

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/36134> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

**Author:** Zubcevic, Asim

**Title:** Book ownership in Ottoman Sarajevo 1707-1828

**Issue Date:** 2015-11-11

## Introduction

The subject of this dissertation is books and their owners as registered in the inheritance inventories of the Sarajevo *sharī'a* court between 1118-1244/1707-1828. The dissertation seeks to answer three main questions: What kinds of books people were likely to own during that period, what kinds of people those book owners were, and, what the answers to these first two questions tell us about the place of the book in Bosnian culture, especially among Bosnian Muslims, who constitute the vast majority of book owners recorded in the inventories.

Answering these questions has required an examination of the wider social and cultural environment in which the Bosnian written culture of the Ottoman period developed and the related issues of literacy, education, the use of different scripts and languages, the role of scribes and book binders, the introduction of print and the place of the written word in a largely oral society. These broader issues have been addressed only to the extent that they help in answering the main questions.

Book ownership provides a window onto the social history of ideas. Although we cannot know with certainty whether the people who owned a book or a set of books actually read them, book ownership data are still useful to historians as indicators of the reading interests of the owners and of the intellectual climate of their society. Considered as a form of self-expression, book ownership can provide valuable insights into “history from below,” since many book owners were ordinary people, about whom historical sources are often silent.

The present study grew out of an interest in the book collection of a particular Sarajevo *kadi*, Šāliḥ ‘Izzat Ḥromozāde, who registered it as an endowment in 1244/1828.<sup>1</sup> An initial attempt to identify the distinguishing features of the collection soon made clear that to do so in any meaningful way would require comparison with the records for other private book collections and book ownership findings in general. It turned out, however, that no systematic research had ever been conducted into book ownership in Sarajevo, or any other Bosnian town, for that matter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Asim Zubčević, “Doprinos porodice Hromić bosanskoj kulturi knjige u 19. st./The Contribution of the Hromić Family to the Culture of the Book in 19<sup>th</sup> Century Bosnia”, *Baština: godišnjak Komisije za očuvanje nacionalnih spomenika Bosne i Hercegovine/Heritage: Annual, The Commission to Preserve National Monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina* V (2009), pp. 403-435.

## 01. The Present State of Research

This is not to say that the history of book ownership in Bosnia has not elicited scholarly interest. Aside from an article which presents some of the preliminary findings of the present study,<sup>2</sup> there are a number of articles which touch upon the topic of the private book collections, mostly of Sarajevans, registered in inheritance records or in endowment charters (Arabic: *waqfiyyas*; Turkish: *vakıfnāmes*). Some of the collections have even been physically preserved. These articles tend to contain only basic information about the books and their owners, with little attempt to explain the nature of the collections or relate them to other aspects of Bosnian written culture. Nearly all the owners considered came from the scholarly class (*'ulamā'*) and, on the basis of these articles, one would never guess that women and artisans comprised a significant proportion of book owners, much less form a clear view of the range and variety of privately-owned books. At best, these articles offer illustrative examples of the book collections of *'ulamā'*.<sup>3</sup>

Other works also shed a certain light on book ownership, without it being their main focus of interest. One such example would be Yuzo Nagata's *Materials on the Bosnian Notables*, which comprises a transcription and translation of 20 entries from the Sarajevo court's inheritance inventories.<sup>4</sup> As the author himself says, his primary focus is on socio-economic conditions in Sarajevo and, as a result, he does not always provide full information on the

---

<sup>2</sup> Asim Zubčević, "Knjige i njihovi vlasnici prema kassam defterima Sarajevskog suda 1762-1787" [Books and their owners according to the Sarajevo court inheritance inventories 1762-1787], *POF* 60 (2010), pp. 431-450.

<sup>3</sup> Mehmed Mujezinović, "Biblioteka Mehmed-Razi Velihodžića, šejha i muderisa Husrev-begova hanikaha u Sarajevu" [the Library of Mehmed-Razi Velihodžić, the shaykh and *mudarris* of the Hüsrev-bey *khānqāh*], *Anali* V-VI (1978), pp. 65-82; Zejnil Fajić, "Biblioteka šejha Abdurrahmana Sirije sa Oglavka: prilog istoriji bibliotekarstva BiH u XVIII i XIX stoljeću" [the Library of shaykh 'Abd al-Rahmān Sirrī of Oglavak: a contribution to the history of librarianship in Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries], *Anali* XI-XII (1985), pp. 55-68; Hatidža Čar-Drnda, "Neki legati Osman-Šehdijine biblioteke" [Some bequests to the 'Uthmān Shahdī Library], *Anali* XV-XVI (1990), pp. 243-252. The author presents briefly three charters whose texts are preserved in the Sarajevo court registers (*sijills*). These are: the charter of kadi Šāliḥ 'Izzat Ḥromozāde of 9 Muḥarram 1244/22 July 1828 (S66/207, 208), the charter of 'Uthmān-afandī ibn Muḥammad bin 'Abd al-Mu'min of Sarajevo dated 27 Rabī' al-Ākhir 1247/5 October 1831 (S69/82), and the charter of Faḍlī Āgīk al-ḥāj Ibrāhim-āghā of Travnik dated 19 Rabī' al-Ākhir 1258/30 May 1842 (S75/103, 104).

<sup>4</sup> Yuzo Nagata, *Materials on the Bosnian Notables* (Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, 1979).

books he came across.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, a study of Ottoman Bosnian guilds includes a list of books owned by a Sarajevo merchant, without providing much further data.<sup>6</sup> For another example, one can cite Bejtić's study of living standards in 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> century Bosnia.<sup>7</sup>

There is valuable information on book owners to be found in other publications, too. In particular, a Bosnian translation of a late 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> and an early 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century Bosnian chronicle, originally written in Ottoman Turkish, makes multiple references to individuals who also figure in the Sarajevo inheritance records, so that, whenever a person mentioned in the chronicle can be identified with a book owner from those records, the editor notes it in his footnotes.<sup>8</sup>

There are also studies on various aspects of Bosnian book culture in the Ottoman period. One example is Muhamed Ždralović's two-volume study of manuscript copyists,<sup>9</sup> in which the author presents two private book collections by way of illustration.<sup>10</sup> More importantly, the work offers a comprehensive examination of Bosnian Muslim manuscript culture. In a way, the present study on book ownership aims to complement Ždralović's work.

---

<sup>5</sup> "It is beyond the scope of this small publication to introduce all the items recorded in each list. So, in this chapter, items not concerned with their economic activities are omitted, such as books...", Nagata, *Materials*, p. 8.

<sup>6</sup> Hamdija Kreševljaković, "Dženetići" in *Izabrana djela, I* [Selected works] (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1991), p. 362.

<sup>7</sup> Alija Bejtić, "Lični i kućni komfor u Bosni i Hercegovini XVIII vijeka" [Personal and domestic comfort in 18<sup>th</sup> century Bosnia and Herzegovina] *Jugoslovenski istorijski časopis* 3-4 (1974), pp. 147-167.

<sup>8</sup> Mulla Mustafa Ševki Bašeskija, *Ljetopis (1746-1804)*, translation from the Turkish, introduction and notes by Mehmed Mujezinović, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1987). Mehmed Mujezinović (1913-1981) appears to have been collecting this information in preparation for a study on book ownership in Sarajevo. The fate of his notes is unclear. According to his son Mustafa Mujezinović (the Bosnian ambassador to the UK at the time of this dissertation's writing), the notes are now lost. On the history of the term "the Bosnian language", see: Muhamed Hadžijahić, *Od tradicije do identiteta (geneza nacionalnog pitanja bosanskih Muslimana)* [From tradition to identity (the genesis of the Bosnian Muslim national question) (Zagreb: Islamska zajednica Zagreb, 1990), pp. 16-46.

<sup>9</sup> Muhamed Ždralović, *Bosansko-hercegovački prepisivači djela u arabičkim rukopisima, I-II* [Bosnian-Herzegovinian copyists of works in Arabic script manuscripts] (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1988); also quoted in Adam Gacek, *The Arabic Manuscript Tradition: a Glossary of Technical Terms and Bibliography* (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2001), p. 187.

<sup>10</sup> Ždralović, *Bosansko-hercegovački prepisivači*, pp. 41-45. The record for one collection owned by Ismā'il-bey Dženetić (Jannatizāde) goes back to 1191/1777, while the other was owned by Aḥmad Munīb Glođo, who died in exile in 1266/1850. Both were Sarajevans.

Mention has already been made of shorter articles on private book collections, which, however, do not go beyond providing basic information on them or their owners. One notable departure from this limited approach is a recent study of the life of a Sarajevo kadi, whose author uses the kadi's private book collection and especially the notes he left on the margins of his books to reconstruct the world of a low-ranking official in the Ottoman bureaucracy.<sup>11</sup> It is a work of microhistory, in which a private library becomes a window onto the world of its owner.

It goes without saying that Bosnian manuscript library catalogues also provide some information about book owners and book collections. This is especially true of the Gāzī Hüsrev-bey Library in Sarajevo and its manuscript collections, now almost fully catalogued.

Lastly, one comes across bits and pieces of information in unexpected places, for example in a study of the Bosnian border military governors (Turkish: *kapūdāns*):<sup>12</sup> “Although there is no doubt that there were completely illiterate governors, there were also those who were educated in the Oriental way. They were buying and reading books in Arabic, Turkish, and Persian. Among those rare exceptions were governors of Kozarac, Tuzla, and Gradačac and governor Suleyman of Ljubuški. There is a letter from 1819 which refers to book purchases by governor Murat of Gradačac. The library of our former Balkan Institute held a manuscript with notes by a Tuzla captain, including data on reading *siyāqa* (a type of script). The last captain of Počitelj had a fine library. We know that Sulejman, the captain of Ljubuški, bought books at an auction in Sarajevo. These were certainly not the only examples.”<sup>13</sup>

All these works and sources are valuable in their own right, but they do not provide a better or more nuanced understanding of the various dimensions of book ownership in Ottoman Bosnia, nor are they meant to.

---

<sup>11</sup> Tatjana Paić-Vukić, *The World of Mustafa Muhibbi, a Kadi From Sarajevo* (Istanbul: Isis Press, 2011).

<sup>12</sup> Hamdija Kreševljaković, *Kapetanije u Bosni i Hercegovini*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1980). British historian Noel Malcolm defines *kapetan* as follows: “Originally, a military administrator in a frontier zone. Normal meaning in Bosnian history: an administrator of a territorial division of Bosnia, with wide-ranging powers, whose office was hereditary”, Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: a Short History* (London: Macmillan, 1996), p. 299.

<sup>13</sup> Kreševljaković, *Kapetanije u Bosni i Hercegovini*, pp. 64, 65. The writer also draws attention to books kept at an inn (*khān*) in the town of Stolac in southern Bosnia.

## 02. The Main Sources

The lack of an in-depth study of book ownership is not for want of sources. Perhaps the most compelling reason for choosing Sarajevo for a case study in book ownership in Ottoman Bosnia is that, despite the destruction of some of the city libraries during the siege of 1992-95, sufficient documents have nonetheless survived to allow research to go ahead, in particular the Sarajevo court registers (*sijills*).

*Sijills* have long served as major sources of information for historians of the Ottoman Empire. Among the various types of document they contain, the inheritance inventories (also known as *qassām* or *tereke* or *mukhallafāt daftars*) are particularly valuable for shedding light on the material circumstances of Ottoman subjects. Their relevance for our study stems from the fact that, whenever an estate included books, they would be registered by title and value, making inheritance inventories a major source for studying book ownership. *Sijills* also occasionally include deeds issued with regard to a special bequest of books, as was the case with the collection mentioned earlier, or other interesting information, as in the case of one example included in the present study, details relating to litigation over a book. An additional benefit of researching the inventories is that the records generally refer to books which are now lost.

There are 88 surviving *sijills* in the Gāzī Hüsrev-bey Library today. Three date from the 10<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> and the rest from the 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> centuries. The 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> century *sijills* cover the years 1119-21/1707-09 and 1140-41/1727-28. There is then a gap until 1176/1762, from when they run continuously to 1268/1852. Systematic analysis of the inheritance inventories year by year over a long time span allows book ownership patterns to be established and a more rounded picture of the subject to be obtained than sampling would.

Inheritance inventories are not the only primary source of information on book ownership, of course. Ownership seals and notes found on extant manuscripts can also be used in reconstructing book ownership. Such sources have not, however, been used in preparing this study, partly because to do so systematically would have required the examination of thousands of manuscripts.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, the mere fact that extant manuscripts have

---

<sup>14</sup> On the manuscript notes as sources for understanding various aspects of book culture see: Adam Gacek, "Ownership Statements and Seals in Arabic Manuscripts", *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 2 (1987), pp. 88-95; Paić-Vukić, *The World of Mustafa Muhibbi*; Tülün Değrimenci, "Bir kitabı kaç kişi okur? Osmanlı'da okurlar ve okuma biçimleri üzerine bazı gözlemler", *Tarih ve Toplum: Yeni Yaklaşımlar* 13 (Güz, 2011), pp. 7-43; *Manuscript*

survived, which is almost certainly a matter of chance, does not necessarily tell us very much about the prevalence or rarity of particular works and genres at a particular time or place.

Extant book collections are another primary source for book ownership, but, again, their major shortcoming is that they are not representative of the “average” collection or book owner, in the way inheritance inventories are more likely to be.

This is not to suggest that inheritance inventories do not suffer from any drawbacks. These drawbacks are to do mainly with the the people whose estates are registered in the inventories and the ways in which the books are entered. A detailed discussion on the limitations of inheritance inventories is given in Chapter Four (*Books and Their Owners According to Sarajevo Inheritance Inventories 1118-1244/1707-1828*).

It has already been mentioned that studying book ownership helps us to understand the intellectual milieu of a given society. Researchers of the late 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> early 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century Sarajevo are fortunate to have at their disposal a major narrative source in the form of the chronicle of Muṣṭafā Basheskī.<sup>15</sup> Its author was a minor ‘ālim (religious scholar), scribe and poet, who left us a record of the people and events he knew and witnessed between 1159/1746 and 1219/1804-05. His chronicle is peppered with personal observations on various subjects. Particularly useful are his descriptions of the learned men of the city, his comments on his friends and acquaintances and their varying degrees of linguistic competence, and his occasional references to other people’s intellectual and religious affinities. Basheskī usually refers to books and reading in general terms (“books in Arabic,” “Ṣūfī books,” etc.), but does sometimes mention books by title. Interestingly enough, the work he mentions most frequently is an astrological manual, which he appears to have consulted on a regular basis.

The value of the chronicle for us is not restricted to the picture it provides of the social and cultural milieu of late 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> and early 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century Sarajevo in general. A good number of the people Basheskī mentions in his necrology also appear as book owners in the

---

*Notes as Documentary Sources, Beirut Texts and Studies, Band 129*, ed. by Andreas Görke and Konrad Hirschler (Ergon Verlag: Würzburg, Beirut, 2011).

<sup>15</sup> For a transcription of the chronicle into modern Turkish see *Molla Muṣṭafā'nın Mecmuası*, ed. Kerima Filan (Sarajevo: Connectum, 2011). See also her very useful afterword: “Reading Molla Muṣṭafā Basheski’s Mecmua”. The *Chronicle* text (ms. 7340) is kept at the Gāzī Hüsrev-bey library in Sarajevo. For its catalogue description see: *GHL*, IV, p. 279.

inheritance inventories. By giving us additional information about book owners, some of it quite revealing and personal in nature, Basheski brings to life some of the book owners in a way that the dry, uniform inheritance inventories cannot. The data collected from the inheritance inventories thus complements the descriptions of various individuals given by Basheski, which is especially valuable given that a comprehensive study of 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> century Sarajevo has yet to be written.<sup>16</sup>

Sarajevo also makes for an interesting case study of book ownership because of its central place in Bosnia's political, economic and cultural life, ever since the city first rose to prominence in the early 10<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> century. Its leading position hardly diminished after the seat of the Ottoman governor was moved to Travnik in 1110/1699 (before being restored in 1266/1850). Given the general absence of book ownership studies for any Bosnian town, it seems fitting to concentrate on the capital city.

Bearing in mind the relativity of historical periodization, the time frame adopted for this study has been determined by the availability of primary sources, on the one hand, and by the fact that it coincides with a fairly distinct period in Bosnian history, on the other.<sup>17</sup> The period in question may be said to have begun in 1110/1699 with the Treaty of Karlowitz, which confirmed major Ottoman territorial losses to the Habsburg Empire in the war of 1094-1110/1683-1699. Towards the end of the war, Sarajevo experienced a short, but traumatic siege at the hands of a Habsburg army, during which countless books were destroyed, a fact brought home by the rarity of *sijills* before the 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> century. Following the treaty, Bosnia became a province of an empire in retreat, precariously wedged between stretches of Habsburg and Venetian-controlled territory. The Bosnian Muslim elite became increasingly discontented with the policies of the Porte. Two uprisings which erupted in

---

<sup>16</sup> A number of studies are available on 9<sup>th</sup>/15<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> century Sarajevo. For a discussion of the literature, see: *Ottoman Bosnia: a History in Peril*, ed. Markus Koller (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2004), p. 20. This is similar to the state of affairs within wider Ottoman historiography, where, as Faroqhi says in a work which contributes to the shift: "The eighteenth century throws up particular difficulties, as very little research has been undertaken, even though documentation is quite abundant", Suraiya Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan: Culture and Daily Life in the Ottoman Empire* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007), p. 18. A recently published study by Kerima Filan is more about the history of Sarajevo as depicted in Basheski's *Chronicle* and the language of the *Chronicle* than about 18<sup>th</sup> century Sarajevo itself: Kerima Filan, *Sarajevo u doba Bašeskije: jezik kao stvarnost* [Sarajevo in the time of Basheski: language as reality] (Sarajevo: Connectum, 2014).

<sup>17</sup> This is the early modern period as defined in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, edited by Virginia H. Aksan and Daniel Goffman (Cambridge University Press, 2007).



the early 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century were of such violence that the province had to be pacified by military means. The Bosnian Muslim feudal lords led opposition to reforming policies of the Porte because they feared loss of power. The Porte's willingness to cede Bosnian territory to a semi-autonomous and increasingly assertive Serbia to the east further eroded Bosnian Muslim faith in the central government in Istanbul. This mood of discontent among ordinary Bosnians is well-illustrated by the chronicler, Basheskī, who expressed admiration for Maḥmūd-pasha Bushati (d. 1210/1796) of Scutari, an Ottoman provincial notable who clashed with the Porte.

Sarajevo's Muslim elite was at the forefront in challenging the central authorities. In 1236/1821, the scholar 'Abd al-Wahhāb Ilhāmī was put to death for writing a poem that was openly critical of the Ottoman governor of Bosnia. At the time of the destruction of the Janissary corps in 1241/1826 in Istanbul, a Sarajevo mob murdered a local supporter of the new government policy. Some years later, a Bosnian feudal lord named Ḥusayn Gradašćević (d. 1250/1834) fought battles with the Imperial army (interestingly enough, the Sarajevo kadi whose bequest of his private library provided the incentive for this study appears to have been connected to these turbulent events). Thus, a circle was closed: from being loyal imperial footsoldiers willing to fight in distant war zones, Bosnian Muslims and their leaders gradually became violently opposed to what they came to see as the corrupt authority of the Ottoman sultan.<sup>18</sup>

This is not to suggest a necessary correlation between book ownership patterns and the wider social and political developments of the times. The choice of 1244/1828 as the end year for the present study is largely due to the fact that it is the year the Sarajevo kadi's collection was left as a bequest. It is the larger of only two book collections whose bequests are registered in the surviving *sijills* for the period under consideration and thus serves us as a case study, considered against the background of the book ownership patterns revealed by the inheritance inventories.

While it would have been possible to continue examining the Sarajevo inheritance inventories until 1268/1852, the time frame adopted and the number of court documents

---

<sup>18</sup> This is well attested by a Bosnian Muslim folk poem about the battle between Ḥusayn Gradašćević's forces and the Sultan's armies near Peć (*Albanian*: Pejë) in Kosovo, in which Ḥusayn Gradašćević's side is described as "Turkish" i.e. Muslim, and the Sultan's army as "infidel" (*kaurska*), quoted in Hadžijahić, *Od tradicije do identiteta*, p. 71.

studied already were deemed sufficient to justify the reaching of general conclusions about book ownership.

### 0.3 Aims and Methods

The lack of research on book ownership in Bosnia is in glaring contrast to the growing interest in the topic internationally. There is now a number of studies on various aspects of book ownership for cities and towns across the Ottoman Empire,<sup>19</sup> while more general studies in cultural history not infrequently include sections on book ownership.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, the interest in the topic seems to reflect a shift in the focus of the historiography of the

---

<sup>19</sup> For an extensive bibliography of works on book ownership studies, book studies and studies into Ottoman cultural history on the basis of inheritance records see: Orlin Sabev, "Osmanlı toplumsal tarihi için değerli kaynak teşkil eden tereke ve muhalefat kayıtları" in *Osmanlı Coğrafyası Kültürel Arşiv Mirasının Yönetimi ve Tapu Arşivlerinin Rolü Uluslararası Kongresi/International Congress of 'The Ottoman Geopolitics Management of Cultural Archive Heritage and Role of Land Registry Archives*, 21-23 Kasım/November 2012 Istanbul, cild 1 (Ankara, 2013) pp. 259-272. For some of the most important works on the subject please see: Mihaila Stajnova, "Ottoman Libraries in Vidin", *Études Balkaniques* 2 (1979), pp. 54-69; Said Öztürk, *Askeri Kassama ait Onyedinci Asır İstanbul Tereke Defterleri (Sosyo-Ekonomik Tahlil)* (İstanbul: Osmanlı Araştırmaları Vakfı [OSAV], 1995); Fahri Sakal, "Osmanlı Ailesinde Kitap", *Osmanlı*, c. 11 (Ankara: Yeni Türkiye, 1999), pp. 732-738; Halil Sahillioğlu, "Ottoman Book Legacies" in Halil Sahillioğlu, ed., *Studies in Ottoman Economic and Social History* (Istanbul: Research Centre for Islamic History, Art and Culture, 1999), pp. 189-191; Meropi Anstasiadou, "Des défunts hours du comun: les possesseurs de livres dans les inventaires après décès musulmans de Salonique", *Turcica*, 32 (2000), pp. 197-152; Colette Establet et Jean-Paul Pascual, "Les livres des gens à Damas vers 1700", *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée*, 87-88 (1999), pp. 143-175; Кендерова, Стоянка, *Книги, библиотеки и читателски интереси сред самоковските мюсюлмани (XVIII пьва половина на XIX век)* (София: Библиотека "Св. Св. Кирил и Методій", 2002); Orlin Sabev, "Private book collections in Ottoman Sofia, 1671-1833 (Preliminary Notes)", *Études Balkaniques* 1 (2003), pp. 34-82; Nelly Hanna, *In Praise of Books: a Cultural History of Cairo's Middle Class, Sixteenth to Eighteenth Century* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 2003); Henning Sievert, "Verlorene Schätze – Bücher von Bürokraten in den Muḥallefāt-Registern" in Tobias Heinzelmann and Henning Sievert, *Buchkultur im Nahen Ostens des 17. Und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Bern: Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2010), pp. 199-263; Henning Sievert, "Eavsdropping on the Pasha's Salon: Usual and Unusual Readings of an Eighteenth-Century Ottoman Bureaucrat", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları/the Journal of Ottoman Studies* XLI (2013), pp. 159-195. It goes without saying that studying book ownership on the basis of inheritance inventories is not some sort of Ottoman peculiarity and that such studies have been conducted for cities in the West. See, for example: Roger Chartier, *Lectures et lecteurs dans la France d'ancien regime* (Paris: Seuil, 1989).

<sup>20</sup> M. Şükrü Hanioğlu, *A Brief History of the Late Ottoman Empire* (Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2008), pp. 38-40, 96; Faroqhi, *Subjects of the Sultan*, pp. 189-191, 264.

Ottoman Empire away from political, military and economic matters to social, cultural and provincial history.<sup>21</sup> Some scholars have welcomed this development, as redressing a previous imbalance in the field.<sup>22</sup>

Reflecting both wider developments in Ottoman studies and a realization of the need to explore sources available close at hand more extensively, interest has been rekindled in various aspects of Bosnia's cultural life under the Ottomans.<sup>23</sup> It is as if scholars are responding to a sense of urgency registered in the calls for new studies into a heritage that came perilously close to near complete obliteration.<sup>24</sup>

Although historians of the book tend to focus on the printed book and its impact on society,<sup>25</sup> book history raises many questions which are equally pertinent for the manuscript book, such as the transmission of texts, the history of reading, the history of libraries, or the question of how the materiality of the book can affect its meaning. Not only do the printed and manuscript book both take the form of the codex, but the impact of print on society cannot be fully appreciated without understanding the manuscript culture which predates it.<sup>26</sup>

Studies in book history often rely on detailed statistical evidence to detect patterns and arrive at conclusions. They enable the researcher to analyse the contents of private book-

---

<sup>21</sup> Ch. K. Neumann, "Political and diplomatic developments" in S. Faroqhi (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Turkey*, vol. 3: *the Later Ottoman Empire, 1603-1839* (Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 45.

<sup>22</sup> *Ottoman Bosnia: a History in Peril*, ed. Markus Koller, p. 8. For Ottoman cultural history of the early modern period in relation to the question of the Ottoman "decline," see also: Dana Sajdi, "Decline, its Discontents and Ottoman Cultural History: By Way of Introduction" in Dana Sajdi, ed., *Ottoman Tulips, Ottoman Coffee: Leisure and Lifestyle in the Eighteenth Century* (London, New York: I.B. Tauris, 2007), pp. 1-40.

<sup>23</sup> Koller specifically bemoans the underutilization of court records, *Ottoman Bosnia: a History in Peril*, p. 20. Unfortunately, many studies in Bosnian remain untranslated and inaccessible to most scholars.

<sup>24</sup> András Riedlmayer, "From the Ashes: the Past and Future of Bosnia's Cultural Heritage" in *Islam and Bosnia: Conflict Resolution and Foreign Policy in Multi-Ethnic States*, ed. Maya Shatzmiller (Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 2002), pp. 98-135.

<sup>25</sup> "The field can be extended and expanded in many ways; but *for the most part* [italics by Asim Zubčević], it concerns books since the time of Gutenberg", Robert Darnton, "What is the history of books?" in *The Book History Reader*, eds. by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (London and New York: Routledge, 2008), p. 9.

<sup>26</sup> D.F. McKenzie, "The sociology of a text: orality, literacy and print in early New Zealand" in *The Book History Reader*, eds. by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, p. 205; Harold Love, "Early modern print culture: assessing the models" in *The Book History Reader*, eds. by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, p. 74.

collections in terms of various categories (such as genre, value, and language) and to identify book owners by social background, wealth, profession, gender and religious identity, resulting in what have been termed “quantitative histories of the book.”<sup>27</sup> Such quantitative methods are applied in the present study, albeit not exclusively. Thus, the data collected from the Sarajevo inheritance inventories about book ownership are collected, examined and presented according to a number of categories. These results are then compared with book ownership studies for Sofia, Salonica, Damascus and Trabzon.<sup>28</sup> Finally, the case study of one particular book owner, a Sarajevo kadi who left his collection as bequest, is analysed in more detail against the backdrop of the book ownership findings in the inheritance inventories.

#### 0.4 Terminology

An important issue that came up during research is that of nomenclature or how to name the book culture which developed in the Ottoman province of Bosnia. The most obvious term might seem to be “Ottoman,” with certain aspects of that book culture further qualified as “Islamic.” These terms have certain limitations, however, born of the fact that they can veil the differences between various parts of an Ottoman Empire such as the Balkans, Anatolia and the Levant, not to mention the ways in which they obscure varieties of cultural experiences even within a plural community, like the Bosnians, or even a subgroup, like the Bosnian Muslims.

In her study on Egyptian book culture in the Ottoman period, Nelly Hanna reminds us that “...within the regions of the Ottoman state, different centres could have their own dynamism.”<sup>29</sup> She also finds the term “Islamic” problematic with regard, for example, to education: “The blanket descriptions of ‘Islamic education’ overlooked regional differences

---

<sup>27</sup> Roger Chartier, “Labourers and voyagers: from the text to the reader” in *The Book History Reader*, eds. by David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery, pp. 89, 90.

<sup>28</sup> Orlin Sabev, “Private book collections in Ottoman Sofia, 1671-1833 (Preliminary Notes)”, *Études Balkaniques* 1 (2003), pp. 34-82; Meropi Anstasiadou, “Des défunts hours du comun: les possesseurs de livres dans les inventaires après décès musulmans de Salonique”, *Turcica* 32 (2000), pp. 197-152; Colette Establet et Jean-Paul Pascual, “Les livres des gens à Damas vers 1700”, *Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Méditerranée* 87-88 (1999), pp. 143-175; Abdullah Saydam, “Trabzon’da halkın kitap olma düzeyi (1795-1846)”, *Millî Eğitim* 170 (2006), pp. 187-201.

<sup>29</sup> Nelly Hanna, *In Praise of Books: a Cultural History of Cairo’s Middle Class, Sixteenth to the Eighteenth Century* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 2003), pp. 17-19. Hanna also warns against focusing too much on local peculiarities.

and tended to portray 'Islamic' societies as an undifferentiated mass, timeless and spaceless."<sup>30</sup>

This question is particularly relevant in approaching the cultural history of Bosnia, which has been deeply influenced, ever since the earliest recorded reference in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, by its geographic position at the intersection of civilizations. The culture of writing bears the imprint of influences from Dalmatia and Dubrovnik on the Adriatic coast, as well as of Serbian-Byzantine centres in the east.<sup>31</sup> Indeed, medieval Bosnia made active use of no fewer than four alphabets: the Greek, the Latin (including the Gothic), the Glagolitic, and the Cyrillic.<sup>32</sup> From the 13<sup>th</sup> century on, the Bosnian form of Cyrillic (*bosančica* or *bosanica*) became the dominant alphabet, the script of religious texts, administration, commerce, and epigraphy.<sup>33</sup> This was the script used by all three Christian denominations: the native Bosnian Church, Roman Catholicism, and Eastern Orthodoxy. Following the conversion of a section of the Bosnian population to Islam, new forms of written culture based on pre-existing Ottoman traditions were introduced. A knowledge of Arabic script became a prerequisite for reading the Qur'an and for mastering Ottoman, Arabic and Persian as the new languages of learning and administration. Bosnian Cyrillic continued in use, however, both for gravestone inscriptions and in diplomatic and private correspondence. Indeed, the use of Bosnian Cyrillic or *bosančica* for letters written by or for Muslims may be regarded as part of the continued development of a common South Slavic tradition into distinct traditions along the lines of confessional differentiation, after the Ottoman conquest. The *bosančica* letters thus represent one form of Bosnian Muslim vernacular literacy. One important consequence of the continued use of this script among Bosnian Muslims was that it established itself as an alternative to Arabic script, known locally as *arebica*, as a form for

---

<sup>30</sup> Hanna, *In Praise of Books*, p. 52.

<sup>31</sup> Herta Kuna, *Srednjovjekovna bosanska književnost* [Medieval Bosnian Literature] (Sarajevo: Međunarodni forum Bosna, 2008), p. 44. From antiquity on, towns on the Adriatic coast exerted a major cultural influence on Bosnia.

<sup>32</sup> *Pisana riječ u Bosni i Hercegovini od najstarijih vremena do 1918. godine* [The written word in Bosnia-Herzegovina from the earliest times until 1918], Lamija Hadžiosmanović et al., (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1982), p. 9.

<sup>33</sup> Bogićević, Vojislav, *Pismenost u Bosni i Hercegovini od pojave slovenske pismenosti u IX v. do kraja Austrougarske vladavine 1918.* [Literacy in Bosnia-Herzegovina from the emergence of Slavic literacy in the 9<sup>th</sup> century until the end of the Austro-Hungarian rule in 1918] (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1975), pp. 32, 33.

writing in the vernacular.<sup>34</sup> It thus constitutes one of the four branches of the Bosnian Muslim literary tradition to develop under Ottoman rule, namely “divan [*dīwān*] literature in Ottoman Turkish, Arabic, and Persian, Alhamiada literary production, oral poetry, and epistolography using the *bosančica* or Bosnian Cyrillic script – the last of which preserved the most direct links with medieval literary forms.”<sup>35</sup> In the end, however, Cyrillic never became a script of Bosnian Muslim book culture.

Coming back to the question of nomenclature, therefore, while one could justifiably use the “Ottoman” label to refer to aspects of Bosnian Muslim book culture that clearly owe their origin to the cultural impact of Ottoman rule – such as the use of Arabic script even for the vernacular and the use of and contributions to literature in Ottoman, Arabic and Persian by educated Bosnian Muslims – it would be strange to describe Bosnian Muslim writings in Cyrillic as “Ottoman.”

The same goes for some Bosnian customs related to the use of the Qur’an. On the surface they might seem to belong to Ottoman or older Islamic traditions. But, this is not always necessarily the case. A case in point is a ritual whereby a copy of the Qur’an is held above the bride’s head during the marriage ceremony, a practice that some suggest is a remnant of “baptism by the book” among the Christians of the Bosnian Church.

For such reasons, the most appropriate term for the book culture discussed in this dissertation seems to be “Bosnian,” by virtue of the fact that those involved in it and who contributed to it were Bosnians by language, territory and history. This is not to suggest that the word “Ottoman” should be discarded, but simply that one should be alert to its limitations and to its multiple contexts.

Moreover, while the term “Bosnian” is, in my view, the most suitable for our purposes, it should not be seen as without its own complications. In discussing how common writings by Bosnian authors in the inheritance inventories really were, for example, we may well ask ourselves what is so particularly Bosnian about a scholar who wrote in Arabic, Ottoman

---

<sup>34</sup> Ivo Banac, “Foreword” in *Bosanska ćirilčna pisma* [Bosnian Cyrillic letters] edited and selected by Lejla Nakaš, *Forum Bosnae* 53-54 (2011), p. 7. The continuing use of the Cyrillic script, even though for limited purposes, may explain why abandoning Arabic script (Bosnian: *arebica*) in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century was less dramatic for Bosnian Muslims than for some other Muslim communities.

<sup>35</sup> Lejla Nakaš, “Introduction: the Cultural and Historical Significance of the Bosnian Cyrillic Epistolary Corpus” in *Bosanska ćirilčna pisma*, p. 34; Lejla Nakaš, *Jezik i grafija krajišničkih pisama* [The language and writing of letters from the borderlands] (Slavistički komitet: Sarajevo, 2010), p. 10.

Turkish or Persian and who spent most of his life outside Bosnia? Such was the case with Aḥmad Sūdī al-Būsnawī (d. after 1006/1598), the writer of important commentaries in Ottoman Turkish on Persian classical works. On the other hand, one of the most important Bosnian Muslim scholars of the Ottoman period, Ḥasan Kāfī al-Aqḥiṣārī (d. 1025/1616) returned to his native land after spending years acquiring education and travelling. The case of someone like the poet Qā'imī (d.1091/1680), who was representative of high Ottoman culture, but also wrote in Bosnian, raises other different issues. In the end, one has to look in each cases for the most suitable terms and expressions, while remaining alert to the possible limitations of one's own choices.

This dissertation consists of the following chapters:

**Chapter One** gives an overview of Sarajevo's history from its foundation as a new Ottoman settlement in 866/1462 through its growth into the provincial capital city of Ottoman Bosnia and the centre of local politics, economy and culture during the 10<sup>th</sup>/16<sup>th</sup> century, the golden age of the city's pre-modern period, when many of its classic buildings were erected through the patronage of prominent Ottoman officials, who commissioned the construction of major religious and educational institutions and established charitable foundations (*waqf*) to finance their maintenance. This period came to a close with the sack of 1109/1697, when Austrian forces looted and burned the city, one consequence of which was the destruction of many books and important documents. This limiting factor to our study of Sarajevan book culture serves as an important reminder that the study of book culture in a given historical context, known as *book history* or *the history of the book*, is always dependent on an understanding of the wider social and cultural circumstances in which that book culture developed.<sup>36</sup>

**Chapter Two** describes the subsequent development of the city's book culture during the 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> and early 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> centuries and its role as a centre of learning. The chapter begins by addressing the role of religious and educational establishments, including primary schools (*maktabs*), Muslim schools of higher learning (*madrasas*) and dervish lodges (*takkas*), which together constitute the mainstays of the Ottoman educational system. This chapter also draws on the already mentioned 12<sup>th</sup> - 13<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> - 19<sup>th</sup> century chronicle by Muṣṭafā

---

<sup>36</sup> For more on the scope of book history see: Robert Darnton, "What is the history of books?", pp. 9-26. For book history in the Islamic world see: *The Book in the Islamic World: the Written Word and Communication in the Middle East*, ed. by George N. Atiyeh (State University of New York Press and the Library of Congress, 1995).

Basheskī to consider aspects of questions of literacy, reading, writing and book copying in a manuscript culture. Basheskī's *Chronicle* conveys some of the flavour of the learned world of Sarajevo, through his descriptions of learned Sarajevans, their knowledge of various subjects and their mastery of various written and spoken languages. Many of those he describes belonged to his circle of friends, who met informally for prayer, readings, and discussion. Such literary salons act as an introduction to considering the more informal ways of acquiring knowledge and education characteristic of the age, not least the coffee-house culture. The chapter also addresses the role of bookbinders as an important facet of manuscript culture and the trade in paper and books. Particular attention is given to Basheskī's cursory reference to newspapers and the light it sheds on the reintroduction of printing in Bosnia. The final part of the chapter addresses the question of limits placed on the written (and spoken) word through censorship, culminating in some cases in the death sentence. Lastly, the chapter draws attention to examples of mutual borrowings between different traditions of book culture.

**Chapter Three** is devoted to the public and semi-public libraries of Sarajevo in the 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Like mosques, *maktabs*, and *madrasas*, libraries were part of the city's cultural grid, places for reading and copying books and for scholarly exchange. This chapter describes the origins of the various types of libraries, based on their institutional affiliations and mode of establishment. The types covered include mosque libraries, *maktab* libraries, *takka* libraries, *madrasa* libraries, independent libraries, and family libraries. The chapter also draws attention to the fact that a number of new libraries were built in the 12<sup>th</sup>/18<sup>th</sup> century, no doubt to compensate for the destruction of previously existing educational institutions in 1109/1697.

**Chapter Four** presents the findings regarding book ownership from a review and analysis of more than 3,000 inheritance inventories from 59 *sijills* of the Sarajevo *sharī'a* court. This review identified 1,236 book owners, whose background is examined in terms of gender, religion, and profession. The data on their books are then broken down by subject, language and price. Finally, the findings are compared with similar studies for a number of other cities during their Ottoman era: Sofia, Salonica, Damascus and Trabzon.

**Chapter Five** examines the life of kadi Şālih 'Izzat Ḥromozāde as a case study in book ownership. His life is reconstructed from primary sources found in the Sarajevo *sijills* and documents kept at the Başbakanlık Arşivi in Istanbul. The endowment charter for his



collection of books is transliterated and the 159 volumes in it are analysed and compared with the book collections of other kadis in the inheritance inventories. The surviving books from his collection are described on the basis of autopsy and library catalogues.

**Chapter Six** raises questions of what it meant to own a book in a predominantly oral and illiterate society and how members of such a society might have viewed books and book-related activities such as reading and writing. The chapter seeks answers to these questions in the originally oral folk poetry, collected in the 13<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> century, whose origins go back further in time and so coincide with the time frame of the present study. The chapter also describes several book-related customs in order to illustrate the range of different uses that were made of books and so remind us that books were not (and are not) used only for such cerebral activities as reading. The customs described are linked to life cycle events like birth, marriage, death and the marking of the seasons.