespeares day. It usually meant grotesque and was used in conjunction with the word death. The smiling skull and Deaths custom of mocking everyone are associated with this

⁵²⁰ „А за Хамлета је морални смисао неодвојив од метафизичког, од питања човекове улоге на земљи. Штавише, та најузвишенија питања за Хамлета сунедвојива од психолошког ослонаца који имају или немају у његовој души, као и од политичког контекста којим је до сржи прожет” (Кољевић 1981: 174).

term. Even before the Ghost appeared Hamlet had already shown his contempt for pretense and his hatred of Claudius. Then in his distinctive manner he makes them visible. Ironic mockery is always the form of his madness⁵²¹ (Šofranac 2013a: 230)

To protect himself from the terrible reality he has come to know, Hamlet has chosen to disguise himself. He has put on the mask of a madman. Hamlet's madness, although simulated, is caused by the horror embodied in him by the realization that ideals do not exist, that the world is not arranged according to his measure, that people act, that they are guided by their own interests without asking the price that such behavior demands. His mask of a madman is a mixture of his internal conflict between two irreconcilable opposites.

Hamlet's so-called, false madness abounds with Dionysian horror that, in Dionysian fashion, destroys everything before it. It is unbridled, chaotic, anarchic, deeply subversive, threatening, frenzied, terrifying. When it comes to the Dionysian, it is about

“[...] spontaneous outbursts of destructive flame, about storms of untamed primordial chaos, about anomalies of consciousness and blind violation of the norms of social order and mental hygiene [...]”⁵²² (Ivanov 2017: 35).

⁵²¹ „Zašto, onda, Šekspirov Hamlet glumi ludaka? Odavno je konstatovano da pretvaranje nije sredstvo za otklanjanje sumnji, što je konvencionalan razlog za glumu ludila u drugim dramama. Hamletu ne pretila nikakva opasnost od Klaudija dok ne počne da se čudno ponaša. Kritičar može da kaže da ne zna motiv, ali glumac mora da ga zna. Kad bih ja režirala predstavu, Hamlet bi mi iskoristio ideju iz Horaciove reakcije na njegovu histeriju: „Da čudnih reči, kneže, zbunjenih!” (I.5.). Hamlet je svestan da je krenuo opasnim putem i, znajući sebe, shvata da može da se čudno ponaša. Hamletov izbor reči, „antic disposition”³⁴¹, veoma je značajan. U Šekspirovo vreme, „antic” nije značilo lud. Obično je to bio epitet uz Smrt i značio je „groteskan”. Ovaj termin odgovara lobanji koja se smeši i tradiciji da se Smrt smeje svima u znak prezira. Hamlet je mržnju prema Klaudiju i prezir prema pretvaranju loše suzdržavao i pre pojave Duha. A onda ih ispoljava na svoj karakterističan način. Njegova gluma ludila uvek ima oblik ironičnog ruganja” (Šofranac 2013a: 230).

⁵²² „[...] стихийским изливима рушилачког пламена, о бурама неукроћеног исконског хаоса, о аномалијама свести и слепом кршењу норми друштвеног уређења и душевне хигијене [...]” (Иванов 2017: 35).

In the heightened emotionality, affectively colored going outside oneself, in going beyond and transcending oneself, the Dionysian horror of Hamlet's "madness" is partly hidden, which is the madness of one man and Hamlet's, which is a literary and psychological phenomenon, an acted, not real, madness that is not madness, which is a mask, the border of which Hamlet rules.

It is the possession of the spirit, the intensification of affect in its terrible, destructive fullness that destroys with its blazing heat. In his work *Bukinja*, Nikola Milošević says that

"[...] Nietzsche interprets Apollonian art as a vision of the principle of individualization, measure, limit, dream, abundance of forms, and Dionysian as a vision of a single will, the primordial one, excess, ecstasy, drunkenness, abundance of strength and movement"⁵²³ (Milošević 2009: 428).

Excess, exaggeration and Dionysian refer to Hamlet's madness. It can be interpreted as crossing boundaries, terrifying in its strength, in the intensification of the affects that seem to rule Hamlet, although he rules them. His "[...] madness, is a liberation, a speech of the unconscious or repressed, Pandora's box of the entire drama"⁵²⁴ (Šofranac 2013b: 37).

The scenes in which Hamlet's madness is described, as well as the scene in which he fails to kill Claudius while praying, testify most to Hamlet's (un)divided character and his (un)subordination to passions. These scenes prove the existence of reason in Hamlet. The proof that Hamlet's madness is not real is found in his words. Namely, in the second scene of the third act, during a conversation with Rosencrantz, Guildenstern and Polonius, Hamlet mutters the following to himself:

⁵²³ „[...] Ниче тумачи аполонску уметност као визију принципа индивидуализације, мере, границе, сна, обиља облика, а диониску као визију јединствене воље, пра – једног, прекомерности, заноса, пијанства, обиља снаге и кретања” (Милошевић 2009: 428).

⁵²⁴ „[...] лудило, је ослобађање, говор несвесног или потиснутог, Пандорина кутија целокупне драме” (Šofranac 2013b: 37).

Playing a fool, clowning around indicates that Hamlet's madness is not real, but that he is acting it all the time, controlling its intensity. It is strongest in the scenes with Gertrude and Ophelia. This is where the Dionysian horror he is acting is best seen. In Hamlet, it manifests itself as false madness, and in Ahmed Nuruddin, as hatred. Hamlet's madness contains Dionysian elements such as destruction, the eruption of a disruptive impulse, destructive rage, exceeding the measure and limit, exaggeration in horror, horror and savagery that can often be found in the view of a mentally ill person.

The Hellenes associated horror accompanied by outbursts of savagery with the mask of the god Dionysus, reading it as a terrifying torrent of horror that cannot be of human origin, but must originate from another world, the world of departed souls. Hamlet shows this horror to two protagonists, Gertrude and Ophelia, who have betrayed his ideal of a chaste, honorable, natural and loyal woman to her man. The reaction of both to this kind of inhuman, superhuman, irrational, inexplicable by human values, was fear. Hamlet chooses to have outbursts of his feigned madness in front of the female figures in his life who disappointed the idealist in him.

"Foucault demands that madness be investigated in terms of its function within and against the structures of power. If the political drama of Essex's madness, rebellion and death has similarities with the tragedies of that time, then the theater itself duplicates and reflects the crisis of authority of late Elizabethan England. In Hamlet and Lear, subordination is characteristic – the narrative serves madness, and not madness serves the narrative. Such a function of narrative leads to the separation of the agent and the internal aspect, which is clearly seen in the problem of Hamlet. Madness displaces the plot, making it a metaphor and taking its place. If madness privileges the subjectivity of the tragic hero, it simultaneously grinds it to pieces and stops it. The Jacobin hero in madness is never alone, banished, he is always on the edge of the dangerous, deceptive space of "sanity in madness", bound by the social situation from which he is (subjectively) separated, connected to the ghost of his former self, whose public form he regains before

death. [...]. Political not in the sense of allusions to actuality like Essex, but in the sense that Hamlet's madness represents a historically specific division by which the interior breaks down the barriers of reason and frees subjectivity. The similarity between the madness of the fictitious Hamlet and the historical Robert Devereux, the unreasonableness with which he violates the sanctity of the queen's chamber and opposes the monarch's orders, stem from the overstepping of ideological boundaries that leads to both high treason and madness. The only thing that is significant is that Shakespeare problematizes Hamlet's madness, and the fact that it cannot be clarified or unmasked, enables his constant perception as a "strange plan" and a threat to the sovereign. In their attempts to diagnose Hamlet's illness, both Claudius and Polonius and Gertrude recognize high treason in that space where reason and madness intersect. "Strange idea" does not make madness, but that reason in him. And Ophelia's madness, although it is nothing more than that, with its "unformedness" threatens to incite political unrest. Thus, madness in Hamlet, although subjective, is not limited by subjectivity, but is constantly interpreted – misinterpreted – as an incitement to social and political unrest. Claudius, when he rebukes Hamlet for his obstinate excessive regret for his father, sets forth a whole series of maxims about respecting natural and divine authority. Claudius sees a feminine trait in Hamlet's grief, melancholy, and Ophelia's madness is there to duplicate, if not parody, Hamlet's. Claudius will explain her distraction as grief for her father, just like Hamlet's melancholy at the beginning of the play. Feminization of madness, warns Hamlet to be careful and control the body with will. As the plot develops, it becomes increasingly difficult to control Hamlet in the literal sense, he has to leave the country, and his melancholy grows into a more dangerous "mask of a madman". The appearance of the Spirit will only deepen the void and give literal meaning to the realm of the supernatural. Hamlet constantly resists the authority of the late king, his father, and his ghost"⁵²⁵ (Codon in: Šofranac 2013a: 143-144).

⁵²⁵ „Fuko zahteva da se ludilo istražuje u smislu njegove funkcije unutar i nasuprot struktura moći. Ako politička drama o Eseksovom ludilu, pobuni i smrti ima sličnosti sa tragedijama toga doba, onda se i samo pozorište duplira i odražava na krizu autoriteta pozno elizabetanske Engleske. Kod Hamleta i

His false madness is given within the framework of the Nietzschean understanding of the Dionysian principle, which implies horror. This horror is frightening with its convincingness and intensity of an uncontrolled volcanic reaction whose lava, what gushes out of it, destroys everything in its path. Dionysian is the horror of existence in which Hamlet finds himself in the midst of the committed sin of

Lira karakteristična je subordinacija – narativ služi ludilu, a ne ludilo narativu. Takva funkcija narativa dovodi do razdvajanja agensa i unutrašnjeg aspekta, što se jasno vidi u problemu Hamleta. Ludilo izmešta radnju, praveći od nje metaforu i zauzimajući njeno mesto. Ako ludilo privileguje subjektivitet tragičnog junaka, ono ga istovremeno i usitnjuje i zaustavlja. Jakobinski junak u ludilu nikada nije sam, proteran, uvek je na ivicu opasnog, varljivog prostora „razuma u ludilu”, vezan društvenom situacijom od koje je (subjektivno) odvojen, povezan sa aveti sebe nekadašnjeg čiju javnu formu ponovo poprima pred smrt. [...]. Političke ne u smislu aluzija na aktuelnosti poput Esekse, nego u smislu toga da Hamletovo ludilo predstavlja istorijski specifičnu podelu kojom unutrašnjost obara barijere razuma i oslobađa subjektivnost. Sličnost između ludila fiktivnog Hamleta i istorijskog Roberta Deveroa, nerazumnost kojom narušava svetost kraljčine odaje i suprotstavlja se naređenjima monarha, potiču iz prekoračenja ideoloških granica koja vodi i u veleizdaju i u ludilo. Značajno je samo to što Šekspir problematizuje Hamletovo ludilo, a to što se ono ne može razjasniti ili raskrinkati, omogućuje njegovu stalnu percepciju kao „čudan naum” i pretnju suverenu. U pokušajima da postave dijagnozu Hamletove boljke, i Klaudije i Polonije i Gertruda prepoznaju veleizdaju u tom prostoru u kome se ukrštaju razum i ludilo. „Čudan naum” ne čini ludilo, nego taj razum u njemu. I Ofelijino ludilo, iako nije ništa više od toga, svojom „neuobličenošću” preti da podstakne političke nemire. Dakle, ludilo u Hamletu, iako subjektivno, nije ograničeno subjektivnošću, već se stalno tumači – pogrešno tumači – kao podstrek na društvene i političke nemire. Klaudije, kada kori Hamleta zbog tvrdoglavog prekomernog žaljenja za ocem, navodi ceo niz maksima o poštovanju prirodnih i božanskih autoriteta. Klaudije u Hamletovoj žalosti vidi žensku crtu, melanholiju, a Ofelijino ludilo je tu da udvoji, ako ne i parodira, Hamletovo. Klaudije će njenu rastrojenost objasniti tugom za ocem, baš kao i Hamletovu melanholiju na početku drame. Feminizacija ludila, upozorava Hamleta da se čuva i voljom kontroliše telo. Kako se radnja razvija, sve je teže kontrolisati Hamleta u bukvalnom smislu, on mora da ode iz zemlje, a njegova melanholija prerasta u opasniju „masku ludaka”. Pojava Duha će samo produbiti prazninu i dati bukvalan smisao prostoru natprirodnog. Hamlet se konstantno opire autoritetu pokojnog kralja, oca, i njegovog duha” (Kodon u: Šofranac 2013a: 143–144).

fratricide, about which he learns from a supernatural force, from the Spirit of his deceased father. Dionysian is the flash that this Spirit symbolizes as a representative of the afterlife that directs Hamlet's actions. The Dionysian element is the morbidity that the connection with the world of the dead introduces. The knowledge of the murder of his father is disturbing for Hamlet's insufficiently masculine nature. The madness, however false, to which Hamlet surrenders himself, as a vice in order to test the courtiers and convince himself that the Spirit is telling the truth, is disturbing. Hamlet's madness and Nuruddin's hatred are Dionysian states.

In her work "The Insane, the Lover and the Poet – Mental Disorders of Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes" on the topic of madness in Shakespeare's great plays, Nataša Šofranac claims: "[...] madness is something wrong inside [...]"⁵²⁶ (Šofranac 2013b: 102). This is a sublimation of the motif of madness, the Hamletian, false one, which sometimes, indeed, can resemble real mental disorder, due to the Dionysian state in which Hamlet finds himself during the performance and the Dionysian horror that is present in him.

His madness is based on disgust, another element of the Dionysian man according to Nietzsche, which he first and most feels towards the two of them, and in the course of the play the feeling of disgust expands to encompass the entire human race. In the case of Ahmed Nuruddin, in the turmoil of the war from which he returned after the news of his death spread, he lost the love of his youth, which he had kept in his memory for years. This was the real reason why he withdrew to a dervish tekke, to faith, excommunicated himself from life except as the bearer of a social role, a public function, a calling, restrained the natural impulses and drives of a man, which, after so many years, would be tickled by the teapot, not only with her beauty, but also by evoking in him the long-suppressed memory of the woman who meant love to him. The loss of her and their love destroyed the ideal of love in him, paving the way for his failure, which was paved

⁵²⁶ „[...] ludilo je nešto pogrešno unutra [...]” (Šofranac 2013b: 102).

with emotional distancing. Hamlet channels his anger first towards the two of them, and then towards everyone. He expresses this in these words:

“Man delights not me – no, nor woman neither [...]”⁵²⁷
(2.2. 303)

He rules over it and uses it when necessary when it suits his plans. Hamlet’s madness has always seemed to be an intriguing literary motif. Ahmed’s hatred, which, being Dionysian, is excessive, destructive, and, like Hamlet’s madness, subversive, is purely masculine.

This is the similarity between Hamlet’s alleged madness and Nuruddin’s hatred. It is a subjective reaction to a boundary situation that leads Ahmed to a transformation. It is a sincere, unadulterated emotion, which he could not have planned, which makes it spontaneous. It was born in his heart as Athena was born from Zeus’s head. It freed him from obedience to order, political and religious constraints that he had not suspected until then, which is why he becomes a subversive element, a threat.

In Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin, the transformation goes in the opposite direction. Hamlet’s father’s death was a shock that provoked a strong reaction of sadness and grief, his mother’s inappropriate behavior produced disgust in him, the Ghost’s words instilled doubt in him, Ophelia’s behavior disappointed him, as did the false, double-minded morality of the court. As the play develops, the strength of Hamlet’s emotions gradually weakens and calms in yourself. Hamlet turns into a persuasive person to ensure that no one in the court is mentally sick in his passionate madness. Hamlet, in his feigned madness, transforms himself into a deranged man so convincingly that no one at court doubts that he is truly mentally ill. Ahmed Nuruddin truly experiences a metamorphosis into an avenger who is comforted, driven, and motivated by hatred for his brother’s murderers, starting

⁵²⁷ „Човек ми се не мили; не, па ни жена [...]”
(Шекспир, *Велике играџије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 52)

with the musellim. Both of them step out of themselves, the only difference being that Hamlet only pretends to be mad, while Ahmed Nuruddin has truly stepped into the darkness of the other “I” within himself, into the cold, dark, and brooding chambers of his destructive drive for decay.

Different critics have defined it differently: as paralysis of the will, melancholy, internal conflict, or simply grief and sorrow, irritation due to the loss of his father, his mother’s hasty marriage, which caused the imagined halo of a saint above her head to fall in Hamlet’s mind, and the decadent halo of a harlot to appear, and Ophelia’s rejection of Hamlet’s affections after Laertes points out to her the superiority of Hamlet’s socially constructed identity as the ruler of Denmark, which prevents him from marrying her even if his intentions were sincere and honorable. Some critics even go so far as to claim that Hamlet has lost touch with reality. But Hamlet disagrees. He says:

“That I essentially am not in madness,
But mad in craft”⁵²⁸
(3. 4. 186–187)

Such an interpretation is a clear opposition to Ahmed’s hatred, which, being Dionysian, is excessive, destructive, and, like Hamlet’s madness, subversive, purely masculine.

The feigned madness is Hamlet’s Dionysian mask. Madness is the crossing of cognitive, emotional, spiritual, and psychological boundaries in the individual. Hamlet gives evidence that he is in control of it, we conclude that there are still limits in him, that he is in control of his mind, even when he is acting. Although his madness is frighteningly faithful to real madness, the fact that he is feigning shows that there is sobriety in him and that his “madness” is a matter of his decision. He deliberately

⁵²⁸ „[...] Како ја у самој ствари нисам луд,
Већ да сам луда само из лукавства”
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев.. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 90).

goes beyond the limit, and the moment he goes beyond it, it means that it must exist in him. This is the Apollonian element of his mask.

Hamlet, after the Ghost has disappeared, tells the guards and his friend Horatio that he plans to feign madness. In earlier versions of the play, such a dramatic device was justified as a cunning ploy to avoid suspicion and buy time. The pointed wooden spears that the seemingly mad boy Hamlet cuts with his knife are a reminder of that era and evidence of shrewd, long-term planning. He uses these spears to spread a net over the sleeping courtiers before setting fire to the palace. In this way, Shakespeare has destroyed the plausible and convincing plot that his source had given him. By pretending to be mad, he has only drawn attention to himself, forced the murderer to constantly watch him, to talk to Gertrude, to send Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to follow Hamlet, and to seek advice from his advisor Polonius. Thus, Hamlet's feigned madness seems to be a cover for some form of real, actual madness. In fact, when he claims not to be mad in his mother's room, he has never seemed more insane (Grinblatt, trans. Stojanović, 2006: 305-307).

Hamlet is poisoned at the end of the play by drinking from a poisoned cup. This is a trap that Claudius has prepared to ensure the death of his nephew (Shakespeare, trans. Simić and Pandurović, 2022: 114).

“Hamlet's madness, in addition to its simulation for the purpose of achieving the goal of revenge, had a very subversive effect on the order, disturbing the entire kingdom and leading to the death of several notables”⁵²⁹ (Šofranac 2011: 157).

Hamlet's madness is

“[...] a mask of a very special kind, because while the personality is lost behind the mask they put on, the false madness allows Hamlet to

⁵²⁹ „Хамлетово лудило је, поред своје симулације ради постизања циља освете, веома субверзивно деловало на поредак, узнемирило је читаво краљевство и довело до погибије неколико угледних личности” (Шофранац 2011: 157).

preserve his personality to the greatest extent possible. It gives him the greatest privilege of all: to say what he really thinks and feels, even at the cost of not being taken too seriously. For madness is [...] a very honorable way of acting: it hides us quite well, but it does not ask us to be scoundrels in return”⁵³⁰ (Hristić in: *The Scene* 1967: 377).

Hamlet’s simulated madness is an acted affect whose intensity is excessive, especially in the scenes before Ophelia and Gertrude.

Ahmed Nuruddin’s hatred is a negative passion. Ahmed Nuruddin also plays a madman during his meeting with the mufti, to whom he went in the hope of getting the mufti to write an order for Harun’s release:

“I turned my mind inside out, feverishly rummaged in its corners to find the droppings of the devil, struggling with that corpse so that there would be yet another [...]”⁵³¹ (Selimović 2018: 158).

In this scene Nuruddin himself mentions insanity, that is, however, different when compared to Hamlet’s, but he is “driven insane” nonetheless.

“The entire time it seemed to me that I was standing on my head, that I was standing on my head, that I was hanging between the floor and the lamp, that I was holding the ceiling up with my shoulders, driven insane by his boredom and my desire to overcome it”⁵³² (Ibid: 162).

This is Jan Kott’s *tragic farce* (Kott 1990: 54) taking place.

⁵³⁰ „[...] maska sasvim naročite vrste, jer dok se ličnost gubi iza maske koju su stavili, lažno ludilo dopušta Hamletu da u najvećoj mogućoj mjeri sačuva svoju ličnost. Ono mu daje najveću povlasticu od svih: da govori ono što zaista misli i oseća ma i po cenu da ne bude shvaćen suviše ozbiljno. Jer ludilo je [...] veoma častan način glume: ono nas sasvim dovoljno skriva, ali ne traži od nas da zauzvrat budemo podlaci” (Hristić u: *Scena* 1967: 377).

⁵³¹ „Изврнуо сам дух наопако, грозничаво копао по закуцима да пронађем ђаволске брабоњке у себи, борио се са мртвцем да не буде још један [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 158).

⁵³² „Цијело време ми се чинило да дубим на глави, да висим између пода и кандиља, да строп подупирем плећима, изгубљен, поблесавио због његове чаме и своје жеље да је савладам” (Селимовић 2004: 162).



10. THE ESSENCE OF HAMLET'S REVENGE

What is overlooked or considered unfounded self-reproach by those who portray him either as a melancholic person prone to excessive introspection or as a ruthless advocate of fulfilling his duty to the spirit of his father is hidden in the premise that he is “unpervaded by his own cause”. It is a mirror of Hamlet’s self-perception. Such interpretations suggest that the delay in action can be attributed to psychological problems or external blockages. However, Hamlet’s claim that he is “unpervaded by his own cause” clearly indicates that the real barriers lie within himself (Klein in: *The Scene* magazine 1967: 299). Hamlet’s revenge, in addition to being able to be analyzed as a personal matter of the individual and his conscience, can also and must be interpreted in the light of medieval political relations in England among members of the aristocracy. The blood feud in Hamlet unmistakably illustrates the all-encompassing mechanism of feudal bloodshed that goes hand in hand with *the Great Mechanism* (Kott in *The Scene* 1967: 322).

Throughout the play, we encounter two distinct categories of questions concerning the intellectual and moral foundations of human behavior, illustrating how Hamlet’s search for meaning ultimately results in a sense of meaninglessness. Starting with the concept of evil as a negating force, foreshadowed by the death of his father and the subsequent marriage of his mother, and personified in the act of Claudius’ murder, Hamlet initially connects immediate reality with this principle, before extending his analysis to more indirect aspects

of existence. In a world characterized by malice and infidelity, love becomes a tragic and inappropriate farce that must be let go (Koljević in: *The Scene* 1967: 358). Dervish also sacrifices love. His departure to war is a departure into the realm of evil. As for adultery, the question arises whether the forced marriage of his beloved (Selimović 2018a: 381) can be characterized in this way.

In this monologue, Hamlet repeats his dark perception of the world and sees suicide as a potential means of escape from it. However, his anxiety regarding the uncertainties that lie after the end of life, in the realm of death, ultimately gives him the excuse not to try to escape (Bajić in: *The Scene* 1967: 332).

The examination of intellectual and moral dilemmas regarding human actions reaches a point where the very essence of those actions is questioned. Shakespeare most deeply examines the significance of human actions precisely in Hamlet. Moreover, before this play, he had not dealt with the effectiveness of human actions in relation to their meaning: how they are perceived by the individual who performs them. It is only in Hamlet that Shakespeare intricately links the significance of human actions with the consciousness for which such meaning is relevant. Hamlet is a dramatic exploration of human action, where the death of the father, the remarriage of the mother – which in the context of Elizabethan beliefs implied incest – and the hint of murder intertwine, leading Hamlet to experience not only the obligation of revenge, but also a complex web of dilemmas related to consciousness (Koljević in: *The Scene* 1967: 357).

It is the need to connect an experience with a broader framework such as the world picture, the desire to move one's own experience, the facts that are current here and then, into the permanent space of one's mind. Hamlet is powerless to act before he has made the effort to learn and understand everything.

In the tragedy, Hamlet's hesitation is most deeply caused by his obsession with it, experiencing this difficulty at the core of his spirit, at the foundations of his spiritual being, which is what most poignantly acts in the tragedy as the reason for Hamlet's hesitation.

The “to be or not to be” monologue, therefore, serves as a time-out for further reflection, a painful mental exercise that aims to weigh all the options before Hamlet decides on a metaphysical choice. In this way, he embodies the age-old philosophical puzzle: how can we know anything before every detail about it is known? If there is one quality that would allow us to legitimately label Hamlet as an intellectual, it is not his educational experience nor his use of clever paradoxes, but his attempt at mental self-transcendence – an endeavor whose agony this tragedy evokes so powerfully and in so many ways – from the realization that we are alone in the universe to the fact that life is not experienced as anything other than the playfulness of matter that occurs in Hamlet in the cemetery scene (Koljević in: *The Scene* 358–359). The cemetery scene in *Death and the Dervish* could be the one in which the dervish tries to find his brother’s bones.

“[...] in that monologue, he repeats his dark vision of the world and he considers a suicide a possibility of liberation, but due to his fear of the unknown from the other side of the boundary separating life and death, there is a reason not to take advantage of that possibility”⁵³³ (Bajić in: *The Scene* 1967: 332).

Helen Gardner, in her essay “Hamlet” and the “Tragedy of the Avenger,” asks what Elizabethan people thought about the ethics of personal revenge. Through thorough research, she came to the conclusion, “[...] that people of Elizabeth’s time considered murder unethical, and personal revenge sinful”⁵³⁴ (Gardner in: *The Scene* 1967: 362). Elizabeth is just another way of transcribing the name Elizabeth, so we are talking about Queen Elizabeth I. In addition, Hamlet is a Christian who believes in God’s commandments. “The status of the

⁵³³ „[...] u tom monologu ponavlja svoju mračnu sliku sveta i vidi u samoubistvu mogućnost oslobođenja, ali u strahu od nepoznatog s one strane granice koja razdvaja život i smrt nalazi se razlog da ne ostvari tu mogućnost” (Bajić u: *Scena* 1967: 332).

⁵³⁴ „[...] da su ljudi Jelisavetinog doba smatrali ubistvo neetičkim, aličnu osvtu grešnom” (Gardner u: *Scena* 1967: 362).

“Ten Commandments” in Christianity is [...] understood as the proclamation of a natural moral law that is, in things and in human hearts, a reflection of God’s eternal law (order)”⁵³⁵ (Tanasković 2018: 235), and murder should fulfill its function of punishment, to ensure the damnation of his soul in the afterlife. Therefore, it must be committed in a situation that will make this possible, and not in one that would ensure that his soul would peacefully go to the other world. The fear that governs Hamlet when it comes to committing (suicide) is caused by religious principles. Therefore, “for religious reasons, he is not even allowed to commit suicide [...]”⁵³⁶ (Koljević 1981: 174). This is obvious when analyzing the most famous lines in the play in which Hamlet ponders the suicide.

The prince is subject to ideology as a political practice that protects the monarch, even if he is illegitimately and illegally on the throne, and that prohibits rebellion against the monarch just because he performs the function of ruler, which protects him with its halo of inviolability (Kostić 1983: 44), and to Christian ideology that prohibits suicide, which we learn from Hamlet’s words.

Hamlet desires suicide at the beginning of the play and thus finds himself in conflict with Christian doctrine, he opposes Claudius from the very beginning of the play with his behavior and in their conversations in which the new king shows a wide range of his Machiavellian hypocrisy. Hamlet will rebel. From a literary character who contemplates suicide and weighs whether to act or not, considering the consequences of his act, he will (still) become an avenger.

Hamlet swore to the Ghost of his father that he would take revenge. However, his undoubtedly sincere intention to take revenge and carry

⁵³⁵ „Статус „Десет Божијих заповести” у хришћанству се [...] поима као обзнањивање природног моралног закона који је, у стварима и у срцима људским, одраз вечног Божијег закона (поретка)” (Танасковић 2018: 235)

⁵³⁶ „из религиозних разлога, њему чак није отоврен ни пут у самоубиство [...]” (Кољевић 1981: 174).

it out quickly was thwarted by Hamletism, which is “[...] inactivity, hesitation and delay due to the struggle with one’s own conscience”⁵³⁷ (Klein 1964: 63). It is, in short, the art of procrastination.

“It was once thought that Hamletism was inactivity, indecision, thinking instead of acting, the absence of will and ability for action, a misanthropic escape from the world and life [...]”⁵³⁸ (*Ibid*: 42).

Hamlet conspicuously does not act. At the same time, he thinks just as conspicuously.

His endless thinking harms his activity. It blocks his will to take action to avenge the murder of his good father. But he is not hesitant in all spheres of life, nor is hesitation his dominant characteristic. On the contrary. He only delays the fulfillment of what he must do, and which, equally, he does not want to do. “Hamlet hesitates only to scold his father” [...]”⁵³⁹ (*Ibid*: 51). This is his main feature throughout the play. He thinks much more than he acts. Hamlet is undeniably prone to reflection. Even reflection in itself is not so harmful as its consequence, which is the lack of will to do what he has sworn to do. But Hamlet is inactive. This is his tragic trait. He is aware of this because he says so.

Everything he does not do goes far beyond what he does. His delaying the moment when he will kill his usurper uncle is the essence of Hamletism. Missing the opportunity to take revenge when Claudius prays and therefore being easy prey for the excellent swordsman that Hamlet is is an example of Hamletism. The fact that Hamlet allows two months to pass since the murder of his father without killing the perpetrator is a consequence of Hamletism (Klein 1964:63).

⁵³⁷ „[...] je neaktivnost, kolebanje i odlaganje usled borbe sa sopstvenom savešću” (Klajn 1964: 63).

⁵³⁸ „Nekad se smatralo da je hamletovština neaktivnost, neodlučnost, razmišljanje mesto delanja, odsutnost volje i sposobnosti za čin, mizantropsko bežanje od sveta i života [...]” (Исцо: 42).

⁵³⁹ „Hamlet se koleba samo sveteći oca” [...]” (Исцо: 51).

In our country, Hugo Klein dealt with Hamletism in the book *Shakespeare and Humanity*⁵⁴⁰ (1964). According to him, it is the same as procrastination, but he makes a distinction between procrastination in the sense of the phenomenon of procrastination as a trait of Hamlet's personality and the specific procrastination in the situation in which he finds himself, facing his duty as a son and heir to the throne to avenge his father by killing his uncle. Since Hamlet is constant in his hesitation to perform such an act, Klein finds in the conscience of the heir to the throne the fundamental reason for his apparent, (over) emphasized sluggishness in action (*Ibid*: 42).

Hamlet is not a man in a hurry to take revenge; it soon becomes apparent that the memory of his father – the one he thinks he wants to keep most in his mind, or any memory for that matter – is far from simple and turns out to be much more complicated than he had anticipated. Something stands in the way of doing the obvious thing – feigning madness – which seems completely pointless in terms of plot. [...] The ghost has suffered the end that devout Catholics most feared. He has been cut off from life without, he admits, a chance to properly prepare for death. "Cut off even in the blossoms of my sins, Unhouseled, disappointed, unaneled, No reck'ning made, but sent to my account With all my imperfections on my head" (I. 5, 76-79) – he did not undergo the last anointing with holy oil; nor did he receive his last communion. Even if we were to set aside for the moment the Protestant belief that purgatory does not exist, no plausible explanation can be given, since the spirits from God's greatest prison cannot, by definition, in any way incite anyone to sin. For it is in this realm that they are cleansed of their earthly sins so that they can ascend to heaven. Again, this spirit does not ask for masses or donations for the poor; he appeals to God's authority at the council when he demands that his son avenge his murder, reclaim his crown, and confront the husband of his widow, and his mother. [...] The strongest claim of Protestant dogma in Shakespeare's time was that

⁵⁴⁰ Хуго Клајн, *Шекспир и човештво*, Просвета, Београд: 1964.

ghosts did not exist at all. The apparitions that people experienced from time to time – those that resembled a loved one or a friend – were mere illusions, if not, at worst, the devil in disguise trying to tempt his victims to sin. Hamlet first claims to have seen an “honest Ghost” [...], but, of course, this early certainty soon turns to doubt [...]. It is precisely such reflections that are immediately followed by a renewed cycle of procrastination and self-reproach, repeated failures. They are an example of a drama within a drama, by which Hamlet intends to obtain independent proof of the Ghost’s claims, but also to express one of the protagonist’s central feelings, the endless uncertainty of being (Greenblatt, trans. Stojanović, 2006: 318–320).

The father’s task of revenge given to his son represents a moral thread that is attributed to him as a legacy. It is, namely, the hub of change – a moral challenge that he faces, and which we are not sure (and neither is he himself) that he has grown up with due to the constant postponement of it until the end of the play.

Many Shakespearean scholars, above all Andrew Cecil Bradley (A.S. Bradley), agree that the cause of Hamletism (Klein 1964: 63) is that the young prince is hurt, indeed, bitterly offended by his mother’s reaction to the loss of her husband who was a shining example of virtue. Hamlet is hurt by her act of remarriage to the worthless Claudius, whom he considers a betrayal of his beloved father. Moreover, “[...] Hamlet expresses a desire for death, disgust for the world and resentment over his mother’s hasty marriage”⁵⁴¹ (Kostić 1982: 36). It will turn out that this Claudius is a murderer, and more than that, a fratricide, a Machiavellian who, having committed a sin, has ascended to a throne that does not belong to him, thereby depriving the one who deserves it by blood.

Nikola Milošević offers several aspects in accordance with which one can analyze “[...] his incomprehensible hesitation [...]”⁵⁴²

⁵⁴¹ „[...] Hamlet izražava želju za smrću, gađenje prema svetu i ogorčenje zbog pre nagljene udaje svoje majke” (Kostić 1982: 36).

⁵⁴² „[...] njegovo neshvatljivo oklevanje [...]” (Milošević u: Šekspir, prev. Simić i Pandurović, 1966: 5).

(Milošević in: Shakespeare, transl. Simić and Pandurović, 1966: 5.). He deals with Hamlet's hesitation from the perspective of critics who disagree among themselves about the reasons for Hamlet's inaction. In the preface to the translation of the book *Hamlet / William Shakespeare*; (translated from English by Živojin Simić and Sima Pandurović), Milošević states that:

“There are, however, such interpreters according to whom Hamlet is not weak at all and hesitated. Without hesitation, he sends Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to their deaths with determination and purpose. On the other hand, allegedly, he does not kill the king simply because he is not given a favorable opportunity to do so. However, Hamlet becomes a murderer only when some immediate incentives force him to do so. Only when what reminds him of injustice and hatred is right in front of his eyes (Polonius' exclamation, the queen's poisoning), only when the drive for self-preservation awakens in him (fear in the case of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern), Hamlet decides to take action”⁵⁴³ (*Ibid.*).

He also explains the opposite point of view, with which he does not agree: other critics, again, believe that Hamlet delays his revenge because he subconsciously feels guilty for the same crime committed by his uncle. But for this opinion, which is advocated by the creator of psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud, there is no sufficient basis in the text of Shakespeare's tragedy itself. “One cannot look for any feeling of guilt in Hamlet that is different from what the writer himself attributes to him”⁵⁴⁴ (*Ibid.*).

⁵⁴³ „Ima, doduše, i takvih interpretatora po kojima Hamlet uopšte nije slabiji i oklevalo. On bez okolišanja i odlučno i smišljeno šalje u smrt Rozenkranca i Gildensterna. Kralja, pak, navodno, ne ubija samo stoga jer mu se za to ne pruža povoljna prilika. Međutim, Hamlet postaje ubica tek onda kada ga na to nateraju neki neposredni podsticaji. Tek kada mu je neposredno pred očima ono što ga podseća na nepravdu i mržnju (Polonijev uzvik, kraljičino trovanje), tek kad se u njemu budi nagon za samoodržanjem (strah u slučaju Rozenkranca i Gildensterna), Hamlet se odlučuje za akciju” (*Исцїо*).

⁵⁴⁴ „Drugi kritičari, opet, smatraju da Hamlet odugovlači s osvetom zato jer se podsvesno oseća krivim za onaj isti zločin što ga je počinio njegov stric. Ali za ovo mišljenje, koje zastupa tvorac psihoanalize Sigmund Frojd nema

Such a view emphasizes that what particularly angers the young prince is that Claudius married his mother and crawled into her bed. This affects him to the point that he feels disgust towards all women, because any one could be a Gertrude, unworthy of love and respect, without the ability to be faithful to one man for the rest of his life, despite death. The emotions of disgust towards the female gender are stimulated by Gertrude's unworthy act, which will mark Hamlet in his relationship with Ophelia, leading him to complete devastation. It is understood that this was contributed to by the fact that Hamlet felt betrayed by Ophelia's rejection, which is connected to the deep, primal disgust that he began to harbor towards Gertrude.

In addition to the above, Milošević also mentions that:

“There are also interpreters of this well-known tragedy who believe that Hamlet is delaying the council because he has come to the conclusion that revenge has no meaning. The world and people are incurably and irreparably immoral and no one will ever be able to change them. However, Shakespeare makes it clear enough that his hero draws his pessimistic conclusions only after he is directly affected by his mother's marriage and the brutal murder of his father. Hamlet's pessimistic orientation is not, therefore, the result of Hamlet's philosophy, but the other way around”⁵⁴⁵ (*Ibid*).

Finally,

“a similar remark can be made to those who believe that Hamlet's hesitation is the result of excessive development of the ability to think, that

dovoljno osnova u samom tekstu Šekspirove trgaedije. Ne može se u Hamletu tražiti neko osećanje krivice koje se razlikuje od onog što mu pripisuje sam pisac” (*Istio*).

⁵⁴⁵ „Ima i takvih tumača ove poznate tragedije koji smatraju da Hamlet odugovlači s savetom zato što je došao do zaključka da osveta nema nikakva smisla. Svet i ljudi su neizlečivo i neopravljivo nemoralni i niko ih nikad neće moći izmeniti. Međutim, Šekspir nam dovoljno jasno stavlja do znanja da njegov junak izvlači svoje pesimističke zaključke tek pošto je neposredno pogođen udajom svoje majke i mučkim ubistvom svoga oca. Hamletova pesimistička orijentacija nije, dakle, rezultat Hamletove filozofije, već obrnuto” (*Isto*).

is, to know at the expense of the ability to act, that is, action. Hamlet's excessive intellectuality is also not a cause but an effect. She begins to represent an obstacle to the activity of the Danish prince after, and not before, the marriage of his mother"⁵⁴⁶ (*Ibid*).

Hamlet, as a Dionysian Man, is characterized by lethargy, apathy, and disgust (Nietzsche 2003: 39), but their cause is not in his indecision, but in the devastating effect that tragic knowledge has on him (Jaspers in: Stojanović (ed.) 1984: 234).

"Hamlet for Nietzsche is not an anti-hero who is distracted from action by too much thinking, but a hero, a tragic hero of knowledge: knowledge here has a devastating effect [...], action rises up against itself [...]"⁵⁴⁷ (Milić 2000: 131).

His authentic emotions, however, are, first of all, emotions of sadness and grief due to facing a boundary situation. Lethargy and apathy are reflected in his perpetual state of inaction, and in Nuruddin's case, in the first part of the novel, they are expressed in absolute subordination to "the Islamist dogma" (Petrović 1981: 42) and a turn towards thoughtfulness that does not result in action, but remains in the sphere of reflexivity.

Hamlet wants to find meaning in a situation where meaning does not exist. He cries out to find meaning in taking revenge, without that meaning being the product of his personal aspirations or impulses. He does not want to channel the hatred he feels for his uncle through

⁵⁴⁶ „slična primedba može se staviti i onima koji smatraju da je Hamletovo oklevanje rezultat preteranog preteranog razvoja sposobnosti za razmišljanje, odnosno saznavanja na račun sposobnosti za delanje, odnosno akciju. Preterana intelektualnost Hamletova takođe nije uzrok već posledica. Ona počinje da predstavlja prepreku za aktivnost danskog princa posle, a ne pre udaje njegove majke" (*Исџо*).

⁵⁴⁷ „Hamlet za Ničea nije antijunak koga previše razmišljanja odvlači od delanja, već junak, tragički junak saznanja: saznanje tu deluje porazno [...], delanje ustaje protiv sebe [...]" (Milić 2000: 131).

„islamističkoj dogmi" (Petrović 1981: 42).

revenge. The task of taking revenge must have a deeper meaning for Hamlet. In order to decide to sin, he must first be convinced that there are valid reasons to do so.

Therefore, meaning is decisive for his decision to carry out revenge. He is faced with a crime. He is on unknown terrain, in which he does not find his way, and he is forced to find his way. Hamlet tries to respond to this challenge. Claudius is an experienced and over-exaggerated usurper, an exponent of power and political function, a quasi-monarch who does not hesitate to kill an innocent man in order to protect his interests. And Hamlet, just a student, interested in philosophy and fencing, needs to find his way in the chess game started by his uncle, and not be just a pawn in a game that is already lost.

“For what is his devising of a mousetrap and acting crazy but a futile attempt to be “on the level” of his opponent’s cunning? Hamlet is clear about who he is dealing with and is well acquainted with the methods of deception and manipulation, as he openly tells Guildenstern and Rosencrantz. He even shows how he himself can skillfully wield them. But he simply cannot accept the role he knows how to play as a model of behavior. Even when he starts slashing around him with his sword, he cannot base his orientation towards revenge on such moral nihilism”⁵⁴⁸ (Koljević 2012: 82).

What holds Hamlet back is the resistance he feels towards the duty of taking revenge. “In a world of general manipulation, Hamlet would like to be “mature” and “to rise to the occasion”” (*Ibid*: 78). However, he resists this with all his might. The Danish

⁵⁴⁸ „Јер шта је његово смишљање мишоловке и глума лудила него узалудни покушај да буде „на нивоу” лукавости свог противника? Хамлету је јасно с ким има посла и добро су му познати методи претварања и манипулације, као што Гилденстерну и Розенкранцу отворено каже. Он чак показује како и сам уме њима спретно да рукује. Али он ту улогу коју уме да игра једноставно не може да прихвати као модел понашања. Чак и када почне да сече мачем око себе, он не може на таквом моралном нихилизму да заснује своју усмереност ка освети” (Кољевић 2012: 82).

prince simply did not grow up to the intrigues and courtly antics among which he found himself thanks to the request of his father's Ghost to avenge him.

He does not find his way in a world in which everything is achieved in a morally questionable way, through manipulation, crime, intrigue, and he is forced to find his way without, at the same time, betraying his inner moral code that forbids him to take revenge just for the sake of taking revenge. Hamlet's execution of revenge must, therefore, have a moral dimension that somewhat justifies it. "In a word, Hamlet's revenge has a moral meaning insofar as it is not a consequence of a vengeful ideology. On the contrary, it is all in the tragic resistance of that ideology [...]. Hence Hamlet's "hesitation", in fact, his heroic stumbling in the darkness with which he cannot reconcile himself"⁵⁴⁹ (Koljević 1981: 85). This irreconcilability makes him similar to Selimović's most famous fugitive.

In *Death and the Dervish*, Nuruddin's misfortune resulting from his brother's arrest constantly attacks him. The path from understanding to action is for him full of complexity and uncertainty. Nuruddin's response should be uncompromising and prompt, and these are qualities that he himself cannot and does not want to embody. He does not feel pressured by urgency, because he places his faith in the law, in the overarching principles of justice. He believes that nothing happens outside the domain of the influence of the eternal law to which we are all bound; to act against the forces of inevitability is both irrational and indefensible. Everything unfolds as a manifestation of fate, and fate cannot be resisted. So, it is not just a lack of willpower that is at work here, but a deep ideological commitment that shapes his inaction (Petrović 1981: 26–27).

Nuruddin shows a lack of decisive commitment to take action. He seems unwilling to engage actively, instead seeking moral justification

⁵⁴⁹ „Речју, Хамлетова освета има морални смисао утолико што није последица осветничке идеологије. Напротив, она је сва у трагичном отпору те идеологије [...]. Отуд је и Хамлетово „оклевање”, у ствари, његово херојско постраће у мраку са којим се не мири” (Кољевић, 1981: 85).

for his inertia. His real responsibility lies not with his brother, but with himself. Nuruddin is not equipped to face all challenges. Two forces emerge within him, two equally powerful tendencies that, opposing each other, envelop him in a state of indecision (*Ibid*: 28–29).

In Shakespeare's play, Hamlet is the victim of Claudius' usurpation of the throne and the occupation of his, Hamlet's, place in the state and family, and thus the violation of the harmony of the divine order and order. He is aware that the throne has been taken from him and that Claudius, although not too bad in his way of ruling, is still a tyrant because his rule has no foundation in law and legitimacy. No matter how much he feels antagonism towards his uncle, he does not kill him the first time he has the opportunity to do so. Hamlet does not want to kill a man who is on his knees and praying, explaining his action by saying that the murderer of his father will not go to hell, which he deserves, because he atoned for his sins through prayer.

Rosencrantz speaks about the political dimension of the murder of the king and the impact it has on the state and the people living in it;

“The cease of majesty
Dies not alone, but, like a gulf, doth draw
What's near it with it. Or 'tis a massy wheel
Fixed on the summit of the highest mount,
To whose huge spokes ten thousand lesser things
Are mortised and adjoined, which, when it falls,
Each small annexment, petty consequence,
Attends the boisterous ruin. Never alone
Did the king sigh, but with a general groan”⁵⁵⁰
(3,2, 15–23)

⁵⁵⁰ „[...] краљева смрт не долази сама,
Него као вртлог одвлачи собом
Све што јој је близу.
То је огроман човек, учвршћен
Наврх највишег брега, на чијим је
Паоцима огромним десет хиљада

Claudius confesses the crime of regicide during prayer:

O, my offence is rank, it smells to heaven;
It hath the primal eldest curse upon't,
A brother's murder! – Pray can I not,
Though inclination be as sharp as will;
My stronger guilt defeats my strong intent;
And, like a man to double business bound,
I stand in pause where I shall first begin,
And both neglect. What if this cursed hand
Were thicker than itself with brother's blood,
Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens
To wash it white as snow? Whereto serves mercy
But to confront the visage of offence?
And what's in prayer but this twofold force,
To be forestalled ere we come to fall,
Or pardon'd being down? then I'll look up;
My fault is past. But, O, what form of prayer
Can serve my turn? Forgive me my foul murder?
That cannot be; since I am still possess'd
Of those effects for which I did the murder, –
My crown, mine own ambition, and my queen.
May one be pardon'd and retain the offence?
In the corrupted currents of this world
Offence's gilded hand may shove by justice;
And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
Buys out the law: but 'tis not so above:
There is no shuffling, there the action lies
In his true nature; and we ourselves compell'd,
Even to the teeth and forehead of our faults,

Ситнијих ствари приковано, стало;
Па кад он падне, свака мала ствар
И ситан додатак дели страшни пад.
Никад краљев уздах није сам осто
А да цео народ није тужан посто”
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровћ, 2022: 80)

To give in evidence. What then? what rests?
Try what repentance can: what can it not?
Yet what can it when one can not repent?
O wretched state! O bosom black as death!
O limed soul, that, struggling to be free,
Art more engaged! Help, angels! Make assay!
Bow, stubborn knees! and, heart with strings of steel
Be soft as sinews of the new-born babe!
All may be well!⁵⁵¹
(3,3, 36–70)

⁵⁵¹ „Мој злочин трули: до неба му смрад
Дуже се, носећ најстрију клетву братоубиства.
Молитви не могу,
Мада је желим колико и хоћу.
Јаку ми вољу јачи грех обара;
А ја ко неко везан с посла два,
Беспослен, стојим не знајући где
Да почнем, те оба занемарујем.
Па да је ова рука проклета
Од братовљеве крви двапут одебљала,
Зар добро небо нема доста кише
Да је спере целу, да буде ко снег?
Чему милост доли да погледа грех?
Нема ли молитва ту двоструку моћ
Да, пре но паднемо, предупреди пад,
И опрости онда кад паднемо већ?
Па погледај горе! Твој је прошло грех
Али о, који би облик молитве
Пристао за мене? „Опрости ми моје гадно убиство!” – То не може бити;
Јер ја и сада уживамкористи
Због којих ово убиство изврших:
Своју круну, своју краљицу и власт.
Може ли когод опроштај да тражи,
А корист од свога злочина да држи?
На путима греха у овоме свету
Позлаћена рука злочина још може
Да измакне правди; и често се још
Пљачком злочина купи злочин сам.

Hamlet does not kill Claudius at the prayer. He would rather see him condemned to the torments of hell. Therefore, he would regret that his hand should send him to heaven even though he has a great opportunity. One of Hamlet's brakes is a moral dilemma. This is the crux of the tragedy. His hesitation to react produces a series of subsequent misfortunes. By not killing the king, he in fact kills Polonius and Ophelia and Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and Laertes and the queen, and, finally, himself. These deaths are a direct consequence of his hesitation and the missed opportunity that presented itself. Despite Hamlet's animosity towards his uncle and his obligation to seek revenge, he is never fully committed to this undertaking. What truly horrifies him is his mother's moral lapse (Bradley 1978: 115–117). But if he were to use that moment to eliminate the villain, he would ensure that the villain's soul would ascend to heaven [...] (*Ibid*: 114), which he does not want. Hamlet hesitates. He thinks this way:

Ал' тако није на небу. Ту нема врдања,
И ту се јавља сваки чин
У својој правој природи; а ми,
Пред очима, лицем својих грехова,
Приморани смо да признамо све.
Па онда? Шта ми остаје? Да кушам
Шта покајање може ил не може.
Ал' шта то вреди једноме који се
Не може да каје? О очаја, беде!
О, срце црно ко смрт! О, ти душо
У мрежи, што се борећ за слободу
Само још више заплићеш! Помоз' те,
Анђели добри! Покушајте бар.
Савијте се, крута колена; а срце
Са челичним жицама омекшај
као жиле каквог новорођенчета!
Све још може кренути на добро!"

(Шекспир, *Велике ѿраѣдије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић 2022:

81–82)

"Now might I do it pat, now he is praying;
 And now I'll do't. And so he goes to heaven;
 And so am I revenged. That would be scann'd:
 A villain kills my father; and for that,
 I, his sole son, do this same villain send
 To heaven.
 O, this is hire and salary, not revenge.
 He took my father grossly, full of bread;
 With all his crimes broad blown, as flush as May;
 And how his audit stands who knows save heaven?
 But in our circumstance and course of thought,
 'Tis heavy with him: and am I then revenged,
 To take him in the purging of his soul,
 When he is fit and season'd for his passage?
 No!
 Up, sword; and know thou a more horrid hent:
 When he is drunk asleep, or in his rage,
 Or in the incestuous pleasure of his bed;
 At gaming, swearing, or about some act
 That has no relish of salvation in't;
 Then trip him, that his heels may kick at heaven,
 And that his soul may be as damn'd and black
 As hell, whereto it goes. My mother stays:
 This physic but prolongs thy sickly days"⁵⁵²
 (3.3. 73–111)

⁵⁵² „На молитви је. Могао бих сад свршити; И сад ћу свршити са њим.
 Па онда, он у рај, а ја ћу бити освећен.
 – О томе треба размислити.
 Један ми зликовац оца убио,
 И зато зар, јединац син му ја
 Шаљем тог зликовца у рај!
 О, то би била плата, награда,
 А освета никад! Он уби оца мог
 Изненада, тешког од јела, са свима
 Гресима његовим силно набујалим,
 Једрог ко мај. И како с његовим
 Рачуном стоји, то зна само Бог!

Hamlet allowed Claudius to survive despite the fact that the usurper did not give King Hamlet a chance to survive or to confess to God before going to his death and thereby give his soul a chance to go to heaven. The prince of Denmark does not want to be the same as the forcibly imposed ruler. He does not kill Claudius in that scene, believing that by killing a man who is praying he would not be committing an act of revenge, unlike a situation in which he would kill him while he is doing something dishonorable, some sin. Although

“Claudius sets to his prayers, and he freely admits his guilt and unwillingness to relinquish his ill-gotten crown, ambition, and queen. His realization that true contrition is thus inaccessible to him is strangely moving. Suddenly Hamlet enters, often behind the kneeling king and, in some performances, with sword raised to achieve his revenge. Again the prince delays, this time saying that the deed now would be no revenge but would basically send the praying king to heaven “fit and seasoned for his passage.” Hamlet’s father was killed suddenly and now must purge his “crimes broad blown” in the afterlife; Hamlet will strike down Claudius when salvation is likewise far from his mind”⁵⁵³ (Bloom 2008: 13–14).

Ал’ по мислима и знању смртника.
Он тешко пати. Па зар сам освећен
Кад му узмем живот сад, кад чисти душу.
И кад је готов и спреман за пут?

Не.

Стој, мачу, буди страшнијег замаха!

Кад буде пијан, заспао, у гневу,

У родоскрвној сласти постеље.

У коцки, свађи, или ма коме чину

Што трун спасења у себи не чува –

Тад га обори; нек се петама

Копрца к небу, нек му душа буде

Проклета, црна као пакао

У који пође! – Моја мати чека –

Лек ти овај муке продужиће; нека!”

(Шекспир, *Велике џратегије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић 2022: 82–83)

⁵⁵³ „Клаудије у молитви отворено признаје своју кривицу и невољност да напусти незаконито стечену круну, амбицију и краљицу. Његово

He refuses to use the Machiavellian means used by the tyrant and criminal, the swindler and murderer, the possessor of his mother's body. He bears his human tragedy with dignity, mourning his good father. After the performance that confirmed the words of his father's Ghost, which he felt he had to check for fear that he had misunderstood them in a way that would best serve his vengeful interests, Hamlet no longer doubts that Claudius killed King Hamlet. He is certain of the crime. Despite this, he does not allow himself to be forced by this fact to respond to it with another crime and to react to murder with murder. He does not do this because his being is disgusted by it.

"Hamlet, a drama about Hamletism, is not a drama about a man incapable of action; Hamlet is filled with Hamlet's struggle to overcome his scruples, which mainly stem from the fact that the task undertaken coincides too much with his personal interest, with aspirations that he considers selfish and vicious [...]"⁵⁵⁴ (Klein 1964: 63).

He does not want to identify himself with the dishonorable representative of the political state ideological apparatus (Alhusser 2009:28) such as the Danish court as the heart of the Danish political system because he does not want to defile his soul and thereby condemn it to the eternal torments of hell. This is the essence of his humanity. He believes in scruples and therefore hesitates, therefore refrains.

признање да је истинско кајање за њега недостижно је неочекивано потресно. У том тренутку улази Хамлет, често постављен иза клечећег монарха и, у одређеним интерпретацијама, са подигнутим мачем, спреман да изврши своју освету. Још једном, принц оклева, тврдећи да садашње деловање не би представљало праву освету, већ би уместо тога омогућило краљу који се моли да оде на небо спреман" (Bloom 2008: 13–14).

⁵⁵⁴ „Hamlet, drama o hamletovštini, nije drama o čoveku nesposobnom za akciju; Hamlet je ispunjen Hamletovom borbom za savlađivanje skrupila, koje uglavnom potiču otuda što se preuzeti zadatak isuviše poklapa s njegovim ličnim interesom, s težnjama koje on smatra za sebične i poročne [...]" (Klajn 1964: 63).

Hamlet does not want to follow in Claudius's footsteps and be a Machiavellian criminal. He does not want to commit a crime, to kill, only for the sake of fulfilling his personal goal – revenge. He wants to know that this is not a crime, but an act of collective deliverance.

But even then Hamlet does not think about killing Claudius from the perspective of his own benefit, but from the collective one. He does not want it for his own interests, but because it is good for the state and the nation. Hamlet wants it now, but “[...] Hamlet seeks the removal of Claudius because he is a “wound on our body”, because the health, interests, needs of the common body demand it, not his personal safety or revenge”⁵⁵⁵ (Klein 1964: 66).

Hamlet does not take revenge on Claudius because it is his private need. He is too afraid of hell to do so. He does not decide on revenge until he is absolutely sure that there is an explanation for it, and thus a justification in the fact that the death of Claudius can bring the general good to the state, and that it is up to him to take revenge for this.

This is the key difference between Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. Hamlet thinks all the time as a legitimately elected king who cares about the well-being of his countrymen. He is turned towards the collective and the general in a healthy way worthy of a good ruler guided by the virtue of rectitude. Ahmed Nuruddin, on the other hand, is driven by personal hatred, a subjective feeling of hurt and insult before the power structures that have wronged him. Unlike Hamlet, he does not want justice, but revenge. Hamlet's motives are honorable and moral, Ahmed's motives spring from his vanity. The murder of his brother is not just a wound in the soul of a grieving man, but an unforgivable insult to a dervish, a sheikh of a tekke. Ahmed Nuruddin's transformation is a metamorphosis of a man who is initially turned towards the general with the intention of escaping from the personal that overtakes and devastates him.

⁵⁵⁵ „[...] Hamlet uklanjanje Klaudija traži zato što je on „čir na našem telu”, zato što to zahtevaju zdravlje, interesi, potrebe zajedničkog tela, ne njegova lična bezbednost ili osveta” (Klajn 1964: 66).

It ends with the execution of revenge by an offended individual in the name of his own grief. Therefore, in death he finds no reconciliation with himself or the world around him, but it becomes a tragic end. Unlike Hamlet, whose death brings a kind of gentleness due to reconciliation with himself and others because his act of revenge is an act aimed at the common good and the idea of preserving the state, preserving people. His revenge is not an act of personal antagonism, as is the revenge of Ahmed Nuruddin.

They start from different centers: at the very beginning, Ahmed Nuruddin is the Sheikh of the tekke, and, as such, a participant in power, whose actions he does not question until he himself is made unhappy by them. Ahmed decides to take revenge because he surrenders to hatred, which is a substitute for the many kinds of love he has been deprived of, and Hamlet decides to take revenge only when he is convinced that this act leads to the liberation of the state from a dishonorable, immoral and hypocritical usurper, a regicide and fratricide, and, what affects him most, his mother's husband, who cannot be compared to King Hamlet in virtue.

It must not stem from a vengeful ideology, but rather represents a counterbalance to such an ideology, which makes his inaction actually heroic. He refuses to use the same means used by Claudius, as well as his satellites such as Polonius, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. He is someone who believes in ideals and does not want to morally degrade his being. That is why he does not decide easily on the task given to him. It is mud that he is not used to, with which he does not want to get dirty, and, as we know, there is no way for the one who takes revenge not to get dirty in this morally and humanly impure process.

“According to ancient tradition, murder is the most complete and final revenge and is imposed as a human duty and an obligation of honor. [...] Claudius must be killed. Immediately afterwards, the values of another, Christian tradition are imposed on Hamlet, according to which what seems to be the most severe punishment can turn out to be the greatest reward. [...] The solution is clear, but the opposite of the first: Claudius

should not be killed". There is no clear outcome, revenge is postponed [...]”⁵⁵⁶ (Kostić 1982: 67–68).

According to Nikola Koljević's opinion, expressed in his book *Shakespeare, the Tragedian*, the figure of the avenger is characterized as the figure of an individual who is subject to the will of external circumstances. He lacks the ability to choose the parameters of his existence and can only move within those given in advance. Shakespeare's protagonist is fundamentally characterized by the urge to create a life that reflects his own values and is in harmony with his intricate spiritually based demands. Accordingly, Hamlet stands in sharp contrast not only to his criminal uncle, but also to the decaying state of Denmark. His opposition to revenge stems not only from his aversion to the externally imposed task of revenge, but from the very essence of his being, as he struggles with a situation in which he cannot dictate the form or meaning of his life. In a state of turmoil and rage, Hamlet swears revenge on the Ghost, promising to erase all the "records" from the "tablet of memory." However, it soon becomes apparent that Hamlet is unable to eliminate them. Although he tries to do so, these "records" instead become more and more pronounced. They drag him towards a path that is consistently opposed to revenge. Thus, in *Hamlet*, the vengeful role of "waiting" is transformed into a form of "ultimate resistance." Hamlet's waiting to organize a theatrical performance that will prove his uncle's guilt proves futile, as does his effort to simulate madness. Despite his intentions, he cannot effectively suppress his inner aversion to revenge. Every time he tries to do so, his essence, intertwined with his spirit and these "crazy writings," rebels against him. Even when he finds the King in prayer, the intricate "writings" in his mind distract him from the duty of revenge (Koljević 2012: 78)

⁵⁵⁶ „Po drevnoj tradiciji, ubistvo je najpotpunija i konačna osveta i nameće se kao ljudska dužnost i obaveza časti. [...] Klaudija treba ubiti. Odmah zatim Hamletu se nameću vrednosti druge, hrišćanske tradicije, po kojima se ono što izgleda kao najteža kazna može pokazati kao najveća nagrada. [...] Rešenje je jasno, ali suprotno od prvoga: Klaudija ne treba ubiti". Jasnog ishoda nema, osveta se odlaže [...]” (Kostić 1982: 67–68).

Hamlet is a thinker, who must think through and process everything that happens, which is both his character and his punishment. His greatest success as a human being is his willingness to act and his acceptance of the inevitability of action (*Ibid*: 27).

Shakespeare's Hamlet, deeply turned to thinking and devoted to the intellectual side of his personality, which is colored by constant reflection, struggles with doubt and even questions his own logic. Instead of basing his actions on some firm and unchanging principle, he draws both himself and the audience into intricate dilemmas that reflect the instability of a fundamental psychological principle (*Ibid*: 17).

The entire play is a tribute to Hamlet's instability. As an intellectually inclined man, he finds himself face to face with a moral challenge in which his intellect is of no help. The play *Hamlet* is the story of a man who is preparing to act. This preparation also involves directing a play-within-a-play to convince himself of the moral correctness of revenge. He is impressed by Fortinbras and promises to be just as enterprising. For Hamlet, intellect is a way to end instability. The feudal tradition imposes revenge (Kostić 1982: 67), and his being, the believer in it, abhors it because he does not want to break God's commandment and condemn himself to suffering in hell. The Christian tradition is based on the commandments of God, who is an external authority. They have an important impact on the consciousness of the two heroes, because both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin perceive religious principles as a crucial part of their inherent being. That is why Hamlet's monologues and Nuruddin's hiding in dogma are shocking. Their determination in fulfilling their moral duty to authority is exaggerated.

Hamlet accepts the imposed demands without thinking, he did so with the order of the Ghost, for whom he was not sure whether it was really the Ghost of old King Hamlet or the temptation of the Wicked. But his passionate acceptance of duty remains in words for a good part of the play.

The part of the above quote that mentions punishment and reward refers to the scene in which Claudius falsely prays for forgiveness

for the sins he has committed, but this repentance is not sincere, it is a deception. This scene best illustrates Hamlet's inner division. He spared Claudius' life not out of honorable reasons but out of a blood-thirsty need to ensure Claudius' soul eternal torment in hell, and that will not happen if he takes his life while he prays, while he is on his knees, his back turned to his potential murderer, helpless.

The scene in which Claudius prays for forgiveness of his sins is most often interpreted in light of "[...] Hamlet's attitude that killing Claudius at that moment would mean the salvation of his soul"⁵⁵⁷ (Ćosović 2020: 24). And this is what Hamlet wants to avoid at all costs, because his intention is for killing Claudius to be salvation, but rather his punishment for the sins he has committed and for the injustice, misfortune and evil he has inflicted on Hamlet, but, even more so, for saving the state from the hands of a decadent illegitimate ruler.

If he kills him, revenge will be carried out, but he wants Claudius to pay for his sins, and this will not happen unless he kills him while he is committing a sin, while he is indulging in shameful impulses, while he is caught in some unworthy act. If he kills him at that moment, his soul will certainly not go to hell, which is Hamlet's desire. This is an interesting moment to take a closer look at the character of the heir to the throne. Namely, with all the qualities that he undoubtedly has, let us recall, he is a university educated, a swordsman, undeniably academically well-versed, enlightened, a representative of the new time, but, at the same time, someone who wants for others what he himself fears: eternal otherworldly torments hiding behind God's commandments.

Hamlet wants a punishment for Claudius who committed a sin. And he wants it to be terrible. So it will be equal to the crime he committed. That is why Hamlet is feverishly afraid of committing a sin himself, which would mean listening to the Ghost. Whichever

⁵⁵⁷ „[...] Хамлетовог става да би убиство Клаудија у том тренутку значило спасење његове душе” (Ћосовић 2020: 24).

side he chooses, he will betray some values, be they Christian or feudal. That is why he is where he is safest – on the border, nowhere (Selimović 2018a: 90). “Behind the face of the Danish prince, one can glimpse a consciousness that is not individual but suprapersonal, a spiritual value that is not individual but general”⁵⁵⁸ (Kostić 1982: 62). This undeniably makes him similar to Ahmed Nuruddin.

His metamorphosis begins with the realization that deep within his being, hatred is born towards the holders of power, who have caused him pain, insulted him and injured him. It follows his perception of the world as an illusion in which he has lived until then. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin’s awareness of a world that exists apart from the one they believed in leads to their (un)masking. It shook their faith in reality because they realized that there was another, terrifying one, full of primordial moral evil embodied in political structures and Machiavellian heroes who strive to preserve their position at all costs, even if it is at the expense of the head of an innocent man.

Hamlet, after the murder of his father, who had innocently suffered at the hands of the Machiavellian ruler Claudius, decided to be passive. He will be overcome by a lethargic element (Nietzsche 2003: 39), an ascetic mood that denies will, as a result of which he will hesitate to take revenge, although he has sworn to hasten to meet it. (*Ibid.*)

“[...] Haste, haste me to know it, that I, with wings as swift
As meditation or the thoughts of love,
May sweep to my revenge”⁵⁵⁹ (I, 5, 29–31).

It seems that Ahmed Nuruddin, a new Ahmed Nuruddin, who has nothing in common with the previous one except his first and

⁵⁵⁸ Иза лика данског краљевића назире се свест која није индивидуална него надлична, духовна вредност која није појединачна него општа” (Kostić 1982: 62).

⁵⁵⁹ „[...] на крил’ма

Брзим ко мисо ил’ љубавне жеље”

(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 35).

last name, has set out towards revenge with such fervor. This new Ahmed Nuruddin is obsessed with hatred that forces him to ethical determination, to action, just as the demand of his father's Ghost forces Hamlet to do so after he tells him the truth about his own murder and thus becomes the instrument of Hamlet's acquisition of Dionysian insight (Milić 2000: 135). Gaining awareness of the monstrosity of life is the essential Nietzschean moment of this thesis because it marks the break of the subjects with their previous ideas about life and the world and with their former selves and raises the question of the moral (in)correctness of revenge.

Their internal division is the root of their ethical indeterminacy. The way to obtain evidence in these two scenes is the use of a mask. Hamlet wears the mask of madness, and Nuruddin the mask of a false friend. These masks are intended to conceal their true intentions, which is one of the functions of the mask according to Nietzsche.

It goes without saying that an action has consequences, but also that the act of said action calls into question the entire past, as well as the future, and in Hamlet's case, the afterlife, violating the ideals of the value system that they had been guided by up to that moment – Hamlet's medieval, Christian, and Nuruddin's dogmatic, depending on whether it was religion or politics in which he thought that personal consciousness was the only criterion. Such an attitude of his indicates not only his personal self-love based on vanity, but also his moral self-love as a dervish (Gluščević 2011: 2033).

Action, therefore, represents a danger to ideals that would unequivocally establish that these ideals are only an illusion, and that serving them is only a mask for personal cowardice that hides from reality under that mask. Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. Hamlet hesitates to take his own life because it is contrary to God. He talks about how he does not value his own life but lives it anyway. His apparent hesitation to raise his hand against Claudius, but he did not raise his hand against himself except as a fear of failing the Christian commandment of God, allows for the possibility that what Hamlet says is not (the whole) truth because his actions, inactions are not in accordance with his words.

For example, between the moment of the promise to the Spirit and the execution of his order, a lot of time has passed for him to act because action implies ethical determination, which supports Kostić's thesis that "[...] the avenger is untrustworthy and it takes him a lot of time to be convinced"⁵⁶⁰ (Kostić 1982: 65). Time also passes between the dervish's realization that his brother was first arrested, then killed, and his revenge. In the meantime, fractures, tectonic tremors occur in the inner being of the two protagonists, which is why the Hamlet and the Ahmed Nuruddin we meet at the beginning are not the same people as they are at the end of the work, but only look the same and bear the same name. But their beliefs change, and with the change in beliefs they change their behavior, which leads to a fatal, tragic ending. During the development of the plot, nothing in them remains the same and unchanged. In between these moments, Nuruddin tempts Mulla Yusuf, just as Hamlet tempts Claudius in order to obtain proof of each other's guilt, which would make their actions easier later.

He is a pest to Denmark that must be removed for the good of the state. Hamlet's revenge therefore carries a statesmanlike dimension, it is a gesture of a ruler who deserves the throne because he frees him from one who does not deserve it, a criminal and a Machiavellian.

Nuruddin's revenge carries a dimension of dehumanization of the individual, which is reflected in the failure of a man who has missed the meaning of life and who has turned into everything he rebelled against. Therefore, Hamlet's tragedy is not completely tragic, while Nuruddin's most certainly is. Hamlet's revenge is guided by a statesmanlike instinct:

"is't not perfect conscience,
To quit him with this arm? and is't not to be damn'd,
To let this canker [cancer] of our nature [i.e., human nature] come
In further evil?"⁵⁶¹
(5.2. 67–70).

⁵⁶⁰ „[...] je osvjetnik nepoverljiv i treba mu dosta vremena da se uveri” (Kostić 1982: 65).

⁵⁶¹ „И зар не бих био
Проклет када бих пустио тај чир

using the madness he simulates as a means of survival in Elsinore, which, due to the newly created situation, has become a hostile, threatening environment for him.

Viewed from a psychological perspective, or, in the language of literature, through psychological theories, these two works, the drama and the novel, which in this thesis is set as its counterpart on many levels, show the psychological states of the central characters, their passions, emotions and affects, their intensity and eclipses, and the way in which they mark the (in)action of one or the other protagonist. These inner forces, Hamlet's alleged madness and Nuruddin's very real hatred, are characterized by exaggeration, which we find in Hamlet's false madness and Nuruddin's real hatred. Hamlet's "madness" and Nuruddin's hatred are the templates for their actions. Behind that action (is) their (morally (un)justified) decision.

Hamlet is a victim. He has suffered injustice, his rights as a human being, heir to the throne, man, son have been violated. He has every right, moreover, his duty is to preserve his honor, to fulfill the task given to him by his father's spirit, to avenge him. The previously mentioned Tudor myth that is recognizable about this drama confirms this right. The tyrant who has seized the throne knows that Hamlet, as the one who should be the next legitimate ruler, has the support of the people. But Hamlet does not take revenge for a long time.

The reasons for his hesitation are one of the most intriguing intrigues not only of Shakespearean scholars around the world, but also of critics, professors of English literature, theorists and, of course, readers. Inactivity by nature, an emphasis on thought processes, giving priority to the intellect rather than the practical, active side of the personality that achieves goals, madness, melancholy, all these are possible causes of his passivity when it comes to revenge. This motif is very complex in the play because

На нашем телу да расте даљим злом?"
(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 127)

“[...] for both Shakespeare and Hamlet, revenge seems to be something more difficult and morally problematic than murder in self-defense. [...]. And revenge is not a matter of the moment and self-defense, but a decision that implies deliberateness and some determination behind which a person is able to stand. According to this, revenge is still “murder with premeditation”. And Hamlet cannot undertake precisely this “premeditation”. His numerous premeditations are a sign of his resistance to such “premeditation”⁵⁶² (Koljević 1981: 81).

He bears his human tragedy with dignity, mourning his good father with soul and the garb of sorrow. Hamlet surrenders to his feelings. That is why he is blocked by the sight of a man who feels the need for repentance and prayer. After the performance that confirmed the words of his father's ghost to him, and which he felt he had to check, fearing that he had not misunderstood them in a way that best served his guilt without guilt, Hamlet has no doubt that Claudius killed King Hamlet. He is certain of the crime.

Despite this, he does not allow himself to be forced by the crime of which there is no longer any doubt to respond to it with another crime and to react to the murder with murder.

“Shakespeare showed with his Hamlet the nobility of this restraint, in contrast to the vile activity, the reckless irresistibility of unscrupulous scoundrels [...]”⁵⁶³ (Klein 1964: 73).

He does not want to identify himself with a dishonorable representative of the political state ideological apparatus such as the Danish court because he does not want to defile his soul and thereby condemn

⁵⁶² „[...] и за Шекспира и за Хамлета освета је, чини се, и нешто теже и морално проблематичније од убиства у самоодбрани. [...]. А освета није ствар тренутка и самоодбране, већ одлука која подразумева снмишљеност и неко одређење иза којег је човек у стању да стане. По томе је освета ипак „убиство са предумишљајем”. А Хамлет не може управо тај „предумишљај” да подузме. Његови бројна предумишљања знак су његовог отпора таквом „предумишљају” (Кољевић 1981: 81).

⁵⁶³ „Шекспир је својим Хамлетом показао племенитост тог уздржавања, насупрот подлој активности, безобзирној неуздржљивости несавесних хуља [...]” (Klajn 1964: 73).

it to the eternal torments of hell. This is the essence of his humanity and the need to act justly.

After Hamlet's departure and Claudius's rise from his knees, it becomes obvious that Claudius has no mercy for Claudius. Accordingly, he will create the circumstances that Hamlet foresees. The unfolding drama has strengthened Hamlet's belief in his uncle's guilt. Moreover, it has revealed to Claudius that his guilt is no longer his private matter. If he is unable to repent, he must, in order to protect himself, eliminate Hamlet. He intends to achieve this by his characteristic methods, using the help of accomplices and using poison as a weapon, which is used by scoundrels.

On the other hand, Hamlet will confront Claudius in his own way: using his immense fearlessness, by revealing his intentions, rather than by using intrigue. He will catch his uncle at the moment when his injustice becomes obvious to the whole court, ensuring that when he is stabbed with the sword, he does not do so as a murderer, but in that scene and in that act his hand becomes the hand of justice (Gardner in: *The Scene* magazine 1967: 368)

11. NURUDDIN'S REVENGE

The motive of revenge in the novel *Death and the Dervish* is addressed by Marko Milošević in his book *From Fear to Rebellion (Od strepnje do pobune)*. In it, he also divides Ahmed Nuruddin's identity into two parts, one of which refers to him as a man devoted to serving God, and the other to a rebel.

“Until the rebellion, we will call Selimović's hero a dervish or a sheikh, after it, in the real novelistic time that runs from the March unrest caused by his brother's arrest to the freezing days of late autumn when the hero awaits execution, we will call him Ahmed [...]”⁵⁶⁴ (Milošević 2005: 217)

expresses the opinion that the development of Ahmed's rebellion took a lot of time, which is very reminiscent of Shakespeare's manner. When he judged himself superior to the malicious people in power, he started a rebellion to save Hadji-Sinanuddin, who was one of the most respected people in the town. He stood as a leader before the crowd whose eyes were burning with a sense of justice, hostility and revenge. His ardor ignited a popular uprising triggered by the distress of Hadji-Sinanuddin surrounded by law enforcement agencies and the significance of what he expected.

⁵⁶⁴ „Do rađanja pobune, Selimovićevog junaka ćemo zvati dervišem ili šejhom, nakon nje, u realnom romansijskom vremenu koje teče od martovskog nemira izazvanog bratovim hapšenjem do promrzlih poznojesenjih dana kada junak iščekuje pogubljenje, zvaćemo ga Ahmedom [...]” (Milošević 2005: 217)

Nuruddin's rebellion stems from deeply personal motives, representing a manifestation of personal dissatisfaction and frustration. He embodies a rebel burdened by the totality of his historical experiences. Nuruddin's rebellion serves only as a way of expressing his hurt within the existing social framework, against which he feels powerless to effect any change (Petrović 1981: 25).

It simply poured out of him like a drive for liberation; it was the murky sediment that reason and moderate Islamic principles had previously contained. This rebellion gave birth to a transformed Ahmed, who resembles the one who once crossed a river with a naked sword clenched in his teeth to confront the crooks. The rebel dervish is the new Ahmed, who has lost faith in the efficacy of divine words. The reformed dervish is the guardian of justice, who resolutely opposes the enemies of the faith. He opposes malice and defends the oppressed from "thugs and rascals" – the kadi and the mussels. He has rejected his role as a non-interfering servant of God and is no longer a mere spectator. He communicated with Mustafa, a high-ranking imperial official, in writing, sending him a letter in which he detailed the malicious nature of the authorities, with the intention that Mustafa, acting in accordance with the situation presented to him by the dervish in the letter, would release his father from prison (Milošević 2005: 240).

Alija Danić, the kadi's father-in-law, sided with the rebel Ahmed, understanding, like many honest citizens of the town, that the arrest of Hadji-Sinanuddin marked the beginning of the persecution of prominent figures, to sow fear among the people, which would aim to prevent new rebellious ventures modeled on those in Posavina and Krajina. For this old man, the act of rescuing Hadji-Sinanuddin represented not only the release of a good man with whom he had been friends, but also the calming of passions within himself among the town's townspeople. This was due to the identification of the oppressive nature of the government in the small town. He believed that this government consistently imposed hardships, forcing individuals to act against their will. It committed

injustices for the sake of its own survival, cultivating animosity, in his opinion (Milošević 2005: 240).

It should have been put an end to. The uprising of the townspeople that the dervish started is the most eloquent expression of the human in him. He experienced the horrified expressions on the faces of the enraged population, their fierce eyes filled with rage, as a common and personal celebration. The rebellion arose from scarcity and excessive prices, from fear, from significant and trivial violations of the principles of justice and fairness, from meaningless assurances of those in power and from years of hardship, from petty affections and deep hatreds, from uncertainty and degradation of individuals, and from the execution of the innocent. Everything was integrated into a life full of suffering (*Ibid.*).

The rebellion stirred Ahmed's inner turmoil, transforming his animosity into a fiery drive, marking a day marked by malicious actions – a somber day when Ahmed's resentment surpassed his personal experience, a day when divine judgment was pronounced and the people got involved. After the uprising, the protagonist experienced a profound emotional release: Musellim disappears, the kadi met his end in the courtroom, while Hadji-Sinanuddin escaped both imprisonment and death. Ahmed discovered the hidden writings that led to his brother's death. Yet he remained dissatisfied, showing no inclination to seek solace in the suffering of others. He did not feel triumphant when he found himself in front of Harun's grave. All his actions were merely contributions to the struggle of the town's population. Seen from an ethical perspective, his catharsis has the force of an indomitable force (*Ibid.*: 240–241). This revenge is “[...] the Sheikh's rebellion against the criminal power of the government that executed his innocent brother, the kadi's scribe, in order to conceal its way of survival in power” (*Ibid.*: 216). Nuruddin did not want their death, but:

“Their fear – that was what was beautiful. Not any reconciliation with their fall. Fear, uncertainty, a ray of hope, restlessness in their eyes. Or even better [...]: everything was over for them, but they did not know it,

they could not believe i and stood upright, arrogant and confident, as they had then, as they always had until then. I would not have liked to see them destroyed; my hatred waned whenever my thoughts, even involuntarily, without obeying me – went farther than I wanted. And for hatred as well as for love, one needs living people”⁵⁶⁵ (Selimović 2018a: 323–324).

In his imagination, he wants the political figures of Kasabali, the muslims, the muftis and, especially, kadies “[...] they did not yet feel lost or humbled”⁵⁶⁶ (Selimović 2018a: 323). However, their death, resulting from Nuruddin’s revenge, is: “[...] the hour of paying off the debt to the enemies”⁵⁶⁷ (Andrejević 1996: 63). Just as Hamlet tries to find meaning, Ahmed Nuruddin “[...] tries to find in revenge the dark but elementary reason for his life and his actions”⁵⁶⁸ (*Ibid* 1996: 64).

Nuruddin’s revenge begins with information he received from Osman beg, who spends the night in a dervish tekke. Osman-bey told the sheikh the news about the career advancement of Silahdar Mustafa, Hadji-Sinanuddin’s son. “Hadji-Sinanuddin’s son had been named the imperial silladar”⁵⁶⁹ (Selimović 2018a: 299). This information is a key piece of Nuruddin’s revenge puzzle:

“I did not know why I was so excited by that news. Before, I would not have cared. I might have been surprised or gladdened by his good luck. Maybe I would even have pitied him. But now it was almost like poison. Good for him, I thought, good for him. The time had come for him to

⁵⁶⁵ „страх њихов, то је оно што је лијепо. Не помиреност с падом. Страх, неизвјесност, трачак уздања, немир у очима. Или још боље [...]; све је за њих свршено, а они не знају, не вјерују, и стоје усправни, дрски, сигурни, као и онда, као и увијек до тада. Не волим да их видим уништене, мржња ми клоне кад моја мисао, и нехотице, не слушајући ме, оде даље него што желим. И мржњи, као и љубави, потребни су живи људи” (Селимовић 2004: 335).

⁵⁶⁶ „[...] нису још изгубљени ни понизни” (Селимовић 2004: 335).

⁵⁶⁷ “[...] час враћања дуга непријатељима” (Andrejević 1996: 63).

⁵⁶⁸ „[...] у освети покушава да нађе мрачни али елементарни разлог свог живота и својих поступака” (*Истио*: 64).

⁵⁶⁹ „царски силахдар, један од најмоћнијих људи у царевини” (Селимовић 2004: 308).

paz back enemies, and he certainly had them. And now they waited in fear for his hand, which had become as heavy as lead overnight, to fall on them, a hand pregnant with many deaths. It seemed impossible, like a dream, like an illusion, too nice. God, what inconceivable happiness – to be able to act”⁵⁷⁰ (Selimović 2018a: 299).

In this inner monologue, the dervish seems to be talking about himself from the past, when he was deaf and blind to the world around him, protected by the glass bell of the dervish solitude. He now thinks as a ruler about the newly acquired power that will be used against the enemy, and his enemies are the kadi, the musellim and the mufti. The hatred he speaks of is not only the one he assumes exists in the silahdar Mustafa, but the one that burns within himself.

It will force him to use Machiavellian means, to use people, Hadji-Sinanuddin, for whose arrest he will be responsible. by making his enemies, those responsible for the murder of his brother, also the enemies of Hadji-Sinanuddin’s son by using the old man with the intention of forcing the newly appointed silahdar to release his father in the hope that this will lead to the suffering of musellim and the kadi.

He will pass on information to the kadi through Mullah-Yusuf that will ensure that Hadji-Sinanuddin is arrested, and then he will use the kadi through insults to ensure that the kadi does not release Hadji-Sinanuddin. In this way, he will force Mustafa to react like a son to save his father and punish the kadi and the musellim, which is the goal of Nuruddin’s revenge. Along the way, he will lie to Ali-hodja that he asked the kadi to influence the kadi to release him.

The dervish will use the kadi’s former spy to act as a courier and bring the kadi false news about Hadji-Sinanuddin’s alleged guilt after he hears from Mullah-Yusuf, “[...] that some Posavina people

⁵⁷⁰ „Не знам зашто ме та вијест толико узбудила, раније би ми било свеједно, можда бих се зачудио, или обрадовао његовој срећи, можда бих га и пожалио. Сад ме готово отровала. Благо њему,мислио сам, благо њему. Дошао је час да плати својим непријатељима, а имао их је, сигурно. И они сад стрепе, чекајући да се на њих спусти његова рука што је преко ноћи постала тешка као олово, трудна многим смртима. [...]” (Селимовић 2004: 308).

escaped from the fortress last night”⁵⁷¹ (*Ibid*: 310). The dervish decided to use this in the name of revenge: “It’s begun, brother Harun. The long-awaited hour has come”⁵⁷² (Selimović 2018a: 304)

Ahmed Nuruddin is the one who takes the reins of fate into his own hands:

“Unlike Hamlet, in which divine providence is at work, the dervish will not only follow the course of his revenge, he will also direct it: “[...] I directed events and it seemed to me that I was above them”⁵⁷³ (*Ibid*: 316).

The Sheikh presents his personal unrest as a divine revelation:

“My darkness slowly dispersed, a thought emerged, vague, uncertain, distant, then closer, clearer, more definite, until it illuminated me like the morning sun. A thought? No! A divine revelation!”⁵⁷⁴ (*Ibid*: 310).

Nuruddin rebels against the injustice that, with his brother’s death, was hidden from him by the exponents of power: the kadi Aini-effendi, the musellim, and the mufti, because it is the kadi in whose name Mullah-Yusuf betrayed Harun and thereby metaphorically did what Ayni-effendi did physically – signed a death sentence in the form of an order for imprisonment in the fortress (*Ibid*: 26) which is the station before the fortress cemetery. It is the destination for the disobedient. For Harun. For the disobedient Nuruddin – Nuruddin avenger. He, like Hamlet,

“[...] protests against injustice. When he says that the world is like a garden full of unweeded weeds or that it is like a dungeon, Hamlet does not say it only to hurt himself, but also to express his pain in this way

⁵⁷¹ „[...] да су ноћас неки Посавци побегли из тврђаве” (*Исџо*: 310). Дервиш је одлучио да то искористи у име освете:

⁵⁷² „Почело је, брате, Харуне. Долази жуђени час” (*Исџо*: 314).

⁵⁷³ „[...] управљао сам догађајима и чинило ми се да сам изнад њих” (*Исџо*: 316).

⁵⁷⁴ „Мој мрак се полако разилазио, помањала се једна мисао, нејасна, несигурна, далека, па све ближа, јаснија, одређенија, док ме није обасјала као јутарње сунце. Мисао? Не! Божје откровење!” (*Исџо*: 310).

and that all of this is so. Hamlet's harakiri is a kind of rebellion against an unjust reality, a rebellion, admittedly wrong and inadequate, but still a rebellion"⁵⁷⁵ (Milošević in: Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, 1966: 8),

what is Nuruddin's revengeful rebellion. The one who will start Nuruddin's revenge is Mullah-Yusuf, Nuruddin's (and Harun's) enemy, a boy whom the dervish met in the war, with whom he talked about the golden bird, to whom he became attached and whom he wanted to protect from the horrors of war. After losing his mother in the turmoil of war, the boy was left an orphan. Then, at Nuruddin's invitation, he came to the tekke. He let Mullah-Yusuf decide how the dervishes would behave when it came to the fugitive because he did not want to make the decision himself.

He was the instrument through which Ahmed Nuruddin launched his revenge, believing that he was taking revenge in the name of Allah and that, therefore, his revenge was an expression of the anger of a righteous man who had been wronged. He wanted to settle scores. As he himself says: "And I did not want anything to happen without me. I had to get even"⁵⁷⁶ (Selimović 2018a: 325). Here we see a turn from a man who until then did not want to deal with matters that did not concern him to changing his attitude when a major event occurred in his life. His plan was to falsely accuse the an innocent man, Hadji Sinanuddin, through Mullah-Yusuf.

"I had sent one of them to his doom, and now they would try to save him, unaware that they were working for me"⁵⁷⁷ (*Ibid*: 311–312).

⁵⁷⁵ „[...] protestuje protiv nepravde. Kad kaže da svet liči na vrt pun neoplevljenog korova ili da liči na tamnicu, Hamlet to ne kaže samo da bi sebe povredio, nego i da bi na taj način izrazio svoj bol i što je sve to tako. Hamletov harakiri je jedna vrsta pobune protiv nepravedne stvarnosti, pobune doduše pogrešne i neadekvatne, ali ipak pobune" (Milošević u: Šekspir, *Hamlet* 1966: 8),

⁵⁷⁶ „[...] не бих желио да се ишта деси мимо мене. Морам да намирим своје рачуне" (Селимовић 2004: 337).

⁵⁷⁷ „Пустио сам низ воду њихова човјека, и они ће га вадити, не знајући да раде за мене. И за правду, јер сам на божјој страни па нека буду и они, нехотице" (*Исџо*: 322).

In a conversation with Ali-aga, Nuruddin states that this is not his revenge against the authorities, but his advocacy for God's justice:

“If we did not defend justice, there would not be any justice. I did not want to rise up against the authorities, but I would be struck by God's punishment if I failed to speak out against the enemies of our faith, and they were anyone who undermined its foundation” (*Ibid*: 312).

But Nuruddin hopes that the kadi will believe Mullah-Yusuf and that he will arrest the goldsmith, which is why the high-ranking goldsmith's son will deal cruelly with the kadi and thus, without even knowing it, work in favor of Nuruddin's revenge. Nuruddin wanted to send a letter, “We should send a letter to Constantinople, to Hadji-Sinanuddin's son, Mustafa, telling him to do everything he can to save his father”⁵⁷⁸ (*Ibid*).

Dervish resorted to the same means used by the authorities when they imprisoned and killed Harun and the unfortunate man whose documents about the non-existent trial he came across, which is why he had to be liquidated. Nuruddin put a man who was not guilty of anything in danger by instructing Mullah-Yusuf to whisper false information to the kadi that Hadji-Sinanuddin was the one who had a share in the escape of the Posavina people from the darkness of the fortress where people were imprisoned, and some were killed for no reason and thrown among piles of other people's bones.

It was known in the town that the goldsmith was weak in the troubles of prisoners, so this information seemed credible and did not arouse any doubt or suspicion. Counting on the earlier “co-

⁵⁷⁸ „Ако не заштитимо правду, правде неће бити. Не устајем против власти, али би ме стигла казна божја кад не бих проговорио против неоријатеља вјере, а то је свако ко јој руши темеље” (*Истио*: 322).

Али Нурудин се нада се да ће кадија поверовати Мула Јусуфу и да ће ухапсити златара, због чега ће се са кадијом сурово обрачунати високо позиционирани златарев син и тиме, ни не знајући, радити у корист Нурудинове освете. Нурудин жили да пошаље писмо

„Треба послати писмо у Цариград, Мустафи, сину хади-Синаудина, нека спасава оца како зна” (*Истио*: 322).

operation” of Mullah-Yusuf and Aini-effendi, the Kasabali judge, Nuruddin arranged for Hadji-Sinanuddin to be taken to the fortress as compensation (*Ibid*: 325) for Harun’s being taken to the fortress and, ultimately, for his own being taken there. What he also wanted to make up for (*Ibid.*). Nuruddin the avenger was that in his and Harun’s cases, no one rebelled.

Nuruddin’s revenge also involves Machiavellian hypocrisy, for it was he who blocked the path of the sejmen as they led Hadji-Sinanuddin to the fortress, ostensibly standing up for an honest man who could not be guilty of what he was accused of, apostrophizing his social reputation and importance. The last part of his plan involved sending a letter to Hadji-Sinanuddin’s son via the Tatars and watching as the force of his influence would aid Nuruddin’s revenge through his reckoning with those who had wronged Ahmed Nuruddin.

By organizing a plot and a trap for Hadji-Sinanuddin, the dervish counted on the collective fear of the town, on the identification of the people with the unfortunate because they themselves could find themselves in his place, on the connection between the individual and the community in the face of a misfortune that had befallen one of them, and which could befall any of them, all of them. He managed their instinct for self-preservation by contrasting it with his (non)belonging to the Order as a collectivity and his rejection of individuals when misfortune befalls him. Nuruddin places himself and the townspeople, including Hadji-Sinanuddin, in a dichotomy of the self: they clearly exclude themselves from the collectivity and the collective, considering themselves superior to them.

At that moment, the power to control other people’s destinies is in his hands. People are just puppets on a string that he pulls, tightens, and releases as needed, closely monitoring every move, his own and others’.

“Nuruddin rebels only after realizing that power is possible in the world (the son of a minor goldsmith, Yusuf Sinanuddin, became a

powerful court dignitary in Constantinople), and that means that he is also possible as a powerful person”⁵⁷⁹ (Kordić 1975: 174).

As at the beginning of the novel, he believes that an individual’s misfortune can be justified if it contributes to a higher goal. But what he does not care about are the instruments with which he achieves it. These are Machiavellian devices such as hypocrisy, lies, intrigue, organizing a trap by informing on a man who was unfortunate enough to fall into it by feeding the lie to a spy and traitor, who was himself an informant of the rulers.

Nuruddin thinks that his Machiavellian action is an act of fighting for the principle of justice:

“I would have to do all kinds of other things that are not pretty, for a deed that was. Maybe I would be forced to do things that I would have been ashamed of in an uneventful life, for justice, which is more important than all of our petty sins.”⁵⁸⁰ (Selimović 2018a: 316).

His “petty sin” is hypocrisy, which colors the scene with the sejmjen who are taking Hadji-Sinanuddin to prison. The situation in which the goldsmith finds himself is a consequence of Nuruddin’s lie:

“I’m sheikh Ahmed Nuruddin, a slave of God and a friend of this good man whom you’re taking away. Where are you taking him away? I ask in the name of the friendship that binds me to him; I ask in his name, since he can’t defend himself now. If any wrong has been spoken about him, it’s a lie. We’re all his guarantors we’re all witnesses that he’s the most honorable man in the kasaba. If you imprison him, who should remain free?”⁵⁸¹ (Selimović 2018a: 308)

⁵⁷⁹ „Нурудин се буни тек после спознаје да је у свету моћ могућа (син незнатног златара Јусуфа Синанудина у Цариграду је постао моћни дворски великодостојник), а то значи да је могућ и он као моћник” (Кордић, 1975: 174).

⁵⁸⁰ „Можда ћу бити натјеран на дјела којих би се стидио у једном празном животу, због правде која је важнија од свих ситних грехова” (Селимовић 2004: 327).

⁵⁸¹ „Ја сам шејх Ахмед Нурудин, божји роб и пријатељ тог доброг човјека што га водите. Куда га водите? Питам у име ових људи који га

Ahmed Nuruddin refers to his friendship with him, to Hadji-Sinanuddin's impeccable reputation in the town, to the noble qualities that he consciously endangered by his denunciation. Although Hadji-Sinanuddin did not end tragically, Nuruddin consciously used him in order to force his son to, in the fight for his father, deal with the town's political leaders in Nuruddin's name. This scene shows his Machiavellianism, his use of people for the purpose of fulfilling his personal agenda, in order to carry out his revenge. He has hatched a plan and is now working it out. Hence the imagination. He explained this situation to Ali-aga as follows:

"The occasion for this was the unpaid war tax. Knocking out their teeth was supposed to inspire fear, after the rebellions in the Posavina and Krayna, so that their misdeeds would not serve as an example to anyone. And that was how it should be. And for this very reason, to avoid a greater disturbance, to avoid something that no reasonable man would desire, those who spread discord and discontent should be removed, those who practice oppression, under the guise of law, and whose misbehavior might lead others to shameful and bloody deeds. If Hadji-Sinanuddin's misfortune would help God to remove them from our midst, even that misfortune would not be in vain, and either would our worries"⁵⁸² (Selimović 2018a: 320–321).

познају, питам у име пријатељства које ме веже за њега, питам у његово име јер он сад не може да се брани. Ако је ишта рђаво речено о њему, лаж је. Сви смо му јамци, и сви смо свједоци да је то најчеститији човјек у касабџи. Ако њега затворите, ко треба да остане на слободи!" (Селимовић 2004: 318).

⁵⁸² „[...] почетак хајке на угледне људе, због све чешћег одбијања да се покоре царским и валијским наредбама, а повод је неплаћена ратна помоћ. То подбијање зуба треба да посије страх, послѣје побуне у Посавини и Крајини, да зло дјело не буде овдје пример никоме. Као што и не треба да буде. И баш зато, да не би било веће пометње, да се не деси што нико паметан не би желио, треба уклонити све оне који стварају смутњу и незадовољство, који врше зулум, тобоже под видом закона, и који би својим рђавим поступцима могли натјерати људе на ружна и крвава дјела. Ако хаџи-Синанудинова несрећа помогне да их Бог одстрани од нас, неће бити узалудна ни та несрећа ни наше бриге" (Селимовић 2004: 332).

The same “petty sin” of hypocrisy will be repeated. The circle closes with a return to one of the scenes from the first part of the novel, in which the dervish goes to the musellim to ask about the reasons for his brother’s imprisonment. In this scene, he goes to the musellim hoping that they will accept him, unlike the last time, when he wanted to not accept him. He still insists on his dervish calling. This time too, he goes to the musellim because of an “alleged sin” (*Ibid*: 332), as was Harun’s.

If originally a man in trouble came to the Musel with difficulty in the form of a dervish, now only the dervish comes to him. He behaves like a cog in the wheel of power. He seems to almost cooperate with it, fulfilling his dervish duty. In the meantime, during which nothing happens except the dervish waiting for his plan to take effect, because, unlike in *Hamlet*, in *Death and the Dervish*, “[...] the wish for revenge hastens decisions”⁵⁸³ (Selimović 2018a: 305), he reproaches himself and thinks about the options he had before he shot the arrow (*Ibid*: 314):

Nuruddin insists that the main reason for his actions is the protection of justice in the name of faith:

Dervish wants the imperial commander to carry out his revengeful plan. It has sprouted in his being, he did not want to not interfere, to give up, but to settle. Moreover, he adds that he is guilty of what will happen and to accept the blame: “I wanted it to happen, and agreed to accept my share of the blame before God”⁵⁸⁴ (*Ibid*: 349). This Nuruddin position is identical to Hamlet’s opinion about the guilt he has in connection with Polonius’ murder:

I will bestow him and will answer well

The death I gave him; so again, good night. I must be cruel only to be kind.

Thus bad begins, and worse remains behind”⁵⁸⁵ (3, 4, 177–179)

⁵⁸³ „[...] жеља за одмаздом убрзава одлуке” (Селимовић 2004: 315).

⁵⁸⁴ „Желио сам да се деси, и пристајао да пред Богом примим свој дио кривице” (Исто: 349).

⁵⁸⁵ „Сахранићу га лепо и за смрт
Његову ја ћу одговарати.

Above, in the case of both, the protagonist is the death that awaits them. "Revenge is Nuruddin's plot, the product of which are the deaths of both the musellim and the kadi"⁵⁸⁶ (Terzić 2023b: 6). When he decided to take revenge in the name of a higher ideal, he rejoiced, saying to himself:

"I was horrified that darkness and mystery were behind everything I could not see, a mystery that would be revealed to me. (...) because I had been chosen to carry out a will stronger than my own"⁵⁸⁷ (Selimović 2018: 281). This makes him similar to Hamlet because "Hamlet is more of an instrument than an actor throughout the drama"⁵⁸⁸ (Koljević in: *The Scene* 1967: 363).

In contrast, the trap for Hadji-Sinanuddin is also a Mousetrap, a trap in which the goldsmith, the father of a powerful son, is literally, physically, caught so that the dervish can use it as the main motive of his performance in front of the seymen. He pretends to be shaken by the arrest of Hadji-Sinanuddin so that the rest of his revenge can proceed smoothly. He wears the mask of a concerned friend, and he himself is responsible for the arrest of an innocent man in general.

He has become a Machiavellian, equal to those who arrested his brother, and Is-haq. In terms of responsibility for the death of the kadi and the muslim, he is equal to Claudius, despite the fact that they are not innocent. He directly concealed the death of another man, and

Тако. И опет: лаку ноћ! Ја морам
Да будем свиреп да бих добар био.
Зло је почело, а горе још чека"

(Шекспир, *Велике трагедије*, прев. Симић и Пандуровић, 2022: 89).

⁵⁸⁶ „Освета је Нурудинова сплетка чији производ су смрти и муселима и кадије” (Терзић 2023b: 6) .

⁵⁸⁷ „Било је страве у том осјећању мрака и тајне иза свега што не видим, тајне што ће се мени открити, али и тихог ликовања што ће се десити оно што чекам, што сам ја изабран да будем извршилац воље јаче од моје” (Селимовић 2004: 290).

⁵⁸⁸ То га чини налик Хамлету јер “Hamlet je tokom cele drame više instrument nego vršilac radnje” (Koljević у: *Scena* 1967: 363).

not one, but two. Ahmed Nuruddin is equal to those against whom he fought in the name of justice, faith and biological ties. This is his downfall.

While there is no ray of light in Nuruddin's downfall, there is in Hamlet's. Ahmed's death is meaningless. There is sublimity in Hamlet's. He has fulfilled his duty. And he did it not for his own good, for the sake of giving vent to his grief to his grieving son, but for the good of Denmark. Hamlet thereby proved himself worthy of the unjustly taken throne. His anger towards his mother and Claudius was justified. Hamlet stops the decadence and secures a new beginning and a good king for his state.

Ahmed dies morally equal to those against whose moral inadequacy he rebelled. Ahmed was born a slave, since he belongs to a low social class, the poor. He lived as a slave of faith, fighting and submitting to the letter of the Koran, living in accordance with its principles, respecting the "Islamist dogma"⁵⁸⁹ (Petrović 1981: 42) to the limits of fanaticism, then turned against it. As a kadi, he betrayed the only light he had gained in life, the light of love and loyalty to another man, whom he betrayed. Ahmed called Judas. Dominated by the Dionysian principle of destructive hatred, he dies as a slave to Dionysus who was born in his grief, strengthened in his anger, and exploded in his hatred. Hatred is Ahmed's excess. Thus the (anti)mask is discarded.

The difference from Hamlet is that Nuruddin does not act out hatred. For him, hatred annuls the border, and thus the Apollonian mask falls from his face. He is divided not only between his original and socially constructed identity, but also between his former self, the previous version of himself, and his current self. Moreover, somewhere between these two versions of his personality is his personality as a judge, which is also a socially constructed identity, because it is a public function.

So, there is Ahmed as an original being, a member of a lower social class, the son and grieving brother of the innocently murdered Harun, then Ahmed, the dervish, then Ahmed the judge, and finally

⁵⁸⁹ „Islamistička dogma” (Petrović 1981: 42).

Ahmed, the avenger. Not counting Ahmed the drowned man. In the first part of the novel, Ahmed Nuruddin is dominated by the Apollonian principle in the form of dervishism, which limits his actions.

From a personal tragedy, the narrative flow shifts towards a political conflict motivated by the emotion of losing a family member, and it is the trigger for the transformation of the main character. "Hamlet's feelings range between self-pity and despondency, and terrible hatred and anger towards those who have brought confusion to his world" (Marić 2015: 38), just as Harun's murder shook the foundations of Nuruddin's sand-built house (Milošević 1978: 175), awakening hatred in him.

Hamlet comes to know another world and becomes aware of its existence. "Due to contact with the other world and deeper reality, Hamlet experiences a feeling of horror, chaos and dizziness over the abyss of the mysterious, metaphysical foundation of human being, and he desperately tries to get hold of some certain foundation of existence" (Marić 2015: 74). For Ahmed Nuruddin, that foundation is hatred.

Nuruddin feels firsthand the injustice behind the political exponents in the novel, presented through the characters of the mussels, then the mufti and, finally, the kadi, whom he will replace in the position of decision-maker. The rulers who are besieging and dressing the kasaba are Machiavellian because they consciously and intentionally, in the name of their own interests, like Claudius in Hamlet, sacrificed an innocent man, Nuruddin's brother, which he does not perceive (only) as an injustice, but as an injustice done to him personally, Nuruddin, the sheikh of the Mevlevi tekke, but also to Ahmed, his son and brother, whose loss is not only the loss of a dervish, but also of a man.

This is the moment in the novel when the transcendental descends to the level of the empirical in the experience of Ahmed Nuruddin. Death as a concept and the experience of death as a phenomenon from the perspective of Islam becomes the personal pain of no longer an ideologist but a man who feels the need to take revenge, and he does so by using the same Machiavellian means, dishonest

instruments such as intrigue and securing his own social status for the sake of fulfilling his goal.

In this way, Ahmed Nuruddin in the final stages of his transformation, when he becomes a judge, a ruler and a maker of political decisions that will have fatal consequences not only for his own life, but also for the lives of other people, he becomes the same as those who killed Harun. His brother's murder is the beginning of his transformation. Before that, however, at the beginning of the novel,

“For the sake of the security of his order, Nuruddin will do almost nothing serious to save his brother, because that rescue would call for rebellion, a rupture of the order of morality, because it would return him to himself, to the essential obligation to think about himself in the realm of morality, order. This escape from responsibility into the mechanics of the absurd as into responsibility for the higher justice of the world is an escape from himself, from the choice of desire that is apparently denied by the philosophy of the absurd” (Kordić 1975: 165).

Furthermore, just as Hamlet would not have had any reason to rebel without his uncle's crime, “without that death Nuruddin would have had no reason to rebel” (*Ibid*: 170). Having it, the personally injured dervish moves towards the third stage of his metamorphosis: at the beginning, Ahmed Nuruddin is a subject, a bearer of a title, a social identity, a bearer of a public function, an exponent of spiritual authority, a dervish, a sheikh of a tekke and a dogma, consciously ethically neutral, an ascetic who did not bury his dead, but his living. The one who broke the bridge between himself and his blood. A fugitive. From himself. And from others. Trust in universal categories is what separates Ahmed Nuruddin from the Machiavellian heroes of this novel until the moment when he himself becomes one of them.

“Surprisingly, I grew accustomed to my new position quickly, as if a long-awaited dream of mine had come true. Maybe this was the golden bird from fairy tales. Maybe somewhere within me I had secretly been for such an act of confidence for a long time, forever. That I had not allowed this vague ambition to manifest itself was because I had cer-

tainly feared disappointment if it did not come true, and suppressed it in a dark and hidden place in my soul, as i did with all other dangerous desires” (Selimović 2018a: 344).

The price of his moral decline is the betrayal of human goodness as an archetypal motif metaphorically represented in the character of Hasan. Nuruddin’s betrayal is not only the betrayal of an individual man, it is not even the betrayal of a best friend, but it is the betrayal of a principle. At the beginning of the novel, Ahmed Nuruddin beats his chest in front of Hasan, insisting that he is fighting to preserve the principle. Nuruddin betrayed the Good. And he also betrayed the individual, the one he did not care about as a dervish even when that individual was Harun. The dervish stood up for the individual only when the latter was no longer alive, and even then, it seems, he stood up more for himself, and himself as a dervish whom he disguised as fraternal pain.

“Paradoxically, one could say that Ahmed is free when he is outside the system. When he rebels, he becomes part of the system to which he wants to offer an alternative order. To make the paradox even greater, it is established that it is more or less the same order. When he is proclaimed kadi, Ahmed discovers that he has always wanted power as confirmation of who he is. – Maybe it is the golden bird from children’s stories – he speculates. – Maybe I have been secretly waiting for this kind of trust for a long time, forever? His Hamletian contemplativeness is replaced by a sense of self-righteousness. Our dervish becomes a little Robespierre. The rebellion is forgotten” (Pištalo in: Palavestra (ed.) 2010: 166)

In the case of Nuruddin, this multiplicity is embodied in his internal division between the original self and the mask, between being and calling, title, function, just as in Hamlet, between content and form. This space is, according to Nietzsche, the space of illusion, lies, illusion, deception, delusion, mask.

There is a clash of two mutually opposed polarities, the existence of which Nuruddin was not aware until he has “[...] truly seen the

essence of things [...]” (Nietzsche 2003: 39). No longer able to take an ethically neutral position, the dervish was forced to recognize that the path of serving the faith is not the only path he walks, but that there is also another, supported by blood and accompanied by the call of the biological imperative (Ivanov 2017: 384).

“The act of revenge of one and the other main character marks the end of the oscillation of the internal pendulum in the being of the two protagonists” (Terzić 2023b: 7).

This means that they nevertheless opt for one of the two choices that until then were the options faced by both Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. This resonates with Nietzsche’s reduction of man from a multitude to a single one. Nietzsche, as Đurić writes,

“[...] only seemingly broke with the logic of identity when he dissolved the subject into a multitude of subjects, because each multitude consists of new subjects, each of which constitutes a unity of a lower order for itself. Instead of completely abandoning the inherited notion of the subject (in the sense of substance), Nietzsche ultimately succumbed to its demands: he found unity at the bottom of every multiplicity, understood the broken parts of the subject as new independent wholes” (Đurić 1997: 107).

Finally, in the revenge carried out by Ahmed Nuruddin, his tragic nature is seen. It did not bring him personal satisfaction. But, by the comparison of its execution, his constant existence on the border of two opposing identities ceased. The Nietzsche’s multiplicity did indeed melt into one. Nuruddin decided to take revenge, taking upon himself the consequences of such an act,

12. CONCLUSION

This monograph is conceived as an interdisciplinary research in which literary theory, literary criticism, (which is an area of literary studies), philosophy, Nietzsche's philosophy and theology, political practice are intertwined, analyzed through the deconstruction of the mechanism of the influence of ideology on the subject – Nietzsche's division and Althusser's: internalization of the voice of authority, the voice of another that speaks from the individual and the phenomenon of dogmatism as a form of individual subordination to authority, whether state, through the demands imposed by political systems and/or state orders, or religious – through those imposed by the dogmatism of Christianity or Islam (the spirit of two religions that is present in the writings).

The research was conducted through the analysis of William Shakespeare's play *Hamlet* and the novel *Death and the Dervish* of Meša Selimović against the background of Nietzsche's *Revaluation of All Values*.

This idea is elaborated by Slobodan Grubačić in his book *The Lighthouse of Alexandria: Interpretations of Literature from the Alexandrian School to Postmodernity*⁵⁹⁰, implying that: "[...] hermeneutics, during its development, has differently set the basic goals that it

⁵⁹⁰ Grubačić, Slobodan, *Aleksandrijski svetionik: tumačenja književnosti od aleksandrijske škole do postmoderne*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zoran Stojanović, Novi Sad : Sremski Karlovci, 2012.

needs to fulfill – to reconcile the extremes that unilaterally favor the Text, the Author or the Context, that is, to limit itself to an isolated interpretation of the text, to an exclusive understanding of its author, or to a completely separate understanding of the entire historical environment in which the text is created. The reversal would not lead to the annulment of these three dimensions, but to their sublimation [...]” (Grubačić 2012: 311).

I wanted to analyze these two works on three levels:

1. The common motif is the boundary situation which is the moment of acquiring tragic knowledge, “[...] a Dionysian moment of sobering up – a moment of insight into horror and meaninglessness [...]” (Milić 2000: 135). “Nietzsche’s tendency to analyze boundary situations will set in motion [...] an entire column of those who are searching for the literary fixation of a special moment in life [...]” (Grubačić 2012: 134). It can be “the life of the author or the hero, it doesn’t matter [...]. Dualism: the duality of the plan, the voices of the hero and the narrator, consciousness and subconsciousness [...]” (*Ibid.*). There they find human nature, possibly already complex, formed from equal parts of instinct and culture” (*Ibid.*). They reveal [...] duality – both in the structure of the work and in the soul of the author” (*Ibid.*).

The basic idea of my thesis is to show the duality, division, and divisiveness of the two protagonists, referring to Nietzsche. He ” [...] with a psychological perspective [...] cut and nuanced the individual and [...] declared the Self a “plural phenomenon” [...]. He opened the door wide to understanding the inner world of man, to subtle analyses of the vulnerable tragic core in human destiny” (*Ibid.*: 337).

2. Historical context – involves the analysis of the social – political – ideological level through the prism of New Historicism, one of the main directions of research of which is the relationship between the state and the individual in terms of shaping the identity of the individual through state ideological apparatuses – institutions. The idea of the state that the supporters of New Historicism opted for originates from Michel Foucault, for whom it is the one that has

absolute control. He sees the state as a center of power that controls society through institutions that are subordinate to and loyal to it and that exercise control over the individual in the name of the state. The state, its authorities that are generators of power are embodied in the figure of the monarch, the church as a powerful controlling institution and its rules, representatives of the highest classes of society, as well as the masculine category that is based on the category of masculinity as a natural prerogative.

3. Universal level – since both works raise universal questions about human (im)morality, about the value of an individual's life, about the value of life, about whose decision it is, who has or does not have the right to take another's life and in the name of what, about human (im)morality, about the individual as part of society, about the phenomenon of identity and (not) have the freedom to shape it.

By comparing the two literary works mentioned above, I wanted to show that ideologies, dogmas, doctrines, doctrinal systems, dominant worldviews – the 'Tudor myth' (Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: 67) and the inseparability of religious and political power in *Death and the Dervish* operate identically despite different times, social systems and political systems, and that the denial of the right to personal autonomy and one's own Self (intimate, private, authentic being) leads to the need for subversion. In terms of the analyzed pieces of writing, this gives rise to the protagonist's need for rebellion and revenge.

My idea was to show the protagonist's inner split, "multiplicity of consciousness and will" according to Nietzsche, through the conflict of empiricism and transcendence within one man, his name was Hamlet or Ahmed Nuruddin. From dogma – members of the system, they found themselves in the situation of a grieving man. It is a conflict between the officialdom of the profession, which implies loyalty to the system and doctrine, and the principle of humanity, which is in the dialogical relation with the aforementioned.

When it comes to Shakespeare and Selimović, the basic stamp of the play *Hamlet* was given by the Tudor myth, best explained through the so-called. Elizabethan picture of the world (monarchist state

structure: ruler equals God, the inviolable right of primogeniture is threatened, everything is a consequence of God's will, whether it is God's punishment or reward, Christianity as the ideological framework of the community). Hence, New Historicism imposed itself as the most expedient prism through which the interpretation of these two works was carried out. It encompassed their multi-layeredness.

New Historicism brought a new way of reading and analyzing literary works. Instead of the previous exclusive limitation to the text, New Historians expand the interpretive framework by interpreting it through interaction with other sciences and disciplines, thus loading into literary works what is not explicitly explained in them, but is implicitly present. This can be seen in the political-cultural-historical subtext of the play *Hamlet*, but also in the ideological subtext of the novel *Death and the Dervish*. In it, dogma is a supra-literary phenomenon. New Historicism imprints extra-literary factors into the meaningful and thematic-motivic threads of works of art, thereby expanding their hermeneutic scope.

Delicate relations within a society are the focus of both analyzed works, with special reference to the hierarchy and binary opposition of the powerful: the subordinate. Politics, power (or lack thereof) social prestige, class position, rigidity of authority, order, history, justice and injustice, domination and subversion, personal and general, individual and collective, internal and external, truth and illusion, illusion and reality, all of this intertwines within *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*. At the same time, these are the starting points for comparative analysis and the observation of intertextual connections in these two works, in the analysis of which, wherever it starts, and through whatever lens it is conducted, it must at least touch on crime and revenge as the supporting pillars of the play and the novel.

Biographical details are the cornerstone of many analyses of these two works, and are therefore important for ours as well. Although overcome, interpretation through a biographical lens resonates with to the play and the novel because it explains the dominant motif of

the loss of a family member, which contributes to the persuasiveness of its literary design and credibility that causes a strong and striking impression on readers.

The great topic of acting, theatricality, display, (in)sincerity, pretense in works, deconstruction of acting, its essence, form and function, the way it is used to fulfill goals, psychological traps that both the guilty (Claudius) and the innocent (Hadji-Sinanuddin) one fall into, Elsinore and the tekke as heterotopies of the acting scene because it is present by actors wearing masks, as are Claudius, Polonius, Hamlet, the actors, but also Mullah-Yusuf, and, finally, Ahmed Nuruddin.

Revealing and hiding is a game that largely determines the dynamics of relationships in the two analyzed works. Spying, watching every step, movement, action, and non-action, facial expressions, words spoken and/or written, the constant threat of impending danger due to some (non)deed committed, half-heartedness and playing roles all of which found their place in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*.

Male-female relationships are also present, which end unhappily in both works. This type of relationship dominates both texts through pairs: King Hamlet and Gertrude, the king is killed, she remarries his murderer, then Gertrude and Claudius, both die at the end of the play, as do Hamlet and Ophelia, then the dervish and his girlfriend before the war, who are not reunited, then the touching scene of the kadi's wife over the dead body of her husband, the mistaken assumption of Mullah-Yusuf's infatuation with her, and Nuruddin's lukewarm attitude towards her, her beauty, and, especially, her rich and influential primary family, Hassan and the married Meyra, his adulterous maid, Hecuba, the wife of the murdered King Priam, and the unknown reason for Laertes' departure to Paris. It can be speculated that the reason is feminine. Finally, we should not neglect the marital ties between Shakespeare himself and his wife, Anne Hathaway, as well as the two marriages of Meša Selimović, the second of which still represents an intriguing piece of information from the writer's personal life.

The inner conflict of subjects, individuals who are torn between two opposing choices, is what Bradley deals with, and some of his premises can also be applied to the hero of the novel *Death and the Dervish*, which connects this work with Shakespeare's tragedy in its certain characteristics, ghostly figures whose identity is unstable, but their function is identical: to tempt the heroes and burden them with a moral obligation, simultaneously positioning them at a point that branches into both this world and the other, and, finally, revenge as the crown of the two works and the completion of the internal moral, spiritual and psychological metamorphoses of the two tragic heroes.

In this book, we have explored the possibilities of Nietzsche's principle of masking in connection with the Dionysian and Apollonian masks through the principle of disguise, that is, masking applied to two subjects, the protagonists of Hamlet and *Death and the Dervish*. We tried to figure out what is Dionysian and what is Apollonian in the masking of these two subjects and how these two masks relate to their understanding of the world in which they live, their immediate environment, the ethical dimension in (in)action and how the principles of Dionysian and (anti-)Apollonian are woven into their moral worldview, as well as what is the difference between mask and anti-mask due to the split caused by the hesitation between two equally strong, but mutually exclusive forces such as the duty of revenge according to human and divine laws and the postponement of the act based on one's own moral worldview. We investigated how masks are relevant in the everyday behavior of the two heroes and what is the purpose of masking in general in the situation they find themselves in and what is its goal, and showed the closeness of these two works in the light of the tragedy of revenge and Shakespearean tragedy.

We have shown the connection between Nietzsche's masks and subjectivity using the examples of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin. The different understandings of the concept of subject in Descartes and Nietzsche best illustrate the contrast and emphasize the nature of the mask as the voice of the Other within us, i.e. the Non-Self, or

the disunity of thought and existence in the subject. More precisely, it is about the inconsistency of consciousness and its source in Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin as subjects who mask themselves. Nietzsche insists that, when it comes to the subject, it is always about the division within it, about its multiplicity. This monograph has explored the relationship between personal and collective identity on the basis of which a socially constructed identity is created in the light of the relationship between the individual and society.

The writing plan involved the systematization of a large corpus of scientific material with the aim of comparing and contrasting textual and extratextual factors.

The goal was to establish a valid theoretical framework within which I analyzed the subjects of these two works and the internal and external circumstances of which they are a product through the prism of New Historicism, which views the text, whether literary or not, as an active factor in historical, political, cultural, ideological and any other discourse.

I wanted to show the cause-and-effect relationships that exist between Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin as subjects, Shakespeare and Selimović as authors and their works, which are, at the same time, capital works not only of their literature, but also of their cultures.

What attracted me to comparing these two works is the possibility of using them to compare two types of cultures, the culture of “small” and “great” peoples, because both works are valued as classics of their literatures and cultures. Their multi-layeredness, namely, elevates them to the rank of cultural artifacts, thereby breaking out of the patterns of literature and literary theory, and establishing cultural connections with social (collective) matrices: tradition and religion and the value systems embodied in them.

Hamlet, since he belongs to the culture of the “great” people, is universally known and recognized. His spirit extends far beyond the borders of the United Kingdom, he is a masterpiece – a work of Western culture. In a broader sense, the play *Hamlet* is almost a national epic of Anglo-Saxon culture because it covers not only socio-political

circumstances, but also the relationship of a ruler who truly deserves to be one by force of legitimacy towards another, who is the False Tsar Stephen the Little of the Elsinore court, while showing the rot of a Machiavellian approach that tramples on everything in its path, starting with humanity.

Death and the Dervish is a magnificent novel of domestic, national literature and culture, in which the dominant view of the world of a man concerned with ideology is present. It is a story about the fate of a deeply unhappy man who, in the name of the Islamist doctrine (Petrović 1981: 42), sacrificed everything, starting and ending with himself.

The idea of the book is to, metaphorically speaking, through Nietzsche's eyes, observe the space of their inner split, to explain the two extremes that simultaneously exist within them, and which vainly try to reconcile with each other because they exclude each other, which divides a person into a "multiplicity of consciousnesses and wills" (Đurić 1997: 97), each of which demands his absolute loyalty. It is a space of moral, spiritual, transcendental torture caused by an ugly reality that implies the "horrors of life" that Nietzsche writes about. This ugly reality is empirically experienced in the case of Hamlet and Ahmed Nuruddin through facing a "boundary situation", which is death, and in both works it is a political issue, as is revenge.

In the introduction to the book *Hamlet: The Prince of Denmark* by William Shakespeare, Svetislav Stefanović says that *Hamlet* is considered one of the most famous and most analyzed works, both in literature and in theater. Despite the fact that it is not the most flawless or the work that inherits the highest artistic value according to aesthetic standards, it is undeniably the most comprehensive, the deepest, and the richest in symbolism, which has yet to be fully understood and explored in all its meanings. No other book, apart from the Bible, has been written about as much literature. Hamlet has not visited any country without becoming a favorite of many peoples (Stefanović in: Shakespeare, trans. Stefanović 2013: 5). In an unusual twist of literary creation, Hamlet, embodying a human type deter-

mined by culture, delves into the most uncultivated, unrefined, and ancient periods of human history, exploring the most brutal aspects of artistic expression (*Ibid.*).

Though some highlight Hamlet's moral apathy and others his insanity both literary critics and theater actors highlight his intellectual prowess. These three characteristics largely define Hamlet's personality: superior intelligence a passive disposition that breeds melancholy and in certain cases a kind of mock insanity. It is necessary to ignore his emotional depth and moments of insanity in order to highlight his intellectual superiority it is also necessary to ignore his intelligence and decision-making speed in order to highlight his passivity and indecision (*Ibid.*).

For he possesses everything, both that which contradicts and negates one another, and that which pairs and enhances one another. He is part of these relations between objects, embodying precisely this connection between objects, not only the difference between the tangible and the intangible, nor the struggle between the rational and the ethical individual, but the connection between them, the deepest and closest, therefore leading to tragedy. In this, the human being is both united and divided. All things fall apart and break about it. The world and time have been broken and come out of their intersections. As in the case of the crucified Christ, everything that had been present before was shattered, and the temple veil was torn in two: the traditional world of law and reason clashed with the realm of eternal love and irrationality. In Hamlet, the timeless world of dominance and all the qualities that go with it clashed with the realm of eternal wisdom, which transcends the phenomena of power and authority (*Ibid.* 10).

Among all literary works in the world, with the exception of the Bible, *Hamlet* stands as a foundational text for the spiritual existence of contemporary individuals. Shakespeare moved from realism to an enhanced form of artistic expression. He saw a transcendent reality that transcended the tangible existence of living beings, contemplating life through the lens of eternity, encompassing all connections to the past and newly discovered connections to the future. His perspective,

which prevailed in many of his creations, was largely retrospective, similar to that of numerous eminent artistic figures throughout history. However, in *Hamlet* he also possessed a unique foresight, imagining the future individual – not as a mere figment of utopia or a realm of dreams devoid of substance, but as a tangible human being engaged in life (*Ibid*: 17).

This representation transcends individual experiences, embodying the essence of humanity as a whole, cultural and future-oriented, emerging from the uncultured forms of the past, yet irrevocably separated from them. *Hamlet* retains elements of the ancient myth from which it evolved, embracing the theme of eternal renewal. It marks the end of one era of humanity while announcing the dawn of another. The character of Hamlet himself is not yet complete, and the new individual who is destined to follow has yet to be formed. Hamlet exists as a ghost, and it is only a ghost that can and must succeed another spirit. Hamlet's spirit engages in a struggle against the material world. Only a spirit that triumphs over matter can emerge from behind it. This phenomenon may arise from Hamlet's profound disillusionment or perhaps from his ultimate silence (*Ibid*.).

However, in *Hamlet*, the situation becomes even more complicated, given that this play can be interpreted as a play on the border between two types of criticism, two philosophical doctrines, two types of theological teachings, Stoicism and Calvinism. Stoicism implies a dignified balance of mind in the face of everything that life brings. A Stoic is calm in the face of life's events, whatever they may be. Because of the influence of Stoicism not only on Hamlet, but also on the entire play, it is important to note the influence of Seneca here, but no longer only in terms of the themes that came through him into Elizabethan drama, but also in terms of the philosophy of Stoicism to which he belonged. Just as Nuruddin, with the growth of hatred, becomes a slave to deviant passion, moving away from his initial dervish contemplative position of inner peace and piety, so does Hamlet change, abandoning the stoic attitude towards life that adorned him at the beginning of the play, and surrenders to fatalism (Terzić 2023b: 9).

From an agent who came to and implemented the idea of the play with a hidden agenda to collect evidence of Claudius' guilt, a son who bitterly suffers for his deceased father and who is openly embittered by the premature marriage of his mother and a murderer, he becomes passivized, allowing himself to be carried away by circumstances. That is how he ended up in the mousetrap set for him by Claudius and Laertes. He simply fell into it, carried away by lethargy and inertia with which, after all, he postpones revenge until near the end of the play. He completely surrenders to God's providence. This position is identical to that of Ahmed Nuruddin, especially at the beginning of the novel, when his response to everything is the phrase "God's will". He then deeply believes that with his faith in God he saves justice, which in his value framework is an ideal and a principle.

Moreover, he will not give up even for a moment the opinion that he is the one who carries out both justice and God's will by committing "plots and acts of revenge" in the second part of the novel, after Harun's death has echoed in him like a bomb (*Ibid*).

The tendency to restrain human nature is a widespread religious principle, which refers to Islam, and is especially associated with Stoicism. He assumes the turmoil of emotions to be a form of spiritual self-mastery (Petrović 1981: 12), which adorns Nuruddin at the beginning of the novel. However, later, after his brother's arrest and death, Nuruddin succumbs to destructive passions fueled by hatred, departing from his initial state of contemplative peace and devotion because he is then "[...] for the first time on the field of real human relations. He is for the first time in a play in which he is not just a spectator" (*Ibid*: 17), just like Hamlet.

He similarly undergoes a transformation. From an active role in obtaining proof of Claudius guilt to a passive acceptance of his current situation Hamlet transitions from a stoic to a fatalistic viewpoint. He eventually falls into the trap set by Claudius and Laertes as a result of his passivity delaying his desire for vengeance until the play's end.

Hamlet's resignation to fate reflects Ahmed Nuruddin's early attitude at the beginning of the novel, where he consistently attributes

events to “God’s will.” Nuruddin firmly believes that his faith in God supports justice, a principle central to his moral framework, and remains steadfast in his conviction that he is an instrument of both justice and divine will, even though he is torn by an internal conflict evident in the second part of the novel, the relic of an unplanned encounter with a musellim, as Harun’s remains are a constant reminder of the evil that has been done and which, from the perspective of humanity, morality, and political philosophy, is truly The novel transforms the rigid boundary between justice and injustice into a fluid one. And for this, along with Aini-effendi, the musellim, whom the dervish hates, is also responsible. The fact that hatred fuels his revenge is confirmed by Nuruddin himself in the words, “[...] a thousand torments were in me, everyone’s, and mine (*Ibid*: 344). These are the torments of decision (*Ibid*: 241), such as the decision about how to approach life’s difficulties. Nuruddin’s and Hamlet’s positions are opposite on this issue.

There is an inherent contradiction in the idea that individuals should actively deal with all the temptations they encounter in life, prioritizing inner peace and preventing emotions from overpowering our rational abilities. Such emotions can undermine us, manifesting themselves as feelings of anger, hatred, or even simulated mental paralysis (Terzić 2023b: 9).

Hamlet has somehow seen through the king’s plan to send him to England under the pretext of following his two former comrades. He is convinced that this plan involves a nefarious intention against him, but he is equally confident in his ability to thwart it. The idea of disobeying this king’s order does not seem to occur to him. It is possible that his conviction that he cannot refuse without thereby simultaneously drawing attention to the king as his father’s murderer is at work here. Moreover, by killing Polonius, he has inadvertently given his adversary a plausible excuse to remove him from Denmark. During the journey, he encounters Fortinbras’ army, which is on its way to conquer Poland. Seeing these soldiers who do not fear death but look it straight in the eye arouses a sense of shame in him as he reflects on his own inertness despite his infinitely greater reasons for acting (Bradley 1978: 119)

Phenomenological, cultural, psychological, political, sociological, theatrical, literary and artistic, mythological, all these branches flow into the same source from which historical, philosophical, and many other directions of interpretation of the two corpus' works are also fed. All of them are in one way or another connected to the main or one of the main motifs in the two parts – the motif of crime. The connection between crime and power is present in both Shakespeare's play and Selimović's novel.

By focusing specifically on the relationship between power and the layers subordinate to it, potentially subversive factors at any given moment, order and the threat of rebellion, repression and punishment, functions, institutions and institutionality that should be based on law, legality and legitimacy as the basic levers of exercising power and opposing personal interests, the use, more precisely, the abuse of power for personal purposes, the conflict between divinely founded supreme authority and subversive Machiavellianism, humanity, at least in traces, and the hypocrisy of criminals, the eternal mythological struggle of David and Goliath emerge from the two parts on which this scientific analysis is based.

Intricate family and interpersonal relationships, conflicts between people, and, even more so, within them, contradictory imperatives, some of which are external and others deeply internal, the lack of love as the beginning and end of the protagonist's tragedy, heightened passions and exaggeration in feelings and performance, hatred and madness, two *diseases of the spirit* (Shakespeare, trans. Simić and Pandurović, 2022: 131) of the two main characters, lies and traps, ideals, all of this is intertwined in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish*, opening up the possibility for inexhaustible analyses and playing with the text, placing it under many different scrutiny.

The intertextuality present in the play and the novel is a network that encompasses seemingly unrelated texts such as sacred books, legends, morals, stories about the Trojan War, literary works from antiquity, as well as the works of mystics mentioned in the Serbian novel, Elizabethan revenge tragedies, even political comedies referred

to by Hamlet's mask role and his role as the court jester, but also other of his tragedies in which the function of the jester is important, such as *King Lear* or those in which a supernatural element is present, the Ghost in *Hamlet*, as in the case of the witches in *Macbeth*, and, finally, *Othello*, in which the motif of jealousy can be analyzed side by side with Hamlet's madness and, even more so, it seems, with the dervish's hatred.

Biographical details are the cornerstone of many analyses of these two works, and are therefore important for ours as well. Although considered outdated, biographism contributes to the drama and the novel because it explains the dominant motif of the loss of a family member, which contributes to the persuasiveness of its literary design and credibility that causes a strong and striking impression on readers.

The internal conflict of subjects, individuals who are torn between two opposing choices, is what Bradley deals with, and some of his premises can also be applied to the hero of the novel *Death and the Dervish*, which connects this work with Shakespeare's tragedy in its certain characteristics, ghostly figures whose identity is unstable, but their function is identical: to tempt the heroes and burden them with a moral obligation, simultaneously positioning them at a point that branches into both this world and the other, and, finally, revenge as the crown of the two works and the completion of the internal moral, spiritual and psychological metamorphoses of the two tragic heroes.

Hamlet, since he belongs to the culture of the "great" people, is universally known and recognized. His spirit extends far beyond the borders of the United Kingdom, he is a masterpiece – a work of Western culture. In a broader sense, Hamlet is almost a national epic of Anglo-Saxon culture because it covers not only socio-political circumstances, but also the relationship of a ruler who truly deserves to be one by force of legitimacy towards another, while showing the rot of a Machiavellian approach that tramples on everything in its path, starting with humanity.

The book seeks to shed light on the similarities and differences between them and to illuminate those places in the Serbian novel that

deviate from the conventions of this subgenre, but also those places that are in accordance with these conventions. It will focus on the two most important nodes of the revenge tragedy, namely crime and revenge. At the same time, the paper will explore the aspects of brutality that adorn the revenge tragedy. The paper also attempts to analyze the significance of evil in drama and novel through Christopher Marlowe's theory of the Machiavellian hero, who is the embodiment of that evil. In addition, this paper will present Bradley's interpretation of Shakespeare's tragedy, within which common features with Selimović's novel are found. Both works are distinguished by an exceptional degree of reflexivity of the protagonists, based on which we gain insight into their inner lives. Thanks to their thoughtfulness and the voice given to them by the author, we see and hear how the pivotal unfortunate events affect them and how the heroes at the end of these two pieces of writing are not the same as they were at the beginning.

We see their hesitation between the two possibilities that lurk around them like Scylla and Charybdis, and how they move between these two dangers, always remaining in the storm of their own (in)decisiveness, equally close and equally far from both Scylla and Charybdis that will eventually swallow them up. This completes their tragedy.

13. BIBLIOGRAPHY IN ENGLISH

- Primary sources

Shakespeare 2002: William Shakespeare, *Hamlet*, edited by Cedric Watts, Wordsworth Edition Limited, Wordsworth Classics Ware, Hertfordshire.

Selimović 2018a: Meša, Selimović, *Death and the Dervish*, translated by Bogdan Rakić and Stephen M. Dickey, Introduction by Henry R. Cooper, Jr., Vulkan, Belgrade.

- Secondary sources

Bajić, 1967: Stanislav Bajić, “Others about Hamlet and Hamlet about Himself” in: *The Scene*, Theatre Arts Review, ed. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, issue 3, May–June 1967, special issue, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, pp. 309–325.

Bečanović-Nikolić 2013: Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić, *In Search of Shakespeare*, Dosije studio, Belgrade.

Bečanović-Nikolić 2007: Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić, *Shakespeare behind the Mirror: the Conflict of Interpretations in the Reception of Shakespeare's Historical Plays in the Twentieth Century*, Geopoetika, Belgrade.

Bradley 1984: A.C. Bradley, “Hegel's Theory of Tragedy”, translated by Miodrag Radović in: *Theory of Tragedy*, edited by Zoran Stojanović, Belgrade, Nolit, pp. 58–75.

- Bradley, 1984: A.C. Bradley, "The Essence of Shakespeare's Tragedy", translated by Miodrag Radović, in: *Theory of Tragedy*, edited by Zoran Stojanović, Belgrade, Nolit, pp. 557-581.
- Bradley 1978., A.C. Bradley *Shakesperean Tragedy: Lectures on Hamlet, Othello, King Lear, Macbeth*, A Fawcett premier book, Fawcett publications, inc., Greenwich, conn.
- Brkić 1959: Svetozar Brkić. "English Renaissance tragedy" in: *English Renaissance tragedies*, Nolit, Beograd, pp. 5-27.
- Coddon, Karin (Coddon, Karin): "Suche Strange Desygns"; Madness, Subjectivity and Treason in Hamlet and Elizabethan Culture, from Susan Wofford (ed.), William Shakespeare, Hamlet, p. 388-394 in: Šofranac, Nataša. *The motif of madness of the characters in four great tragedies by William Shakespeare – Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, and King Lear*, doctoral dissertation, Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf>
- Ćosović 2020: Tatjana Ćosović, *The motif of freedom in the heroes of Shakespeare's tragedies Hamlet, Othello, King Lear and Macbeth in an existentialist and Christian key*, doctoral dissertation, Belgrade.
- Grubačić 2012: Slobodan Grubačić. *The Alexandrian Lighthouse: Interpretations of Literature from the Alexandrian School to Postmodernity*. Zoran Stojanovic Publishing House, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Dollimore, Jonathan, *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and His Contemporaries* in: Grubačić 2012: Slobodan Grubačić, *The Alexandrian Lighthouse: Interpretations of Literature from the Alexandrian School to Postmodernity*. Zoran Stojanovic Publishing House, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad.
- Ferguson 1967: Francis Ferguson, "Hamlet, King of Denmark: An Analogy of Action" in: *The Scene*, a Journal of Theater Arts, translated from English by Martha Fraind, verses translated by Živojin Simić and Sima Pandurović, ed. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, number 3, May-June 1967, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, 337-352.
- Dover 1967: Johm Dover Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet*, First Edition, Cambridge at the University Press, the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, London, Great Britain.

- Felbabov 2002: Vladislava Felbabov, "New Historicism" in: *Dometi*, a magazine for culture, spring-summer-autumn-winter, year 29, four issues, 108–111, edited by prof. dr. Vladislava Felbabov, Sombor, City Library "Karlo Bijelicki", pp. 7–42.
- Gardner 1967: Helen Gardner, "Hamlet and the Tragedy of the Avenger" in: *The Scene*, Theatre Arts Review, translated by Đorđe Krivokapić, editor. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, volume 3, May–June 1967, special issue, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, pp. 362–370.
- Greenblatt 2020: Stephen Greenblatt, "An oblique perspective in: *Tyrant: Shakespeare on politics*, Belgrade, Vulkan, 2020, pp. 7–29.
- Greenblatt, Steven. "Culture", Translated by Vladimir Gvozden in: *Zlatna greda*: The magazine for literature, art and opinion 37 (nov. 2004): 40–43. in: Aleksić, Jana. "New Historicism and Cultural Materialism in Serbian literary thought" in: *Knjizevna Istorija* (0350–6428), 54/177 (2022), Institute of Literature and Art Belgrade, 2022, / original scientific paper 82.09"19/20"821.163.41.09"19/20" <https://doi.org/10.18485/kis.2022.54.177.2>; accessed August 20, 2024; <https://doi.fil.bg.ac.rs/pdf/journals/kis/2022-177/kis-2022-54-177-2.pdf>, 33–60.
- Greenblatt, Steven. "Towards a Poetics of Culture". Translated by Zoran Paunović in: *Dometi*, a cultural magazine, spring-summer-autumn-winter, vol. 29, issue 4, 108–111, edited by prof. dr. Vladislava Felbabov, City Library "Karlo Bijelicki", Sombor, 2002, pp. 43–58 in: Felbabov, Vladislava. "New Historicism" in: *Dometi*, a cultural magazine, spring-summer-autumn-winter, vol. 29, issue 4, 108–111, edited by prof. Dr. Vladislava Felbabov, Sombor, City Library "Karlo Bijelicki", 2002, pp. 7–42.
- Greenblatt 2005: Greenblatt Steven, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From Moore to Shakespeare*: with a new preface, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Greenblatt, Steven. *Hamlet in Purgatory*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2011. in: Spremić, Milica. *Politics, Subversion, Power: New Historicism Readings of Shakespeare's Great Tragedies*, Belgrade, Zadužbina Andrejević, 2011.
- Hibbard 1987, G. R. Hibbard (ed). *The Oxford Shakespeare: Hamlet*, Oxford world's classics, General Editor Stanley Wells, Oxford University Press, pp. 1–66.

- Holdernes, Graham. *Shakespeare: The Histories*, St. Martin's Press, New York 2000, 12, in: Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić, *Shakespeare behind the Mirror: The Conflict of Interpretations in the Reception of Shakespeare's Historical Plays in the Twentieth Century*, Belgrade, 2007.
- Hristić 1967: Jovan Hristić, "Hamlet's Question". In: *The Scene*, a journal of theatrical art, ed. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, number 3, May–June 1967, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad: 371–387.
- Klein 1964, Hugo Klein, *Shakespeare and Humanity*, Prosveta, Belgrade.
- Klein 1967: Hugo Klein "What happens in Hamlet" in: *The Scene*, Theatre Arts Review, ed. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, vol. 3, May–June 1967, special issue, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, pp. 297–309
- Koljević 2012: Nikola Koljević, *Shakespeare the Tragedian: Andrić's Masterpiece*, Belgrade: Banja Luka: Academy of Sciences and Arts of the Republic of Srpska, Official Gazette, 2012.
- Koljević 1981: Nikola, *Shakespeare, Tragedian*, „Svjetlost”, OOUR Publishing, Sarajevo.
- Koljević 1967: Nikola Koljević, "Hamlet in Shakespeare's Dramatic Development" in: *The Scene*, Theatre Arts Review, ed. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, number 3, special issue, May–June 1967, Sterijino pozorje–Novi Sad, pp. 353–361.
- Kostić 2011: Rastko Kostić "In an Uncomplicated Search for the Danish Prince". A Book about Hamlet / Saxo Grammaticus ... [et al.] ; [preface, selection of appendices, translation from Danish and English] Rastko Kostić. Krug Commerce, Belgrade.
- Kostić 1979: Veselin Kostić in: *English Literature Book I (650-1700)*, IGKRO, Svjetlost, OOUR Textbook Institute, Sarajevo, Publisher's Working Organization, Nolit, Belgrade.
- Kostić 1982: Veselin Kostić, *William Shakespeare's Hamlet: a portrait of a literary work*, Institute for Textbooks and Teaching Materials, Belgrade.
- Kostić 1983: Veselin Kostić, *Shakespeare's life and world*, Scientific book, Belgrade.
- Kostić 2010: Veselin Kostić. *Shakespeare's Dramaturgy*, Pillars of Culture, Belgrade.

- Kott, Jan 1990. *Shakespeare our contemporary*, translated by Petar Vujičić, Sarajevo, „Svjetlost”, Publishing work organization OOUR, Publishing activity Sarajevo.
- Kott 1967: Jan Kott, “Hamlet and Orestis” in: *The Scene*, magazine for theatrical art, translated from Polish by Petar Vujičić, editor. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, number 3, May–June 1967, special issue, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, pp. 309–325.
- Marić 2015: Jasminka Marić, *Philosophy in Hamlet*, Alfa University, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Belgrade.
- Milanović 2009: Vujadin Milanović, *Hamlet in Serbian Literary Criticism*, Belgrade, Serbian Europe, 2009.
- Milosevic 1966 Nikola Milošević “Introduction” in: *William Shakespeare, Hamlet*, translated by Živojin Simić and Sima Pandurović, Nolit, Belgrade.
- Nutatl, Anthony D.: *Shakespeare the Thinker*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2007 in: Šofranac, Nataša. *The motif of madness of the characters in four great tragedies by William Shakespeare’s four great tragedies – Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, and King Lear*, doctoral dissertation, Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> accessed September 3, 2024, doctoral dissertation, Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> accessed on September 3, 2024.
- Parry 1967: Jean Pari, “Hamlet or the personality of the son” in: *The Scene*, magazine for theatrical art, translated by Mirjana Miočinović, editor. Josip Kulundžić, year III, book I, number 3, May–June 1967, special issue, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, pp. 387–395.
- Righter 1967. Anne Righter. “Hamlet and the Contemporary Stage”. “Power of Illusion”. *Shakespeare and the idea of the play*, Penguin Books in association with Chatto & Windus, First published by Chatto & Windus 1962, Penguin Books, Ltd. Penguin Shakespeare library, PSL I, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books Inc., 3300 Clipper Mill Road, Baltimore II, Md, U.S.:A. Penguin

- Books Australia Ltd., Ringwood, Victoria, Australia, copyright Anne Righter, 1962, published in Penguin Shakespeare Library, pp. 138–147.
- Robertson, John Mackinnon: *Hamlet Once More*, London, Richard Cobden-Sanderson, 1923 in: Šofranac, Nataša. *The Motif of Madness in the Heroes of William Shakespeare's Four Great Tragedies – Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, and King Lear*, doctoral dissertation, Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 2013a. <http://doi-serbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> accessed September 3, 2024.
- Sahlins, Marshal. *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, 1975, VIII, 55. “New Historicism” in: *Dometi*, a cultural magazine, spring-summer-autumn-winter, year 29, four issues, 108–111, edited by Prof. Vladislava Felbabov PhD, Sombor, City Library “Karlo Bijelicki”, 2002 (p. 26).
- Spremić 2011: Milica Spremić, *Politics, Subversion, Power: New Historicist Readings of Shakespeare's Great Tragedies*, Zadružbina Andrejević, Belgrade.
- Stefanović 2013: Svetislav Stefanović, “Introduction” to: Shakespeare, William, *Hamlet: King of Denmark*, translated by Svetislav Stefanović, Kragujevac, Imperija knjiga, 5–17.
- Strier 1982. Richard Strier (Strier, Richard) (1982). Identity and Power in Tudor England: Stephen Greenblatt, Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare Author(s): Richard Strier Source: boundary 2, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Spring, 1982), pp. Published by: Duke University Press Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/302803> Accessed: 08-03-2018 02:20 UTC; pp. 383–394. <http://simonestok.com/site-buildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/identityandpowerintudorengland-stephengreenblattrenaissanceselffashioning.pdf>; accessed 4/8/2024.
- Šofranac 2013a, Nataša. *The motif of madness of the characters in four great tragedies by William Shakespeare's four great tragedies – Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, and King Lear*, doctoral dissertation, Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 2013a. <http://doi-serbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> accessed September 3, 2024.

- Šofranac 2013b: Šofranac Nataša. "The 'sufferer, the lover and the poet': the mental disorders of Shakespeare's tragic heroes", *Communication and Culture Online*, Year IV, Number 4, pp. 96–108. <https://www.komunikacijakultura.org/index.php/kk/article/view/121/88>, accessed on February 27, 2022.
- Šofranac 2011: Nataša Šofranac, "Milica Spremić, Politics, Subversion, Power, New Historicist Readings of Shakespeare's Great Tragedies", Belgrade: Zadužbina Andrejević, 2011, p. 124 in: *Philologia*, 2011, 9, pp. 153–161, <https://philologia.org.rs/index.php/ph/issue/view/10/8> accessed on August 27, 2024.
- Tennenhouse, Leonard, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres*, New York and London, Methuen, 1986 in: Spremić, Milica. *Politics, Subversion, Power: New Historicist Readings of Shakespeare's great tragedies*, Belgrade, Zadužbina Andrejević, 2011.
- Vygotsky, Lev. *Psychology of Art*, (trans. Jovan Janićijević), Belgrade, NOLIT, in: Šofranac, Nataša., *The motif of madness of the characters in four great tragedies by William Shakespeare's four great tragedies – Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, and King Lear*, doctoral dissertation, Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> accessed September 3, 2024. doctoral dissertation, Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf>
- Vukčević 2007: Radojka Vukčević, "On the Paths of New Historicism" (interview with Steven Greenblatt). *Proceedings of Matica Srpska for Literature and Language*, book LV, volume 1/2007, pp. 131–135. https://www.maticasrpska.org.rs/stariSajt/casopisi/knjizevnost_55-1.pdf accessed on August 28, 2024.
- Watts 2002: Cedric Watts, "Introduction" in: William Shakespeare, *Hamlet* (ed. by Cedric Watts), Wordsworth classics, ISBN 9781853260094, Wordsworth Editions Limited, Ware, Hertfordshire pp. 9–25.
- Veesser 2002: Harold Veesser, "Introduction", *Dometi*, magazine for culture, spring-summer-autumn-winter, vol. 29, number four, 108–111, edited by prof. dr. Vladislava Felbabov, Sombor, City Library "Karlo Bijelicki", pp. 59–68.

- (b) Literature on the life and work of Meša Selimović with special reference to *Death and the Dervish*:

Andrejević 1996: Danica Andrejević, *Poetics of Meša Selimović*, Prosveta, Belgrade.

Ahmetagić 2010: Jasmina Ahmetagić, "Private and Public in Selimović's Novels "Death and the Dervish" and "The Fortress"", *In memory of Meša Selimović, on the hundredth anniversary of his birth (1910–2010)*, ed. by full member of the Academy Predrag Palavestra, Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, 2010, Serbian Academy and Arts, scientific meetings, Volume CXXIX, Department of Language and Literature, Book 22, pp. 145–155.

Bogićević 1973: Miodrag Bogićević, "The Dervish and Death" by Meša Selimović (Izraz, Sarajevo, 1967, XI, vol. XXI, no. 1, pp. 59–69 in: La-gumdžija, Razija, *Critics on Meša Selimović with an Autobiography*, "Svjetlost", Publishing House, Sarajevo, 1973, pp. 46–55.

Cooper 2018a: Cooper, Jr., Henry R. "Introduction" in: Meša, Selimović, *Death and the Dervish*, translated by Bogdan Rakić and Stephen M. Dickey, Vulkan, Belgrade.

Vučković 2014: Radovan Vučković, "Serbian Novel in the Context of the Existentialist Novel" in: *Meša Selimović*. Jovan Delić (ed), Publishing Center of Matica Srpska, Anthology Edition of Ten Centuries of Serbian Literature, vol. 66, Novi Sad, 2014, pp. 521–527.

Glušćević 1981: Zoran Glušćević. "Between Dogma and Nothingness", pp. 2030–2055, in: *Literature* 11, Publishing Working Organization "Prosveta", Belgrade.

Dedović 2012: Nedžad Dedović, "Repression as a Part of the Power Discourse in the Novels of Meša Selimović", <https://www.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/> Accessed August 1, 2024. Author's note: The text is an integral part of the master's thesis Discourse of Power in Selimović's novel, defended at the Faculty of Humanities in Mostar on April 2, 2012. Accessed on August 1, 2024.

Delić 2014 (ed.): Jovan Delić, "The Golden Decade of Meša Selimović" in: *Meša Selimović*, edited by Jovan Delić (ed.), Publishing Center

- of Matica Srpska, Anthology Edition Ten Centuries of Serbian Literature, vol. 66, Novi Sad, pp. 7–33.
- Delić 2021: Jovan Delić, “Poetic and Thematic Interpenetrations of Andrić’s and Selimović’s Prose”. Proceedings of the scientific conference held on July 17, 2020 at the Andrić Institute. Aleksandra Vraneš (ed.), Andrić Institute, Andrićgrad, pp. 7–40.
- <https://www.andricevinstitut.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/%D0%9F%D0%9E%D0%95%D0%A2%D0%98%D0%A7%D0%9A%D0%90-%D0%98-%D0%A2%D0%95%D0%9C%D0%90%D0%A2%D0%A1%D0%9A%D0%90-%D0%9F%D0%A0%D0%9E%D0%96-%D0%98%D0%9C%D0%90%D0%8A%D0%90-%D0%90%D0%9D%D0%94%D0%A0%D0%98%D0%8B%D0%95%D0%92%D0%95-%D0%98-%D0%A1%D0%95%D0%9B%D0%98%D0%9C%D0%9E%D0%92%D0%98%D0%8B%D0%95%D0%92%D0%95-%D0%B7%D0%B1%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%BA-%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B4%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0-%D0%9E%D0%B4%D1%98.-%D0%B7%D0%B0-%D0%BA%D1%9A%D0%B8%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%B%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%82.pdf> приступљено 3. септмбра 2024.
- Đorđević 1996: Časlav Đorđević. “Dervish and Christ: an unread place in the novel *Death and the Dervish* by Meša Selimović”, in: *Matica Srpska Proceedings*, Novi Sad, Vol. 172, vol. 458, vol. 6. pp. 860–891.
- Egerić 2000: Miroslav Egerić, *Spirit and Deed: Essays on the Novels of Meša Selimović*, ITP “Zmaj”, Novi Sad – Banja Luka.
- Egerić 2010: Miroslav Egerić, “Dogma and Individual Life in the *Death and the Dervish*”, pp. 93–99, in: *Memorial of Meša Selimović*, Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Scientific Conferences, Book CXXIX, Department of Language and Literature, Book 22, Belgrade, 2010.
- Egerić 1982: Miroslav Egerić, *Death and the Dervish by Meša Selimović*, Institute for Textbooks and Teaching Aids, Belgrade.
- Jerkov 1993: Aleksandar Jerkov, *Peculiarities of the Narrative Process in the Novels of Ivo Andrić, Vladan Desnica, Meša Selimović, Miloš Crnjanski and Danilo Kiš: (Types of Immanent Poetics)* : Doctoral Dissertation, Belgrade : [A.M. Jerkov].

- Jerkov 2004: Aleksandar, "The Golden Book of Meša Selimović" in: Selimović, Meša, *Death and the Dervish*, NIN, Institute for textbooks and teaching aids, Belgrade, pp. 413–433.
- Jerotić 1973: Vladeta Jerotić, "On some metamorphoses of the "individuation process" in the novel "Death and the Dervish" by Meša Selimović" (Essay: Književne novine, I-II, 1969. god.) in: *Critics of Meša Selimović with an autobiography*, edited by Razija Lagumdžija, Svjetlost, Publishing Company, Sarajevo, pp. 67–74.
- Kecmanović 2010: Vladimir Kecmanović, "The Assets of Escaping to Allegory", *In memory of Meša Selimović, on the hundredth anniversary of his birth (1910–2010)*, ed. by full member of the Academy Predrag Palavestra, Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts 2010, Serbian Academy and Arts, scientific meetings, Volume CXXIX, Department of Language and Literature, Book 22, pp. 169–173.
- Kordić 1975: Radoman Kordić, *Archeology of the literary work*. Education, Belgrade.
- Kovač 1999: Nikola Kovač, "Political logos and novelistic myths" in: Novi izraz, Sarajevo, 1999, Pen Center of Bosnia and Herzegovina, no. 6 (digital edition) in: Nedžad Dedović, "Repression as part of the discourse of power in the novels of Meša Selimović, 2012. <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/> Author's note: The text is an integral part of the master's thesis Discourse of Power in Selimović's novel, defended at the Faculty of Humanities in Mostar on April 2, 2012. Accessed on August 1, 2024.
- Kovac 2012: Nikola Kovač, "Political logos and novel mythos" in: *New expression*. Sarajevo: Pen Center of Bosnia Herzegovina. No. 6 (digital edition), 1999 in: Nedžad Dedović, "Repression as part of the discourse of power in the novels of Meša Selimović". <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/>
- Kovač 2005: Nikola Kovač, *Political novel-fiction of totalitarianism*. Sarajevo: Armis Print in: Nedžad Dedović, "Repression as part of the discourse

- of power in the novels of Meša Selimović”, 2012. Author’s note: The text is an integral part of the master’s thesis *Discourse of Power in Selimović’s novel*, defended at the Faculty of Humanities in Mostar on April 2, 2012. Accessed on August 1, 2024. <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/> Author’s note: The text is an integral part of the master’s thesis *Discourse of Power in Selimović’s novel*, defended at the Faculty of Humanities in Mostar on April 2, 2012. Accessed on August 1, 2024.
- Lagumdžija 1986: Razija Lagumdžija (pr.), *The work of Meša Selimović in literary criticism*. Sarajevo: Oslobođenje 1986 in: Nedžad Dedović, “Repression as part of the discourse of power in the novels of Meša Selimović”, 2012 <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/>
- Lagumdžija 1975: Razija Lagumdžija, *The literary work of Meša Selimović, From the short story Song in the Storm to the novels Death and the Dervish* and Fortress, Sarajevo.
- Lagumdžija 1988: Razija Lagumdžija, *A letter about a dervish*, Univerzal, Tuzla.
- Milošević 2005: Miloš Milošević, *From anxiety to rebellion*, Zmaj, Novi Sad.
- Milosević 1978: Nikola Milošević. *The Sand House: Literature and Metaphysics: Crnjanski, Desnica, Nastasijević, Lalić, Andrić, Selimović*, Slovo ljubve, Belgrade.
- Milošević 1966: Nikola Milošević, *Hamlet*, trans. Simić and Pandurović, Nolit, Belgrade.
- Milošević 2009: Nikola Milošević, *Flares: essays on ancient and Russian themes and on Nietzsche*, „Zadužbina Miloš Crnjanski”, Novi Sad, Orpheus.
- Petrović 1981: Miodrag Petrović, *Novel by Meša Selimović*, Gradina, Niš.
- Pervić 1973: Muharem Pervić, “Dervish and Poet” in: *Critics of Meša Selimović*, edited by Razija Lagumdžija, “Svjetlost”, Publishing Company, Sarajevo, pp. 18–45.
- Pištaló 2010: Vladimir Pištalo, “Rebellion, Friendship, Generosity” in: *In memory of Meša Selimović, on the hundredth anniversary of his birth (1910–2010)*, ed. by full member of the Academy Predrag

- Palavestra, Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts 2010, Serbian Academy and Arts, scientific meetings, Volume CXXIX, Department of Language and Literature, Book 22, pp. 163–167.
- Popović 1988: Radovan Popović, *The Life of Meša Selimović*, BIGZ, Belgrade.
- Protić 1986: Predrag Protić, “Death and the Dervish by Meša Selimović”. in: Lagumdžija, Razija (ed.): *The work of Meša Selimović in literary criticism*. Sarajevo: Oslobođenje, 1986, pp. 215–225 in: Nedžad Dedović, “Repression as a part of the discourse of power in the novels of Meša Selimović”, 2012. <https://arhiva.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/>.
- Prohić 1972: Kasim Prohić. *To do and to be: a novel by Meša Selimović*, “Svjetlost”, Sarajevo, 1972.
- Selimović 1983: Meša Selimović. *Writers, opinions and conversations*, BIGZ, Belgrade, 1983.
- Selimović 2018b: Meša Selimović. *Memories*, Vulkan, Belgrade.
- Skakić 1976: Mirko Skakić, *Literary work of Meša Selimović*, Petar Kočić, Belgrade.
- (c) Literature on Nietzsche’s philosophy
- Vattimo 2011: Đani Vattimo., *Subject and Mask: Nietzsche and the Problem of Liberation*, translated by Saša Hrnjez, Zoran Stojanović Publishing House, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad, 2011.
- Vivarelli 2022: V. Vivarelli, “Nietzsche and the Masks of the Free Spirit. Montaigne, Pascal and Sterne, Würzburg: Königshausen and Neu-u-mann”, 1998, p. 15 in: Radojčić, Saša, “Nietzsche’s Masks – An Essay on Perspektivism”, University of Arts in Belgrade, Faculty of Fine Arts, Belgrade, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0023-5164/2017/0023-51641755076R.pdf> accessed February 27, pp.76–88.
- Đurić 1998: Miloš Đurić, “Friedrich Nietzsche and Hellenic Culture”, Nietzsche, Friedrich, *Writings on Greek Literature and Philosophy*, Zoran Stojanović’s Bookstore, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad.

- Đurić 1997: Mihajlo Đurić, *Nietzsche and Metaphysics*, Selected Writings, Book VII, NIU Official Gazette of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Tersit, Belgrade, 1997.
- Fink 1981: Eugen Fink, *Nietzsche's Philosophy*, Biblioteka znaci, large edition of books, Center for Cultural Activity, Zagreb.
- Klass, T. N. Von Peitschen und Masken. Nietzsche's Search for Strategies of Self-Incitement, in: Masken und Maskierungen, ed. Schäfer, A. and Wimmer, M. (2000), Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedia, pp. 266–267 in: Radojčić, Saša, "Nietzsche's Masks – An Essay on Perspectivism", University of Arts in Belgrade, Faculty of Fine Arts, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0023-5164/2017/0023-51641755076R.pdf> accessed February 27, pp. 76–88.
- Nietzsche 2003, Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy*. Translated by Shaun Whiteside, ed. by Michael Tanner, Penguin Books Ltd., Clays Ltd, Elcograf S.p.A, Great Britain.
- Nietzsche 1998: Friedrich Nietzsche, *Writings on Greek Literature and Philosophy*, translated by Tomislav Bekić... [et al.], Zoran Stojanović Publishing House, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad, 1998.
- 1871—Nietzsche, Friedrich. *From The Birth of Tragedy*. (Harold Bloom) in: *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Hamlet*, edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, An imprint of Infobase Publishing, Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Hamlet Copyright © 2008 by Infobase Publishing Introduction © 2008 by Harold Bloom; Bloom's Literary Criticism An imprint of Infobase Publishing 132 West 31st Street New York NY 10001 Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Hamlet / edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. p. cm. — (Bloom's Shakespeare through the ages) Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-0-7910-9592-8 (hc : alk. paper) 1. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616. Hamlet. 2. Hamlet (Legendary character) 3. Tragedy. I. Bloom, Harold. PR2807.H2623725 2008 822.33—dc22 2007050853 best_hamlet_resource_critical_theory.pdf (weebly.com) http://misscp.weebly.com/uploads/3/1/1/2/31129815/best_hamlet_resource_critical_theory.pdf, приступљено 14. новембра 2021. год.

Radojčić, Saša. "Nietzsche's Masks – An Essay on Perspectivism", University of Arts in Belgrade, Faculty of Fine Arts, Belgrade, DOI 10.5937/kultura1755076R UDC 14:929 Nietzsche F. 255.2:1 original scientific paper, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0023-5164/2017/0023-51641755076R.pdf> accessed February 27, 2022, pp. 76–88.

• Other

Aleksić 2024: Jana Aleksić, "New Historicism and Cultural Materialism in Serbian Literary Thought" in: *Literary History* (0350–6428), 54/177 (2022), Institute of Literature and Art Belgrade, 2022, / original scientific paper 82.09"19/20"821.163.41.09"19/20" <https://doi.org/10.18485/kis.2022.54.177.2>; accessed August 20, 2024; <https://doi.fil.bg.ac.rs/pdf/journals/kis/2022-177/kis-2022-54-177-2.pdf> , pp. 33–60.

Althusser 2009: Louis Althusser, *Ideology and State Ideological Apparatuses: (Research Notes)*, translated by Andrija Filipović, Karpos, Loznica.

Andrejević 2010: Ana Andrejević, *Emergence of Dramatic Literary Form in the Classical Period and its Effect on the English Renaissance Drama* UDC: 821.111.09-2"15/16"; 821.124'02.09-2+821.14'02.09-2 University of Pristina with Temporary Headquarters in Kosovska Mitrovica, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of English Language and Literature,. <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0354-3293/2010/0354-32931040117A.pdf>, accessed on September 2, 2024, pp. 117–127

Vesić 2013: Violeta M. Vesić, *New historical interpretations of American literature of the constitutional-revolutionary period*, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, Belgrade. <https://nardus.mpn.gov.rs/bitstream/handle/123456789/4041/Disertacija.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y> accessed August 27, 2024.

Grubačić 2012: Slobodan Grubačić, *The Lighthouse of Alexandria: Interpretations of Literature from the Alexandrian School to Postmodernity*, Zoran Stojanović Publishing House, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad.

- Ivanov 2017: Vjačeslav Ivanov, *Dionysus and Prodionysianism*, translated by Antonina Pantelić, Logos, Belgrade.
- Zizjulas 1998: Jovan Zizjulas, "From Mask to Personality", translated from the Greek by Bishop Amphilochius, Platonic Eros and Christian Love, Ioannis Sikurtis, translated by Atanasije Jevtić, ed. Reverend Milorad Sredojević, small library of the priest, Christian thought, University educated Orthodox theologians, Hilandar Fund, Foundation "Nikolaj Velimirović and Justin Popović", Srbinje – Belgrade – Valjevo – Munich.
- Jaspers 1984: Karl Jaspers, "Tragic knowledge", translated by Sreten Marić in: Stojanović, Zoran (ed.), *Theory of tragedy*, Nolit, Belgrade, pp. 232–248.
- Kovač 1988: Nikola Kovač, *Novel, history, politics*, SOUR "Veselin Masleša", IRO "Sarajevo", OOUR Publishing activity, Sarajevo.
- Kovač 1975: Nikola Kovač, *The conflict of being and ideal: alienation in the work of Albert Camus*, "Light", Publishing company, Sarajevo.
- Lešić 2003: Zdenko Lešić, *New Historicism and Cultural Materialism*, Narodna knjiga, Alfa, Belgrade.
- Mallier 1982: Philippe Mallier, "Identity: terms and concept*" in: *Culture: Journal of Theory and Sociology of Culture and Cultural Politics* No. 59, Institute for the Study of Cultural Development, Belgrade, prev. Dragan Minderović, <https://www.casopiskultura.rs/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Kultura%20broj%2059.pdf> accessed February 27, pp. 19–36.
- Milić 2000: Novica Milić, *Lectures on Reading*, Narodna knjiga / Alfa, Belgrade, 2000.
- Milošević 1965: Nikola Milošević, *Negative Hero*, Vuk Karadžić, Belgrade.
- NEW Larousse Encyclopedia in Three Volumes, 3 (N-Ž), trans. Zorica Božić. et al., publisher Zemun: JRJ (Belgrade : Publikum), 1999.
- Pehter 2002: Edward Pehter, "New Historicism and its Discontents: The Politicization of Renaissance Drama" in: *Dometi*, a cultural magazine, spring-summer-autumn-winter, year 29, issue four, 108–111, ed. by prof. dr. Vladislava Felbabov, Sombor, City Library "Karlo Bijelicki", pp. 107–132.

- Zlopaša 2015: Srđa Zlopaša, "Subjectivity in Psychoanalysis and Psychiatry", *Clinic for Psychiatry, Clinical Center of Serbia, Belgrade, Serbia, Engrami*, vol. 37, January-March 2015, no. 1, 63–74, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0351-2665/2015/0351-26651501063Z.pdf>, accessed February 27, 2022.
- Stein 2007: Murray Stein, *Jung's Map of the Soul*, trans. Žanet Prinčevac de Villablanca, Laguna, Belgrade.
- Stojnov 1999: Dušan Stojnov, "Identity: Polyphrenic or Monolithic?", in: *Psihologija* 1999, 3-4, 141–156 UDK 159.922.4.072(=861) Department of Psychology, Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade, 1999. <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0048-5705/1999/0048-57059903141S.pdf> accessed March 1, 2022, pp. 141–156.
- Tanasković 2018: Darko Tanasković, *Islam: Dogma and Life*, 3rd supplemented edition, Serbian Literary Association, Belgrade.
- Tomović 1980: Slobodan Tomović, *The Hero of Absurdism*. Pobjeda, Titograd.
- Felbabov 2002: Vladislava Felbabov, "New Historicism" in: *Dometi*, a cultural magazine, spring-summer-autumn-winter, year 29, issue 4, 108–111, ed. by Prof. Dr. Vladislava Felbabov, City Library "Karlo Bijelicki", Sombor, pp. 7–43.
- Šipka 2014: Danko Šipka, *Comprehensive Serbian-Engllsh dictionary*, Prometej, Novi Sad.
- Schlegel 1984: August Wilhelm Schlegel, "The Essence of Greek Tragedy" in: translator Milana Mrazović in: *Theory of Tragedy*, ed. by Zoran Stojanović, Nolit, Belgrade, pp. 75–84.
- Works of the author cited and paraphrased in the monograph:
- Terzić 2023a: Marija Terzić, "Phantom Figures in *Hamlet* and *Death and the Dervish* in: *Matica Srpska Chronicles* 199 (512/3), Novi Sad, pp. 268–283.
- Terzić, 2023b: Marija Terzić, "*Hamlet* and the *Death and the Dervish* in the Context of the Tragedy of Revenge" in: *Bastina*, Priština – Leposavić, volume 33, issue 69, pp. 69–79.

- Terzić 2023c: Marija Terzić, "Measure and Excess: Ahmed Nurudin – Transforming Apollo into Dionysus". In: *Filolog, Journal of Language, Literature and Culture*, Banja Luka, pp. 497–511.
- Terzić, Marija 2022a: "Text, Author, Context: Comparative Parallels of Shakespeare and Selimović, Hamlet, Nurudin, Hamlet and Death and the Dervish" in: *Proceedings of the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Pristina*, 52 (4), pp. 167–183.
- Terzić 2022b: Marija Terzić, "The Mousetrap" in the play *Hamlet* and the novel *Death and the Dervish*" in: *Oktoih: Journal of the Department of Serbian Language and Literature of Matica Srpska*, Društvo članova u Croj Gori XII/13, Podgorica, pp. 115–128.

14. BIBLIOGRAPHY IN SERBIAN

- Примарна литература:

Шекспир 2022, Вилијам Шекспир, *Велике њдрагеије: Хамлеи, Краљ Лир, Маибет, Оиело*, превод и напомене Живојин Симић и Сима Пандуровић, Београд: Вулкан, 2002, стр. 9–138.

Селимовић 2004: Меша Селимовић, *Дервиш и смрт* (приредио и поговор написао Александар Јерков), НИН, Београд.

- Секундарна литература:

- а) Литература о животу и делу Вилијама Шекспира са посебним освртом на драму *Хамлеи*:

Бајић, 1967: Stanislav Bajić, „Drugi o Hamletu i Hamlet o sebi”, *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, Josip Kulundžić (ur.), godina III, knjiga I, boj 3, мај–јун 1967, специјални број, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, стр. 9–325.

Бечановић-Николић 2013: Зорица Бечановић-Николић, *У њдраању за Шекспиром*, Досије студио, Београд.

Bećanović-Nikolić 2007: Zorica Bećanović-Nikolć, *Šekspir iza ogledala : sukob interpretacija u recepciji Šekspirovih istorijskih drama u dva-desetom veku*, Geopoetika: Beograd.

Блум 2008: Харолд Блум (Harold Bloom), *Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Hamlet*, edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom, Bloom's Literary Criticism, An imprint of Infobase Publishing, Bloom's Shakespeare Through the Ages: Hamlet Copyright © 2008

- by Infobase Publishing Introduction © 2008 by Harold Bloom; Bloom's Literary Criticism An imprint of Infobase Publishing 132 West 31st Street New York NY 10001 Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Hamlet / edited and with an introduction by Harold Bloom. p. cm. — (Bloom's Shakespeare through the ages) Includes bibliographical references and index. ISBN 978-0-7910-9592-8 (hc : alk. paper) 1. Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616. Hamlet. 2. Hamlet (Legendary character) 3. Tragedy. I. Bloom, Harold. PR2807.H2623725 2008 822.3'3—dc22 2007050853 best_hamlet_resource_critical_theory.pdf (weebly.com) http://misscp.weebly.com/uploads/3/1/1/2/31129815/best_hamlet_resource_critical_theory.pdf , приступљено 14. новембра 2021. год.
- Bredli 1984: A.S. Bredli, „Hegelova teorija tragedije”, preveo Miodrag Radović, *Teorija tragedije*, prir. Zoran Stojanović, Beograd, Nolit, стр. 58–75.
- Bredli, 1984: A.S. Bredli, „Suštastvo Šekspirove tragedije”, preveo Miodrag Radović, *Teorija tragedije*, priredio Zoran Stojanović, Beograd, Nolit, стр. 557–581.
- Brkić 1959: Svetozar Brkić, „Engleska renesansna tragedija” u: *Engleske renesanse tragedije*, Nolit, Beograd, стр. 5–27.
- Батс 2002: С. Батс, „Introduction”, William Shakespeare, *Hamlet* (ed. by Cedric Watts), Wordsworth classics, ISBN 9781853260094, Wordsworth Editions Limited, стр. 9–25.
- Визер 2002: Визер Харолд, „Увод”, *Домейи*, часопис за културу, пролеће-лето-јесен-зима, год. 29, четвороброј, 108–111, приредила проф. др Владислава Фелбаов, Сомбор, Градска библиотека „Карло Бијелицки”, стр. 59–68.
- Vigotski, Lav. Psihologija umetnosti, (prev. Jovan Janićijević), Beograd, NOLIT, 1975. Šofranac, Nataša. *Motiv ludila kod junaka četiri ve-like tragedije Vilijama Šekspira – Hamlet, Magbet, Otelo, i kralj Lir*, doktorska disertacija, Beograd, Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SO-FRANAC.pdf>

- Вукчевић 2007: Р. Вукчевић, „Путевима новог историзма” (интервју са Стивеном Гринблатом). *Зборник Мајице српске за књижевност и језик*, књига LV, свеска 1/2007, https://www.maticasrpska.org.rs/stariSajt/casopisi/knjizevnost_55-1.pdf
приступљено 28. августа 2024. год, стр. 131–135.
- Gardner 1967: H. Gardner, „Hamlet i tragedija osvetnika”. *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, preveo Đorđe Krivokapić, Josip Kulundžić (ur.), godina III, knjiga I, boj 3, maj–jun 1967, specijalni broj, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, стр. 362–370.
- Grinblat 2020, S. Grinblat, „Iskošena perspektiva“ u: *Tiranin: Šekspir o politici*, Beograd, Vulkan, 2020, стр. 7–29.
- Grinblat 2006: Stiven Grinblat *Vil iz Stratforda : kako je Šekspir postao Šekspir*, prevod Dragana Govedarica, biblioteka lica i naličja, knjiga br. 6, Београд, PortaLibris.
- Гринблат, Стивен. „Култура”, Превод Владимир Гвозден у: *Злајина іреда*: Лист за књижевност, уметност, културу и мишљење 37 (нов. 2004): стр. 40–43 у: Алексић, Јана. „Нови историзам и културни материјализам у српској књижевној мисли” у: *Књижевна Историја* (0350–6428), 54/177 (2022), Институт за књижевност и уметност Београд, 2022, / оригинални научни рад 82.09”19/20”821.163.41.09”19/20”<https://doi.org/10.18485/kis.2022.54.177.2> ; приступљено 20. августа 2024. године; <https://doi.fil.bg.ac.rs/pdf/journals/kis/2022-177/kis-2022-54-177-2.pdf> , стр. 33–60.
- Гринблат, Стивен. „Ка поетици културе”. Превод Зоран Пауновић у: *Дометии*, часопис за културу, пролеће-лето-јесен-зима, год. 29, четвороброј, 108–111, приредила проф. др Владислава Фелбабов, Градска библиотека „Карло Бијелицки”, Сомбор, 2002, стр. 43–58. Фелбабов, Владислава. „Нови историзам” у: *Дометии*, часопис за културу, пролеће-лето-јесен-зима, год. 29, четвороброј, 108–111, приредила проф. др Владислава Фелбабов, Сомбор, Градска библиотека „Карло Бијелицки”, 2002, стр. 7–42.
- Гринблат 2011: Стивен Гринблат, *Самообликовање у ренесанси: од Мора до Шекспира*, превеле Невена Мрђеновић и Јелена Стакић,, Београд, Clio, 2011.

- Greenblatt 2011: Stephen Greenblatt, *Hamlet in Purgatory*, Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2011. Spremić, Milica. *Politika, subverzija, moć: novoistorijska tumačenja Šekspirovih velikih tragedija*, Beograd, Zadužbina Andrejević, 2011.
- Dollimore 1984, Dollimore J. Radical Tragedy: Religion, ideology and power in: *The Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries*. U: Grubačić, Slobodan, *Aleksandrijski svetionik: tumačenja književnosti od aleksandrijske škole do postmoderne*. Издавачка књижарница Зорана стојановића, Сремски Карловци – Нови Сад, 2012.
- Довер 1967: Džon Dover Vilson, *What Happens in Hamlet*, Cambridge at the University Press, the syndics of the Cambridge University Press, First edition, London, Great Britain.
- Klajn 1967: Hugo Klajn, „Šta se zbiva u „Hamletu” u: *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, Josip Kulundžić (ur.), godina III, knjiga I, broj 3, maj–jun 1967, specijalni broj, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, str. 297–309
- Kodon, Karin (Coddon, Karin): „Suche Strange Desygns”; *Madness, Subjectivity and Treason in Hamlet and Elizabethan Culture*, Susan Wofford (ed.), William Shakespeare, Hamlet, str. 388–394 in: Šofranac, Nataša. *Motiv ludila kod junaka četiri velike tragedije Vilijama Šekspira – Hamlet, Magbet, Otelo, i kralj Lir*, doktorska disertacija, Beograd, Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> pristupljeno 3. septembra 2024.
- Koljević 2012: Nikola Koljević, *Šekspir tragičar: Andrićevo remek-delo*, Beograd : Banja Luka : Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Republike Srpske, Službeni glasnik.
- Кољевић 1981: Никола Кољевић, *Шексџир, љраиичар*, Сарајево, „Светлост”, ООУР издавачка дјелатност.
- Koljević 1967: Nikola Koljević, „Hamlet u Šekspirovom dramskom razvoju”u: *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, ur. Josip Kulundžić, godina III, knjiga I, broj 3, specijalni broj, maj–jun 1967, Sterijino pozorje–Novi Sad, str. 353–361.

- Kostić 2011: Rastko Kostić. „U neobaveznoj potrazi za danskim princem”. *Knjiga o Hamletu / Sakso Gramatik ...* [et al.] ; [predgovor, izbor priloga, prevod s danskog i engleskog] Rastko Kostić, Krug Commerce, Beograd.
- Kostić 1982: Veselin Kostić u: *Engleska književnost Knjiga I (650-1700)*, IGKRO, „Svjetlost, OOUR Zavod za udžbenike, Sarajevo, Izdavačka radna organizacija , Beograd, Nolit, 1979.
- Kostić 1982: Veselin Kostić, *Hamlet Viljema Šekspira: portret književnog dela* Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd.
- Kostić 1983: Veselin Kostić, *Šekspirov život i svet*, Naučna knjiga, Beograd.
- Kostić 2010: Veselin. *Šekspirova dramaturgija*, Stubovi kulture, Beograd.
- Kot 1990: Jan Kot, *Šekspir naš savremenik*, preveo Petar Vujičić, Sarajevo, „Svjetlost”, Izdavačka radna organizacija OOUR, Izdavačka djelatnost Sarajevo.
- Kot 1967: Jan Kot, „Hamlet i Oresti”u: *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, preveo s poljskog Petar Vujičić, Josip Kulundžić (ur.), godina III, knjiga I, broj 3, maj–jun 1967, specijalni broj, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, str. 309–325.
- Marić 2015: Jasminka Marić, *Filozofija u Hamletu*, Beograd, Alfa univerzitet, Fakultet za strane jezike, Beograd.
- Milanović 2009: Vujadin Milanović, *Hamlet u srpskoj književnoj kritici*, Srpska Evropa, Beograd.
- Milošević 1966: Nikola Milošević, „Predgovor“ u: Viljem Šekspir, *Hamlet*, preveli Živojin Simić i Sima Pandurović, Nolit, Beograd.
- Nutatll, Anthony D.: Shakespeare the Thinker, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2007. Šofranac, Nataša. *Motiv ludila kod junaka četiri velike tragedije Vilijama Šekspira – Hamlet, Magbet, Otelu, i kralj Lir*, doktorska disertacija, Beograd, Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SO-FRANAC.pdf> pristupljeno 3. septembra 2024.
- Pari 1967: Žan Pari, „Hamlet ili ličnost sina” u: *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, prevela Mirjana Miočinović, Josip Kulundžić (ur.), godina III, knjiga I, broj 3, maj–jun 1967, specijalni broj, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, str. 387–395.

- Rajter 1967. En Rajter (Anne Righter). „Hamlet and the Contemporary Stage”. „Power of Illusion”. *Shakespeare and the idea of the play*, Penguin Books in association with Chatto & Windus, First published by Chatto & Windus 1962, Penguin Books, Ltd. Penguin Shakespeare library, PSL I, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England, Penguin Books Inc., 3300 Clipper Mill Road, Baltimore II, Md, U.S.A. penguin Books Australia Ltd., Ringwood, Victoria, Australia, copyright Anne Righter, 1962, published in Penguin Shakespeare Library 1967, str. 138–147.
- Robertson 1923: Robertson John Mackinnon: Hamlet Once More, London, Richard Cobden-Sanderson, 1923. Šofranac, Nataša. *Motiv ludila kod junaka četiri velike tragedije Vilijama Šekspira – Hamlet, Magbet, Otel, i kralj Lir*, doktorska disertacija, Beograd, Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> pristupljeno 3. septembra 2024.
- Sahlins 1975: Marshal Sahlins, *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago. University of Chicago Press, VIII, 55. Нови историзам” у: *Домейи*, часопис за културу, пролеће-лето-јесен-зима, год. 29, четвороброј, 108–111, приредила проф. др Владислава Фелбабов, Сомбор, Градска библиотека „Карло Бијелички”, 2002, (str. 26).
- Spremić 2011: Milica Spremić, *Politika, subverzija, moć: novoistorijska tumačenja Šekspirovih velikih tragedija*, Beograd, Zadužbina Andrejević.
- Strir 1982. Ričard Strir (Strier, Richard) (1982). Identity and Power in Tudor England: Stephen Greenblatt, Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare Author(s): Richard Strier Source: boundary 2, Vol. 10, No. 3 (Spring, 1982), pp. Published by: Duke University Press Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/302803> Accessed: 08-03-2018 02:20 UTC; pp. 383–394. <http://simonestok.com/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/identityandpowerintudorenglandstephengreenblattrenaissanceselffashioning.pdf> ; приступљено 4/8/2024.
- Стефановић 2013: Светислав Стефановић, „Увод”у: Шекспир, Виљем, *Хамлеј: краљевић Данске*, превод: Светислав Стефановић, Крагујевац, Имприја књига, 2013, стр. 5–17.

- Tennenhouse 1986: L Tennenhouse, *Power on Display: The Politics of Shakespeare's Genres*, New York and London, Methuen, 1986.
- Spremić, Milica. *Politika, subverzija, moć: novoistorijska tumačenja Šekspirovih velikih tragedija*, Beograd, Zadužbina Andrejević, 2011.
- Ferguson 1967: Frensis Ferguson, „Hamlet, kraljević Danske: analogija radnje” u: *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, prevela s engleskog Marta Frajnd, stihove preveli Živojin Simić i Sima Pandurović, Josip Kulundžić (ur.), godina III, knjiga I, broj 3, maj–jun 1967, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, str. 337–352.
- Фелбабов, Владислава. „Нови историзам”у: *Домейни*, часопис за културу, пролеће-лето-јесен-зима, год. 29, четвороброј, 108–111, приредила проф. др Владислава Фелбабов, Сомбор, Градска библиотека „Карло Бијелички”, 2002, стр. 7–42.
- Хибард 1987: Г. Р. Хибард (Hibbard, G. R) (ed). *The Oxford Shakespeare: Hamlet*, Oxford world's classics, General Editor Stanley Wells, Oxford University Press, 1987, pp. 1–66.
- Holdernes 2000: Graham Holderness, *Shakespeare: The Histories*, St. Martin's Press, New York 2000, 12, у: Zorica Bečanović-Nikolić, *Šekspir iza ogledala : sukob interpretacija u recepciji Šekspirovih istorijskih drama u dvadesetom veku*, Geopoetika, Beograd, 2007.
- Hristić 1967: Jovan Hristić, „Hamletovo pitanje”. U: *Scena*, časopis za pozorišnu umetnost, Josip Kulundžić (ur.), godina III, knjiga I, broj 3, maj–jun 1967, Sterijino pozorje – Novi Sad, str. 371–387.
- Ђосовић 2020: Татјана Ђосовић, *Мотив слободе код јунака Шекспирових трагедија Хамлет, Отело, Краљ Лир и Мајбей у егзистенцијалистичком и хришћанском кључу*, докторска дисертација, Београд, 2020.
- Šofranac 2013(a): Nataša Šofranac, *Motiv ludila kod junaka četiri velike tragedije Vilijama Šekspira – Hamlet, Magbet, Otel, i kralj Lir*, doktorska disertacija, Beograd, Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, 2013a. <http://doiserbia.nb.rs/phd/fulltext/BG20130918SOFRANAC.pdf> pristupljeno 3. septembra 2024.
- Šofranac 2013(b): Nataša Šofranac, „Umobolnik, ljubavnik i pesnik”: mentalni poremećaji Šekspirovih tragičnih junaka”, *Komunikacija*

- i kultura online*, Godina IV, broj 4, 20136, <https://www.komunikacijaikultura.org/index.php/kk/article/view/121/88>, pristupljeno 27. februara 2022. god, str. 96–108.
- Šofranac 2011: Nataša Šofranac, „*Milica Spremić, Politika, subverzija, moć: novoistorijska tumačenja Šekspirovih tragedija*”, Beograd: Zadužbina Andrejević, 2011, str. 124 u: *Philologia*, 2011, 9, <https://philologia.org.rs/index.php/ph/issue/view/10/8> pristupljeno 27. avgusta 2024, str. 153–161.
- (6) Литература о животу и делу Меше Селимовића са посебним освртом на роман *Дервиш и смрт*
- Андрејевић 1996: Даница Андрејевић, *Поеџика Меше Селимовића*, Просвета, Београд.
- Ахметагић 2010: Јасмина Ахметагић, „Приватно и јавно у Селимовићевим романима „Дервиш и смрт“ и „Тврђава“ у: *Сјоменица Меше Селимовића поводом сјоменичне рођења (1910–2010)*, Предраг Палавестра (ур.), Српска академија наука и уметности, Београд, научни скупови, Књига CXXXIX, одељење језика и књижевности, Књига 22, стр. 145–155.
- Bogićević 1973: Miodrag Bogićević, „„Derviš i smrt” Meše Selimovića (Izraz, Sarajevo, 1967, XI, knj. XXI, br. 1, str. 59–69) u: Lagumdžija, Razija, *Kritičari o Meši Selimoviću sa autobiografijom*, „Svjetlost”, Izdavačko preduzeće, Sarajevo, 1973, str. 46–55.
- Вучковић 2014: Радован Вучковић, „Српски роман у контексту егзистенцијалистичког романа” у: Меша Селимовић, Јован Делић (пр.), Издавачки центар Матице српске, Антологијска едиција Десет векова српске књижевности, књ. 66, Нови Сад, 2014, 521–527
- Глушчевић 1981: Зоран Глушчевић, „Између догме и ништавила”, стр. 2030–2055 у: *Књижевност* 11, Издавачка радна организација „Просвета”, Београд.
- Dedović 2012: Nedžad Dedović, „Represija kao dio diskursa moći u romanima Meše Selimovića”, <https://www.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/> Приступљено 1. августа 2024.

- Делић 2014: Јован Делић, „Златна деценија Меше Селимовића” у: *Меша Селимовић*, Јован Делић (пр.), Издавачки центар Матице српске, Антологијска едиција Десет векова српске књижевности, књ. 66, Нови Сад, стр. 7–33.
- Делић 2021: Јован Делић, „Поетичка и тематска прожимања Андрићеве и Селимовићеве прозе” у: *Зборник радова са научној скупи одржаног 17. јула 2020. у Андрићевом институту*, Александра Вранеш (ур.), Андрићев институт, Андрићград, Вишеград, стр. 7–40. <https://www.andricevinstitut.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/%D0%9F%D0%9E%D0%95%D0%A2%D0%98%D0%A7%D0%9A%D0%90-%D0%98-%D0%A2%D0%95%D0%9C%D0%90%D0%A2%D0%A1%D0%9A%D0%90-%D0%9F%D0%A0%D0%9E%D0%96%D0%98%D0%9C%D0%90%D0%8A%D0%90-%D0%90%D0%9D%D0%94%D0%A0%D0%98%D0%8B%D0%95%D0%92%D0%95-%D0%98-%D0%A1%D0%95%D0%9B%D0%98%D0%9C%D0%9E%D0%92%D0%98%D0%8B%D0%95%D0%92%D0%95-%D0%B7%D0%B1%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%BA-%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B4%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0-%D0%9E%D0%B4%D1%98.-%D0%B7%D0%B0-%D0%BA%D1%9A%D0%B8%D0%B6%D0%B5%D0%B2%D0%BD%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%82.pdf> приступљено 3. септембра 2024.
- Ђорђевић 1996: Часлав Ђорђевић, „Дервиш и Христос : једно непрочитано место у роману *Дервиш и смрт* Меше Селимовића”, у: *Лейбойс Матице српске*, Год. 172, књ. 458, св. 6, стр. 860–891.
- Егерић 2000: Мирослав Егерић, *Дух и чин : есеји о романима Меше Селимовића*, ИТП „Змај”, Нови Сад – Бања Лука, 2000.
- Егерић 2010: Мирослав Егерић, „Догма и појединачни живот у роману *Дервиш и смрт*”, у: *Сјоменица Меше Селимовића*, Српска академија наука и уметности, научни скупови, Књига СХХХХ, Одељење језика и књижевности, Књига 22, Београд, стр. 93–99.
- Егерић 1982: Мирослав Егерић, *Дервиш и смрт Меше Селимовића*, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, Београд.

- Јерков 1993: Александар Јерков, *Особености и приповедачкој њосиуика у романима Иве Андрића, Владана Деснице, Меше Селимовића, Милоша Црњанској и Данила Киша* : (видови иманентне поетике) : докторска дисертација, Београд : [А.М. Јерков],
- Јерков 2004: Александар Јерков, „Златна деценија Меше Селимовића” у: Селимовић, Меша, *Дервиш и смрт*, НИН, Београд, стр. 413–433.
- Jerotić 1973: Vladeta. Jerotić, „O nekim metamorfozama „individuationog procesa” u romanu „Derviš i smrt” Meše Selimovića” (Esej: Književne novine, I-II-1969. god.) u: *Kritičari o Meši Selimoviću sa autobiografijom*, priredila Razija Lagumdžija, Svjetlost, Izdavačko preduzeće, Sarajevo, str. 67–74.
- Кецмановић 2010: Владимир Кецмановић, „Преимућства бекства у алегорију”, *Сјоменица Меше Селимовића њоводом сјојо-дишњице рођења (1910–2010)*, Београд, Српска академија наука и уметности, научни скупови, Књига CXXXIX, одељење језика и књижевности, Књига 22: 2010, стр. 169–173.
- Kovač 1999: Nikola Kovač, *Politički logos i romaneskni mitos* у: Novi izraz. Sarajevo: Pen Centar Bosne Hercegovine. Br. 6 (digitalno izdanje), 1999. У: Nedžad Dedović, „Represija kao dio diskursa моћи u romanima Meše Selimovića, 2012. [https://www.tacno.net/novosti/represija – kao – dio – diskursa – moci – u – romanima – mese – selimovica/](https://www.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/)
- Kovač 2005: Nikola Kovač, *Politički roman-fikcije totalitarizma*. Sarajevo: Armis Print, 2005, у: Nedžad Dedović, „Represija kao dio diskursa моћи u romanima Meše Selimovića, 2012. [https://www.tacno.net/novosti/represija – kao – dio – diskursa – moci – u – romanima – mese – selimovica/](https://www.tacno.net/novosti/represija-kao-dio-diskursa-moci-u-romanima-mese-selimovica/)
- Kordić 1975: Radoman. Kordić, *Arheologija književnog dela*. Prosveta, Beograd, 1975.
- Lagumdžija 1986: Razija Lagumdžija (pr.) *Djelo Meše Selimovića u književnoj kritici*. Sarajevo: Oslobođenje 1986 у: Nedžad Dedović, „Represija kao dio diskursa моћи u romanima Meše Selimovića,

Skakić 1976: Mirko Skakić, *Književno delo Meše Selimovića*, Petar Kočić, Beograd.

(в) Литература о Ничеовој филозофији:

Vatimo 2011: Đani Vatimo, *Subjekat i maska: Niče i problem oslobođenja*, preveo Saša Hrnjez, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad.

Vivarelli 1998: V. Vivarelli, „Nietzsche und die Masken des freien Geistes. Montaigne, Pascal und Sterne, Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann“, 1998, стр. 15 у: Радојчић, Саша, „Ничеове маске – оглед о перспективизму“, Универзитет уметности у Београду, Факултет ликовних уметности, Београд, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0023-5164/2017/0023-51641755076R.pdf> 2017, приступљено 27. фебруара 2022. год, стр. 76–88.

Đurić 1998: Miloš Đurić, „Fridrih Niče i Helenska kultura“, Niče, Fridrih, *Spisi o grčkoj književnosti i filozofiji*, knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad, 1998.

Ђурић 1997, Михаило Ђурић, *Ниче и мейџафизика*, Изабрани списи, Књига VII, НИУ Службени лист СРЈ, Терсит, Београд.

Klass, T. N. Von Peitschen und Masken. Nietzsches Suche nach Strategien der Selbst-Anrührung, in: Masken und Maskierungen, ed. Schäfer, A. and Wimmer, M. (2000), Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedia, pp. 266–267 у: Радојчић, Саша, „Ничеове маске – оглед о перспективизму“, Универзитет уметности у Београду, Факултет ликовних уметности <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0023-5164/2017/0023-51641755076R.pdf> , 2017, 76–88, приступљено 27. фебруара 2022. год, стр. 76–88

Niče 2020: Fridrih Niče, *Rođenje tragedije*, prevela Vera Stojić, Dereta, Beograd.

Niče 1998: Fridrih Niče, *Spisi o grčkoj književnosti i filozofiji*, preveli Tomislav Bekić... [et al.], Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad.

Радојчић 2017: Саша Радојчић, „Ничеове маске – оглед о перспективизму“, Универзитет уметности у Београду, Факултет лико-

- вних уметности, Београд, DOI 10.5937/kultura1755076R УДК 14:929 Ниче Ф. 255.2:1 оригиналан научни рад, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0023-5164/2017/0023-51641755076R.pdf>, 2017, приступљено 27. фебруара 2022. год., стр. 76–88
- Fink 1981: Eugen Fink, *Nietzscheova filozofija*, Biblioteka znaci, velika edicija knjiga, Centar za kulturnu djelatnost, Zagreb.
- Остало:
- Алексић 2022: Јана Алексић, „Нови историзам и културни материјализам у српској књижевној мисли” у: *Књижевна Историја* (0350–6428), 54/177 (2022), Институт за књижевност и уметност Београд, 2022, / оригинални научни рад 82.09”19/20”821.163.41.09”19/20”<https://doi.org/10.18485/kis.2022.54.177.2> ; приступљено 20. августа 2024. године; <https://doi.fil.bg.ac.rs/pdf/journals/kis/2022-177/kis-2022-54-177-2.pdf>, стр. 33–60.
- Altiser 2009: Luj Altiser, *Ideologija i državni ideološki aparati: (beleške za istraživanje)*, preveo Andrija Filipović, Karpos, Loznica.
- Андрејевић 2010: Ана Андрејевић, „Настанак драмске књижевне форме у антици и њен утицај на енглеску ренесансну драму” УДК: 821.111.09-2”15/16”; 821.124’02.09-2+821.14’02.09-2 Универзитет у Приштини са привременим седиштем у Косовској Митровици, Филозофски факултет, Катедра за енглески језик и књижевност, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0354-3293/2010/0354-32931040117A.pdf> приступљено 2. септембра 2024, стр. 117–127.
- Vesić 2013: Violeta M. Vesić, *Novoistorijska tumačenja američke književnosti ustavno-revolucionarnog perioda*, Beogradski univerzitet, Filološki fakultet, Beograd <https://nardus.mpn.gov.rs/bitstream/handle/123456789/4041/Disertacija.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y> приступљено 27. avgust 2024. god.
- Grubačić 2012, Slobodan Grubačić, *Aleksandrijski svetionik : tumačenja književnosti od aleksandrijske škole do postmoderne*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci, Novi Sad.
- Иванов 2017: Вјачеслав Иванов, *Дионис и њрадионизацијсво*, превела Антонина Пантелић, Логос, Београд, 2017.

- Зизјулас 1998: Јован Зизјулас, „Од маске до личности”, превод са грчког Епископ Амфилохије, Платонски ерос и хришћанска љубав, Јоанис Сикуртис, превод. Атанасије Јевтић, ур. Јереј Милорад Средојевић, мала библиотека свечаник, хришћанска мисао, Универзитетски образовани православни богослови, Хиландарски фонд, Задужбина „Николај Велимировић и Јустин Поповић”, Србиње – Београд – Ваљево – Минхен.
- Jaspers 1984: Karl Jaspers, „Tragično znanje”, preveo Sreten Marić u: Stojanović, Zoran (pr.), *Teorija tragedije*, Nolit, Beograd, 232–248.
- Kovač 1988: Nikola Kovač, *Roman, istorija, politika*, SOUR „Veselin Masleša”, IRO „Sarajevo”, OOUR Izdavačka djelatnost, Sarajevo.
- Kovač 1975: Nikola Kovač, *Sukob bića i ideala: alijenacija u djelu Albera Kamija*, „Svjetlost”, Izdavačko preduzeće, Sarajevo.
- Lešić 2003: Zdenko Lešić, *Novi istoricizam i kulturni materijalizam*, Narodna knjiga, Alfa, Beograd, 2003.
- Malrije 1982: Filip Malrije, „Identitet: pojmovi i koncepcija*”u: *Kultura: časopis za teoriju i sociologiju kulture i kulturnu politiku* br.59, prev. Dragan Minderović, Zavod za proučavanje kulturnog razvitka, Beograd, <https://www.casopiskultura.rs/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Kultura%20broj%2059.pdf> pristupljeno 27. februara 2022. god, str.19–36.
- Milić 2000: Novica Milić, *Predavanja o čitanju*, Narodna knjiga / Alfa, Beograd.
- Milošević 1965: Nikola Milošević, *Negativan junak*, Vuk Karadžić, Beograd.
- НОВА Larousse енциклопедија у три тома, 3 (N-Ž), прев. Зорица Божић .. et al., издавач Земун : ЈРЈ (Београд : Публикум), 1999.
- Пехтер 2002: Едвард Пехтер, „Нови историзам и његова незадовољства: политизација ренесансне драме”. У: *Домейни*, часопис за културу, пролеће-лето-јесен-зима, год. 29, четвороброј, 108–111, приредила проф. др Владислава Фелбаов, Сомбор, Градска библиотека „Карло Бијелицки”, 107–132.
- Злопаша 2015: Срђа Злопаша, „Субјективност у психоанализи и психијатрији”, Клиника за психијатрију, Клинички центар

- Србије, Београд, Србија, Енграми, вол. 37, јануар-март 2015, бр. 1, 63–74, <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0351-2665/2015/0351-26651501063Z.pdf>, приступљено 27. фебруара 2022. год.
- Stajin 2007: Marej Stajin, *Jungova mapa duše*, prev. Žanet Prinčevac de Villablanca, Laguna, Beograd.
- Стојнов 1999: Душан Стојнов, „Идентитет: полифрен или монолитан?“, у: *Psihologija* 1999, 3-4, UDK 159.922.4.072(=861) Одељење за психологију, Филозофски факултет, Београд, 1999. <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/0048-5705/1999/0048-57059903141S.pdf> приступљено 1. марта 2022. год., стр. 141–156.
- Танасковић 2018: Дарко Танасковић, *Ислам: гоџа и живоић*, 3. допуњено издање, Српска књижевна задруга, Београд.
- Tomović 1989: Slobodan Tomović, *Junak apsurdna*, Pobjeda, Titograd.
- Фелбабов 2002: Владислава Фелбабов, „Нови историзам“. У: *Дометии*, часопис за културу, пролеће-лето-јесен-зима, год. 29, четвороброј, 108–111, приредила проф. др Владислава Фелбабов, Градска библиотека „Карло Бијелицки“, Сомбор, стр. 7–43.
- Шипка 2014: Данко Шипка, *Велики српско-енглески речник*, Прометеј, Нови Сад.
- Šlegel 1984: A.V. Šlegel, „Suština grčke tragedije“u: prevelar Milana Mrazović u: *Teorija tragedije*, priredio Zoran Stojanović, Nolit, Beograd, 75–84.
- Радови ауторке цитирани и парафразирани у монографији:
- Терзић 2023а: Марија Терзић, „Фантомске подобе у *Хамлеју* и *Дервишу* у: *Летњојис Мајице српске*, 199 (512/3), Нови Сад, стр. 268–283.
- Терзић, 2023б: Марија Терзић, „*Хамлеј* и *Дервиш* у: *Хамлеј и Дервиш и смрт* у контексту трагедије освете“у: *Башићина*, Приштина–Лепосавић, волумен 33, свеска 69, стр. 69–79.
- Терзић 2023в: Марија Терзић, „Мера и прекомерност: Ахмед Нурудин – преображај Аполона у Диониса“. У: *Филолој*, часопис за језик, књижевност и културу, Бањалука, стр. 497–511.

Терзић, Марија 2022а: Марија Терзић, „Текст, аутор, контекст: компаративне паралеле Шекспира и Селимовића, Хамлета и Ахмеда Нурудина, *Хамлеџа и Дервиша и смрти*” у: *Зборник радова Филозофској факултету Универзитета у Приштини*, 52 (4), ISBN 0354-3293, 2020, стр. 167–183.

Терзић 2022б: Марија Терзић, „Мишоловка” у драми *Хамлеј* и роману *Дервиш и смрт* у: *Окџоих: Часопис Одељења за српски језик и књижевност Мајнице српске*, XII/13, Подгорица, стр. 115–128.

15. INDEX OF NAMES

- Ahmetagić, Jasmina 12, 17
 Aleksić, Jana 57–61
 Althusser, Louis (Altiser, Luj) 37, 38, 61, 71, 76, 77, 85, 71, 203, 204, 274, 344
 Andrejević, Ana 108, 109, 120, 121, 134
 Andrejević, Danica 96, 241, 242, 454
 Andrič, Ivo 374
 Apollo (Apolon) 17, 24, 240, 244, 245, 255, 281, 287, 341, 342, 345, 352, 359
 Aposlte Paul (sveti apostol Pavle) 74
 Archbishop Edwin Sandys (nadbiskup Sendis, Edvin) 74
 Bacon, Francis (Bejkon, Fransis) 367
 Bajić, Stanislav 209, 400, 422, 423
 Bandello, Matteo (Bandelo, Mateo) 115
 Bečanović-Nikolić, Zorica 17, 22, 31, 33, 34, 45, 47, 49, 50, 54, 58, 60, 61, 69, 76, 77, 87, 88, 92, 96, 143, 178, 202, 227, 244, 406, 471,
 Belleforest de, Francois 16, 90, 114, 115, 116, 117
 Belsey, Catherine (Belsi, Ketrin) 203, 204
 Bloom, Harold 12, 35, 359, 438, 439
 Bolingbroke, Henry, Henry IV of England (Henri IV Lankaster) 87, 88
 Boone, James 60
 Bradley, A.C. (A.S. Bredli) 13, 279, 280–285, 287–290, 400, 427, 436, 480, 482
 Bradocke, Richard (Bredok, Ričard) 115
 Brajović, Tihomir 58
 Brannigan, John 260
 Brkić, Svetozar 119, 120, 258
 Bogićević, Miodrag 107, 311
 Bulatović, Boris 58
 Carey, Henri 80
 Codon, Catherine () 414
 Cooper, R. Henry Jr. 21, 80
 Crist, Jesus (Isus Hrist) 74
 Crowell Oliver (Kromvel, Oliver) 77
 Čosović, Tatjana 289, 444
 Decartes, René (Dekart, Rene) 191, 192, 474

- Dedović, Nedžad 91, 94, 128, 130, 166, 245
- Delić, Jovan 18, 25, 98, 99, 185, 233, 359, 361
- Dickens, Charles (Dikens, Čarls) 115
- Dollimore, Jonathan (Dolimor, Džonatan) 57, 76, 259
- Dorđević, Časlav 385–387
- Douglas, Mary 60
- Dyonis (Dionis) 17, 24, 341, 342, 345, 347, 350, 352, 357
- Đurić, Mihailo 19, 23, 30, 189–193, 222, 223, 235, 247, 250, 253, 344, 349, 352, 355–357, 359 – 361, 468
- Egerić, Miroslav 92, 93, 146, 159, 161, 172, 181, 238, 294, 307, 387
- Elizabeth I, the Queen (Elizabeta I Tjudor) 42, 45 87, 88, 145
- Aeschylus (Eshil) 122
- Espen, Hammer (Espen, Hamer) 17
- Euripides (Euripid) 122
- Felbabov, Vladislava 41, 44, 47, 48, 50–55, 58, 61, 62, 64, 65
- Fergusson, Francis (Ferguson, Francis) 27
- Fink, Eugen 278, 308
- Foucault, Michael (Fuko, Mišel) 68, 70, 85–87, 413, 414
- Gallagher, Kathryn (Galager, Ketrin) 52, 70
- Gardner, Helen 134, 423, 450
- Gerald, Graf (Džerald Graf) 58
- Gertz, Clifford (Gerc, Kliford) 60, 61, 70
- Gianterasio, Vattimo 31, 37, 173, 182, 187, 222, 230, 235, 237, 343, 350
- Gluščević, Zoran 268, 272, 273, 301, 305, 446
- Grammaticus, Saxo (Gramatik, Saks) 16, 116–118
- Greenblatt, Stephen 15, 41, 48, 49–53, 55, 56, 58–60, 62–64, 70–72, 74, 75, 78, 80–87, 91, 92, 113, 114, 118, 135, 144–146, 149, 153, 156, 362, 363, 365–369, 374, 419, 427
- Grubačić, Slobodan 64, 70, 76, 222, 469, 470
- Gvozden, Vladimir 58
- Hathway, Anne 473
- Hegel, Friedrich Wilhelm Georg (Georg Vilhelm Fridrih Hegel) 282
- Henry VII (Henri VII Tjudor) 87, 88
- Henry VIII (Henri VIII Tjudor) 87, 88
- Herder von, Gottfried Johann (Johan Gotfrid fon Herdder) 54
- Hibbard, George Richard 372, 374
- Holderness, Graham 45
- Ив́анов, Ив́анович Вячесла́в (Иванов, Вјачеслав) 20, 23–25, 28, 137, 163, 174, 175, 228, 244, 270, 280, 308, 350, 388, 411
- Hristić, Jovan 11, 145, 216, 217, 231, 405, 420

- James I Stuart 42
 Jaspers, Theodor Karl (Karl Jaspers)
 33, 196, 197, 247, 274, 430
 Jerkov, Aleksandar 15, 104, 105, 177
 Jerotić, Vladeta 196
 Jirsak, Mirko 98
- Kant, Immanuel (Immanuel Kant)
 178, 179
 Kašanin, Milan 58
 Kecmanović, Vladimir 90
 Klass, T. N. Von Pietschen und
 Masken 237
 Klein, Hugo (Klajn, Hugo) 16, 19,
 20, 131, 361, 421, 425, 426, 439,
 440, 449
 Koljević, Nikola 26, 134, 137, 142,
 146, 147, 149, 151, 161, 410,
 422–424, 431, 432, 449, 463
 Kordić, Radoman 460, 466
 Kostić, Rastko 107, 108, 115, 120,
 259
 Kostić, Veselin 87, 89, 127, 128, 131,
 132, 134, 138, 140, 150, 152,
 153, 168, 182, 183–186, 234,
 277, 424, 442, 443, 447
 Kott, Jan (Kot, Jan) 13, 82, 91, 144,
 145, 150, 167, 181, 247
 Kovač, Nikola 20, 158, 164, 166, 172
 Kyd, Thomas 16, 90, 107, 111, 112,
 118–121, 123, 125–127, 135
- Lagumdžija, Razija 94, 107, 164, 166,
 196, 299, 307–309, 311, 386
 Lešić, Zdenko 42–45, 48, 56, 58, 64,
 65, 67, 85, 86, 203, 204, 248
 Lodge, Thomas (Lodž, Tomas) 118
- Machiavelli, Niccolò (Makijaveli,
 Nikolo) 13, 36, 142, 143, 151, 153
 Malrije, Filip 200
 Marić, Jasminka 119, 163, 263, 296,
 369, 408, 409, 465
 Marlowe, Christopher 135, 144,
 153, 483
 Meres, Francois 113
 Milanović, Vujadin 107, 143, 216,
 227, 262, 268, 269
 Milić, Novica 33, 177–179, 184, 193,
 241, 247, 251, 261, 262, 272,
 294, 311, 312, 342, 343, 345,
 409, 430, 446, 470
 Milošević, Miloš 101, 102, 167, 171,
 184, 185, 374, 451–453
 Milošević, Nikola 29, 32, 96, 152, 209,
 225, 237, 238, 332, 343, 412,
 427, 429, 456, 465
 Milutinović, Zoran 58
 Miola, Robert 122
 Montaigne de, Michel (Mišel de
 Montenij) 240
 Montrose, Luis (Luis Montrouz)
 50, 51
 More, Thomas (Mor, Tomas) 15, 60,
 71, 92
 Мрђеновић, Невена 75, 83, 85, 86
- Nietzsche, Fridrih 11, 12, 17, 19, 27,
 28, 31, 35, 36, 37, 86, 141, 170,
 173, 175, 186, 189, 190 – 194,
 198, 222, 223, 226, 235 – 237,
 239, 247, 250, 252, 262, 265,
 267, 293, 325, 341, 344, 346,
 349, 351, 352, 355, 359, 361,
 412, 430, 445, 468–470, 474

- Njegoš, Petrović Petar 103
 Norton, Thomas (Norton, Tomas) 135
 Nuttall, A.D. 126
- Palavestra, Predrag 17, 58, 89, 90, 325
 Pandurović, Sima 23, 29, 62, 141, 168, 169, 194, 205, 209, 210, 213, 214, 225, 267, 292, 370, 371, 391–394, 397–400, 405, 417–419, 427, 434, 436, 438, 445, 448, 463
 Pari, Žan 148
 Pavier, Thomas (Tomas Pevier) 115
 Pechter, Edward (Pehter, Edvard) 45, 46, 55, 258
 Pervić, Muharem 307–309, 311
 Petrović, Miodrag 22, 24, 29, 30, 31, 39, 151, 160, 162, 163, 165, 178, 193, 196, 200, 229, 237, 238, 240, 245, 246, 250–252, 286, 287, 291, 292, 294, 298, 300, 301, 304, 306, 309, 313, 320, 329, 334–338, 345, 347, 359, 375–379, 382, 383, 384, 430, 432, 452, 464, 476, 479
 Petrović, Svetozar 58
 Popović, Radovan 39, 325
 Prohić, Kasim 162, 180, 245, 246
 Protić, 94, 164, 166
- Radojčić, Saša 200, 237, 404
 Radulović, Milan 58
 Rahter, Anne (Rajter, En) 213, 214
 Richard II Plantagenet (Richard II of England) 87, 88
- Robertson, J.M. 125
 Sackville, Thomas 135
 Sadler, Hamnet 81
 Sadler, Judith 81
 Sahlins, Marshal 61
 Skakić, Mirko 242
 Chastel, André (Šaštel, Andre) 216
 Schlegel, August Wilhelm (Аугуст Вилхелм Шлегел) 34, 35
 Schopenhauer, Arthur (Šopenhauer, Artur) 265
 Selimović, Meša 12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 24, 32, 52, 62, 63, 80, 82, 88–90, 96–105, 129, 130, 139, 151, 162, 169, 185, 188, 197, 223, 229, 232, 235, 238, 253, 256, 260, 271, 274, 278, 279, 292, 294, 296–299, 302, 303, 309, 310, 313–318, 320–323, 326–330, 333–336, 347, 353, 354, 356, 359, 360, 380, 383, 394, 408, 420, 432, 445, 454–462, 467, 469, 473, 481
 Seneca, Lucius Annaeus (Seneka, Enej Lucije) 13, 108, 134, 135
 Shakespeare, John (Šekspir, Džon) 365, 366
 Shakespeare, William 12, 15, 16, 23, 26, 58, 60, 62, 63, 65, 70, 71, 80–82, 88, 89, 92, 107, 111, 113, 114, 116–119, 121, 125, 127, 131, 133, 135, 136, 141, 142, 144, 146, 147, 149, 157, 168, 169, 180, 181, 194, 205, 206–208, 2019, 210, 211, 212, 214, 225, 235, 240, 243, 253,

- 267, 280, 281, 284, 292, 362, 366, 367, 370, 371, 391–394, 397–399, 400, 405, 417–419, 427, 429, 433, 434, 436, 438, 445, 448, 449, 456, 463, 468, 473, 476, 481
- Simić, Živojin 23, 29, 62, 141, 168, 169, 194, 205, 209, 210, 213, 214, 225, 267, 292, 370, 371, 391–394, 397–400, 405, 417–419, 427, 434, 436, 438, 445, 448, 463
- Sinfeld, Alan (Sinfield, Alan) 76
- Sophocles (Sofokle) 122
- Spenser, Edmund 73
- Spremić, Milica 46, 52, 54–58, 64–66, 70, 76, 77, 86, 87, 138, 163, 170, 259, 365, 368, 369.
- Стакић, Јелена 75, 83, 85, 86
- Stein, Murray (Marej Stajn) 395
- Stojnov, Dušan 228
- Stefanović, Svetislav 110, 267, 268, 476, 477
- Stojanović, Vladan 80, 81, 145, 146, 149, 363, 419, 427
- Stojanović, Zoran 33, 34, 197, 247, 274, 279, 280–285, 288–290, 430, 469
- Strir, Richard 84
- Taletov, S. Petar 263, 265
- Tanasković, Darko 180, 244, 271, 424
- Tennenhouse, Leonard (Lenard Tennenhaus) 63
- Terzić, Marija 160, 341, 342, 380, 381–383, 463, 468, 478, 480
- Tillyard, Eustace Mandeville Wetenhall (E.M.V. Tilijard) 68
- Tomović, Slobodan 376
- Tyndale, William (Tindejl, Vilijam) 74
- Vesić, Violeta 55, 58, 63, 64
- Vivarelli, V. 404
- Vučković, Radovan 18, 25, 89, 90
- Vukčević, Radojka 366, 367
- Vygotski, Semyonovich Lev (Vigotski, Lav) 407
- Williams, Raymond (Vilijams, Rejnolds), 75, 76
- Wilson, Dover (Vilson, Dover) 216
- Veaser, Harold (Vizer, Harold) 40
- Watts, Cedric (Vots, Sedrik) 215, 371–373
- Zlopaša, Srđa 234
- Зизјулас, Јован 202
- Šofranac, Nataša 70, 121–124, 126, 144, 176, 216, 218, 219, 249, 393, 395, 401, 403, 404, 407, 411, 412, 414, 416, 419
- Шипка, Данко 103

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I am extremely thankful to the book reviewers, Professor Zoran Paunović, PhD, full member of SASA, *Department of Language and Literature*, full professor at Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Svetlana Šeatović, PhD, the editor-in-chief of the Poetics edition, and the *Poetics of Modern and Contemporary Literature* department head, Institute for Literature and Art, and Jelena Jovanović, PhD, *Department for Serbian and Comparative Literature*, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Niš for their immense input that made this book better. Their pieces of advice have enhanced my monograph in more ways than I can count. On the other hand, everything that is not good in the book, every spelling, punctuation, quotation or any other kind of error is exclusively due to the author's oversights and omissions. Those are really honest mistakes.

Next, I owe great gratitude to my editor, Aleksandra Kundaković Radojčić, PhD, for her never-ending patience and grace, and, especially, the countless corrections, as well as to Leposava Knežević, who patiently composed this book technically and encouraged me to persevere in this endeavor. I heartwarmingly and wholeheartedly cherish her motivation and kindness.

Moreover, I owe many thanks to Professor Aleksandar Jerkov, PhD, who has been a true friend in the challenging moments when I did not think this book would be published. I am honored that he was on my doctoral dissertation defense committee and that I have the privilege of asking him for advice. Thank you for being there for me, Professor Jerkov! I appreciate it immensely.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my professors at Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Nataša Šofranac, PhD, and Radojka Vukčević, PhD, for the kind-hearted support they have been giving me for years.

In addition, I thank my colleague, Aleksandra Žeželj Kocić, PhD, who offered me selfless help. I feel nothing but sincere respect for her.

I thank my institution, Institute for Literature and Art in Belgrade, headed by Bojan Jović, PhD, the publisher of this book, for giving me the opportunity to continuously improve my professional skills and for providing me with his well-intended suggestions.

I owe Professor Zoran Paunović, PhD, and Svetlana Šeatović, PhD, more gratitude than I can put into words because they have been showing understanding and tolerance for my countless questions, dilemmas, and uncertainties.

Also, this book would not have been possible without the support of Predrag Todorović, PhD, who was my mentor at Institute for Literature and Art in Belgrade.

I owe a big thank you to my colleagues who accepted me as part of the team. It means the world to me, not only professionally but personally as well.

Marija S. Terzić
THE NEW HISTORICIST PARALLELS
OF *HAMLET* AND *DEATH AND THE DERVISH*

Published by
Institute for Literature and Art
Belgrade, Kralja Milana 2
e-mail: ikum@ikum.org.rs
www.ikum.org.rs

For the publisher
Bojan Jović, PhD
Director of Institute for Literature and Art

Editor
Aleksandra Kundaković Radojičić, PhD

Layout
Leposava Knežević

Number of Copies: 150

Printed by
Birograf comp doo Belgrade

ISBN 978-86-7095-355-0

CIP – Каталогизација у публикацији
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

821.111.09-2 Шекспир В.
821.163.41.09-31 Селимовић М.

TERZIĆ, Marija, 1991-

The New Historicist Parallels of "Hamlet" and
"Death and the Dervish" / Marija S. Terzić. - Belgrade
: Institute for literature and art, 2025 (Belgrade :
Birograf). - 523 str. ; 24 cm. - (Book Series Poetika ;
book 16 / [Institute for literature and art])

Tiraž 150. - Napomene i bibliografske reference uz
tekst. - Bibliografija: str. 485-501. - Registar.

ISBN 978-86-7095-355-0

- а) Шекспир, Вилијам (1564-1616) -- "Хамлет"
б) Селимовић, Меша (1910-1982) -- "Дервиш и смрт"

COBISS.SR-ID 170719753