

# ***DĪVĀN-I ḤĀFĪZ: A CASE STUDY OF A PERSIAN MANUSCRIPT IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY'S BOSNIA***

By

Bajramović Lejla

Submitted to  
Central European University  
History Department

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Nadia Al-Bagdadi  
Second Reader: Professor Maria Craciun

Budapest, Hungary

2007

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>Chapter 1 - Persian Manuscript as Artifact in Ottoman Empire</b> .....	8
1.1. Persian manuscripts in private collections .....	10
1.2. Ottoman court collecting Persian manuscripts .....	13
1.3. Shirazi manuscripts .....	17
<b>Chapter 2 - Persian Manuscripts in Ottoman Bosnia</b> .....	21
2.1. Spread of Ottoman literacy in Bosnia .....	23
2.2. The libraries in Ottoman Bosnia .....	25
2.3. Persian manuscripts in Bosnian libraries .....	27
2.4. Private collections of Persian manuscripts in Ottoman Bosnia .....	28
2.5. Public libraries in Ottoman Bosnia .....	35
2.6. The circulation of Persian manuscripts .....	38
<b>Chapter 3 - Hāfiz' Dīvān and the Gazel Genre</b> .....	43
3.1. Hāfiz' Dīvān and the <i>gazel</i> genre.....	43
3.2. Symbolism in sufism .....	46
3.3. Two different readings of <i>Dīvān -i Hāfiz</i> .....	49
<b>Chapter 4 – Dīvān -i Hāfiz from the GHB Library in Sarajevo</b> .....	51
4.1. Technical analysis of the manuscript and its miniatures.....	51
4.2. Text – image analysis .....	54
4.2.1. Miniature 1: “Lovers in the Garden” .....	55
4.2.2. Miniature 2: “Leyla and Mecnun” .....	58
4.2.3. Miniature 3: ”Bathing woman” .....	60
4.2.4. Miniature 4: “Wine bar” .....	61
4.2.5. Miniature 5: “Polo – game” .....	64
4.3. Reconstruction of meaning .....	65
4.3.1. Theory .....	65
4.3.2. Practice: exterior harmony .....	68
4.3.3. Inner harmony.....	69
4.3.4. Concept of form, space, time and reality.....	70
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	75
<b>Appendix A – Five gazels from Dīvān -i Hāfiz</b> .....	77
<b>Appendix B – Five miniatures from the manuscript of Dīvān -i Hāfiz No.1366 from The GHB Library in Sarajevo</b> .....	83
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	89

## INTRODUCTION

In the period between 1463 and 1878 Bosnia - Herzegovina has been a province of the Ottoman Empire. Consequently, as well as in other parts of the Empire, the Ottomans influenced all aspects of life in this province, including the political, economic and cultural development. Still, the Bosnian *eyalet*<sup>1</sup> was different from other provinces in Rumelia for two reasons.<sup>2</sup> First, Bosnia was a bordering province of the Ottoman Empire towards the Habsburg Empire and was therefore considered important because of its strategic position. Secondly, the Bosnian *eyalet* was outstanding because of the relatively quick spread of Islam, both in towns and villages, whereby this province soon became one of the pillars of the Ottoman Empire. Converting to Islam, the Bosnian autochthonous population opened itself to a new culture, which among various other factors included Ottoman literacy, comprising not only the knowledge of Ottoman Turkish but also Arabic and Persian language, and the Ottoman system of education.

The spread of Ottoman literacy and the introduction of the Ottoman – Islamic school system in Bosnia was parallel to the spread of Islam.<sup>3</sup> That process, begun by building mosques and *tekke-s* (*derviş* convents), which became religious but also cultural centers of Bosnian towns and villages, has continued with the introduction of *mekteb-*

---

<sup>1</sup> In this work I used the Ottoman transliteration system according to the romanisation tables of the American Library Association – Library of Congress (ALA – LC), which I found most appropriate. See <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/roman.html>.

<sup>2</sup> Ismet Kasumović, *Školstvo i obrazovanje u Bosnaskom ejaletu za vrijeme Osmanske uprave* (School system and education in the Bosnian eyalet during the Ottoman rule), Mostar: Islamski centar, 1999, pp.36.

<sup>3</sup> Azra Gadžo – Kasumović. *Education – Beginning and Development of the Ottoman – Islamic Literacy in the Bosnian Eyalet*, International Congress on Learning and Education in the Ottoman World: Proceedings, Istanbul: IRCICA (2001): pp. 207-224, here: pp. 207.

s (lower, elementary schools) and *medrese-s* (higher, secondary schools), where the native population obtained the traditional Ottoman - Islamic education.<sup>4</sup> Candidates for the state service were educated in big centers of the Empire, mostly in Istanbul.<sup>5</sup> One can say that the biggest part of the Bosnian population in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, rich or poor, was integrated, one way or another, in the process of education.<sup>6</sup>

Of course, the process of education required books and eventually, numerous libraries emerged in Ottoman Bosnia, mostly within the aforementioned religious – educational institutions (public libraries)<sup>7</sup>. Although these libraries were primarily meant to serve educational purposes, they were not restricted to students alone: everyone could borrow a book. Apart from that, Bosnian people possessed private libraries containing works from all fields of contemporary knowledge. In fact, a large number of Oriental manuscripts, meaning manuscripts written in Arabic, Ottoman Turkish, Persian and Bosnian language with Arabic script, which come from both public and private libraries from the Ottoman period, and which have been preserved until nowadays, are the best evidence for the intensive interest in books among the native population.

The biggest part of the manuscripts from these libraries is written in Arabic and Ottoman Turkish, which is not surprising if one takes into account that Arabic was the language generally used for writing about theological, philological and philosophical

---

<sup>4</sup> Gadžo – Kasumović, 2001: pp. 212.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.: pp. 208.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> The term “public library” designates a library, which was not in possession of a private person, whereas the term “private library” refers to a library belonging to a private person. The distinction between “public” and “private” libraries in the Islamic culture carries a specific meaning: “private libraries” allowed access to the broader reading audience as well. See Nadia Al-Bagdadi. *From Heaven to Dust: Metamorphosis of the Book in Pre – modern Arab Culture*, The Medieval History Journal, 8, 1 (2005): pp. 100.

issues, and that Ottoman Turkish was the language of the administration in the Empire.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, there is also a quantity of Persian manuscripts, which suggest that the autochthonous population of Ottoman Bosnia possessed knowledge of Persian, and read and collected manuscripts written in that language.<sup>9</sup>

Among these Persian manuscripts, there is one particular and important manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, identified as No. 1366 in the Gazi Husref – Bey Library in Sarajevo<sup>10</sup>. This manuscript illustrated with five miniatures and dated to the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>11</sup>, belongs to a small group of preserved texts decorated with miniatures in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and represents therefore a work of great historical and artistic value. Although it is listed in the catalogues<sup>12</sup>, this manuscript has never been the subject of thorough scholarly attention. Yet, being the only example of illustrated manuscripts containing figurative representations in Bosnia<sup>13</sup>, a detailed analysis of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* No.1366 would be of great importance. Considering the lack of detailed scholarly research, the aim of my thesis is to examine this manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the cultural - historical and art historical perspective. Hereby I attempt to collect all the available historical data about this manuscript. Furthermore, I seek to give the technical description of this manuscript and its miniatures. Besides that, the

<sup>8</sup> Trako, Salih. Lejla Gazić. *Katalog rukopisa Orijentalnog instituta: lijepa književnost* (Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Oriental Institute: Belles – Lettres), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut, 1997, pp. 17.

<sup>9</sup> According to the catalogues of the Gazi Husrev - Bey Library, the Oriental institute and the Bosniak institute in Sarajevo, which I enumerate in the bibliography, there were 699 Persian manuscripts; 464 Persian manuscripts kept in the Oriental institute burned during the war 1992 – 1995. Additionally, it has to be mentioned that various other institutions in Sarajevo, as well as in other towns of Bosnia and Herzegovina possess manuscript collections; nevertheless, they are not catalogued.

<sup>10</sup> In further text the GHB Library.

<sup>11</sup> Fehim Nametak ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of The Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 4, London - Sarajevo: Al – Furqān - Gazi Husref - Begova biblioteka, 1998.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> According to the catalogues of the GHB Library, the Oriental institute and the Bosniak institute in Sarajevo, as well as to the secondary literature, which I examined within the framework of this thesis (see bibliography), this manuscript is the only example of illustrated manuscripts containing figurative representations in Bosnia.

fact that the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* represents a work of Persian classical poetry, which is influenced by Sufism and offers the possibility of two different readings of the text – profane and mystical one, raises the question of the reading of the miniatures themselves: one can ask whether it is possible to approach the images from the mystical point of view as well? Therefore, I shall apply the text – image analysis: first from the profane and then from the mystical perspective.

Further, using the aforementioned manuscript as evidence for the intensive interest in Persian manuscripts among the native population, I seek to explore the circulation and use of Persian manuscripts, with or without illustrations, in this former Ottoman province. Concerning the local scholarship, there is not much written on Persian manuscripts. Art historians have dealt mainly with Islamic architecture, never entering the “sensitive” field of figurative representations in Islamic painting. However, orientalist have had great achievements in cataloging the manuscripts preserved in Bosnian libraries from the Ottoman period. Fehim Nametak<sup>14</sup>, Zejnil Fajić<sup>15</sup> and Salih Trako<sup>16</sup>, among others, contributed to our knowledge of private and public libraries in Ottoman Bosnia. By examining the holdings of these libraries I wish to prove that works of Persian classics were collected and popular among the educated population in Bosnia. In order to achieve these objectives, I shall use primary sources such as the published catalogues of the GHB Library, the Oriental institute and the Bosniac

---

<sup>14</sup> Nametak, 1998.

<sup>15</sup> Zejnil Fajić. *Biblioteka Abdulah – efendije Kantamirije* (The Library of Abdulah – Efendi Kantamiri) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and EI – Kalem, 2000, pp. 253-275. Zejnil Fajić. *Biblioteka Šejha Abdurrahmana Sirije sa Oglavka* (The Library of Šeyh ‘Abdurrahman Sirri from Oglavci) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and EI – Kalem, 2000, pp. 291-302. Zejnil Fajić. *Originali i prepisi vakufnamera sačuvanih do danas* (Originals and Copies of *vakufnāme-s* preserved until today) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and EI – Kalem, 2000, pp. 175-179.

institute in Sarajevo written by the aforementioned and several other authors.<sup>17</sup> Hereby I shall focus on the available data about the time and place of production, as well as the data about the scribes or copyists of Persian manuscripts contained in these catalogues. Furthermore, in order to reconstruct, at least partly, the ways in which these manuscripts came to Bosnia and in which they circulated within this former Ottoman province, I attempt to establish the owner (s) of Persian manuscripts, especially those containing works of Persian classics. Additionally, I shall use secondary sources such as published articles dealing with Oriental manuscripts and libraries in Ottoman Bosnia.

Although there is no extensive literature specifically dealing with the Bosnian manuscript that is the subject of this investigation, secondary literature dealing with illustrated manuscripts in general can be useful for the development of a methodological framework for this research. In this sense, the works of Lale Uluç<sup>18</sup>, Filiz Çagman and Zeren Tanındı<sup>19</sup>, Yves Porter<sup>20</sup> and E. Yasertar<sup>21</sup>, who have dealt with Persian miniature in general, were of crucial importance for my work. Lale Uluç, in her study of book production in Shiraz, analyses the Ottoman audience for precious manuscripts coming from this Persian city. The works of this author are helpful while placing Bosnia in a broader context of the Empire it was part of. Examining the question of the understanding of the book and the painting that it contained by

---

<sup>16</sup> Salih Trako ed. *Katalog perzijskih rukopisa Orijentalnog instituta u Sarajevu* (Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts of The Oriental Institute in Sarajevo), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, 1986.

<sup>17</sup> See bibliography.

<sup>18</sup> Lale Uluç. *Ottoman Book Collectors and Illustrated Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts*, REMMM 87-88 (1999): pp. 85-107. Lale Uluç. *Selling to the Court: Late-Sixteenth-Century Manuscript Production in Shiraz*, Muqarnas, Vol. 17 (2000): pp. 73 - 96.

<sup>19</sup> Filiz Çagman and Zeren Tanındı. *Remarks on Some Manuscripts from the Topkapi Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman – Safavid Relations*, Muqarnas, Vol. 13 (1996): pp. 132 – 148.

<sup>20</sup> Yves Porter. *From the “Theory of the Two Qalams” to the “Seven Principles of Painting”: Theory. Terminology and Practice in Persian Classical Painting*, Muqarnas, Vol. 17 (2000): pp. 109 - 118.

contemporary viewers, Yves Porter discusses two theories coming from sixteenth century Persia: the “Theory of two Qalams” and “Seven principles of painting”. The results of Porter's interpretation of these theories, which connect the painting to the calligraphy, are the starting point of my text – image analysis of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* No. 1366. Further, I consulted E. Yarshater and his comparison of Persian painting and poetry: the common features of the two, which this author suggests, shall serve as a link of the painting and poetry and support my proposal of two different readings of the miniatures contained in the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the GHB Library in Sarajevo.

In order to determine the place of Bosnia within the broader context of the Empire, stressing the relation between the center and the provinces, the first chapter deals with illustrated Persian manuscripts in the Ottoman Empire. Focusing primarily on its center, it shows the ways by which illustrated Persian manuscripts came to the Empire, who the people reading and collecting these precious manuscripts were and why they collected them. Besides that, this chapter analyzes the ways in which illustrated Persian manuscripts came into possession of Ottoman sultans and the way the interest for them in the Ottoman Empire influenced the production of such manuscripts in Persia. Finally, it raises the question of the circulation of illustrated Persian manuscripts within the Empire.

In the second chapter the focus of research will move from the center to the local level: the province of Bosnia. Hereby the question arise: how did Persian manuscripts come to the periphery, especially to this remote border province? Therefore, this chapter is dedicated to the examination of the holdings of the best known private and

---

<sup>21</sup> E. Yarshater. *Some Common Characteristics of Persian Poetry and Art*, Studia Islamica, No. 16



public libraries in Bosnia, focusing on the manuscripts of Persian classics. Thereby, I examine the catalogues of the three most relevant libraries in Bosnia: The GHB Library, The Oriental Institute<sup>22</sup> and The Bosniac Institute in Sarajevo. I concentrate on data concerning the owners and all relevant information, which can be found in seals, colophons and additional inscriptional notes in the manuscripts themselves.

Further, before dealing with the main subject of my thesis, I consider it important to introduce *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz* as a literary work. Therefore, chapter 3 will give a short history of *gazel* as a “genre of the time” and Ḥāfīz’ achievements within this context. Considering the fact that *gazel* was influenced by sufism, the chapter continues with discussion on symbolism in sufism and on Ḥāfīz’s use of sufi symbols.

Finally, chapter 4 represents the core of the thesis. It consists of the analysis of the miniatures from the manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz* No.1366: after the technical description, the next step will be the text – image analysis. Considering the fact that the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz* was conceived as a volume of Islamic mystical poetry, I will try to collate the miniatures of this manuscript with the texts they are accompanied by. Hereby I wish to give answer to the questions of artist’s intentions, while creating the paintings, and spectator’s response to them. By avoiding to observe the miniatures of this *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz* as taken out of their natural context, namely a manuscript consisting of both text and image, I seek to propose two different readings of the miniatures: a profane and a mystical one.

---

(1962): pp. 61 - 71.

<sup>22</sup> The Oriental Institute in Sarajevo and its 5263 manuscripts burned down during the war in Bosnia 1992 – 1995. Fortunately, the catalogues of this institution were preserved; therefore, it is possible to

## Chapter 1 - Persian Manuscript as Artifact in Ottoman Empire<sup>23</sup>

In order to place Bosnia within the broader context of the Empire, stressing the province – center relation, this chapter deals with illustrated Persian manuscripts in the Ottoman Empire. It focuses primarily on its center and shows the ways by which illustrated Persian manuscripts came to the Empire, who the people reading and collecting these precious manuscripts were and why they collected them. Apart from that, it analyzes the ways in which illustrated Persian manuscripts came into possession of Ottoman sultans, as well as the way the interest for them in the Ottoman Empire influenced the production of such manuscripts in Persia. Finally, it raises the question of the circulation of Persian manuscripts within the Empire.

The number of Persian manuscripts and commentaries on Persian works<sup>24</sup> preserved in libraries, museums and archives on the territory, which belonged to the Ottoman Empire, but also all over the world, suggest that the ability of reading and writing Persian language was widely spread among the educated population throughout the Empire. Persian has been taught in the *medrese-s*, used as a court language by the Ottoman elite and was often necessary for those performing state duties.<sup>25</sup> Yet, the Persian language was primarily conceived of by the educated elite in the Empire as a language of mysticism and literature, and used by Ottoman writers, who were familiar

---

know which manuscripts have been kept there. Although these manuscripts do not exist any more, they are important because they testify to the large number of manuscript which existed in Ottoman Bosnia.

<sup>23</sup> Using the term “Ottoman Empire” I refer here to the period between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Nevertheless, this chapter deals mainly with the examples from the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>24</sup> Francis Richard. *Lecteurs ottomans de manuscrits persans du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, REMMM 87 - 88 (1999): pp. 79 – 83, here pp. 81. According to Richard, among preserved manuscripts are not only the original Persian works, but also the commentaries on Persian works in Arabic or Ottoman language.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.: pp. 80 - 81.

with Persian literature, for the same purpose. Persian classics<sup>26</sup>, such as the literary works of Hakīm ‘Abdul-Ḳāsim Firdūsī Tūsī (931’1020), known as Firdūsī, Cemāluddīn Abū Muḥammad Ilyas b. Yūsuf b. Mu’ayyad Nizāmuddīn (1141-1202), known as Nizāmī, Abū ‘Abdullah Musarrifuddīn b. Muṣliḥuddīn Sa‘dī Shīrāzī (1184-1291), known as Sa‘dī, Nūriddīn ‘Abdurrahmān b. Aḥmet Cāmī (1414-1492), known as Cāmī, Muḥammad b. İbrāhīm an – Nishabūrī (1119-1193), known under the pseudonym Fāriduddīn ‘Aṭṭār, Shamsuddīn Muḥammad Ḥāfiẓ Shīrāzī (1325-1389) and others, were highly appreciated by the educated Ottoman population and served as examples upon which Ottoman authors created their works.<sup>27</sup>

Thus, Persian manuscripts, especially illuminated and illustrated (“*musavver*” and “*müzehheb*”) ones, were considered precious objects and occupied a specific place among the manuscripts circulating throughout the Ottoman Empire between the 16<sup>th</sup> and the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the production of manuscripts in general started to decrease.<sup>28</sup> Considering the fact that these manuscripts played such an important role as artistic and educational objects, several questions arise: Who were the people who were reading and collecting these Persian manuscripts? What were their reasons for collecting Persian manuscripts? Where were these manuscripts produced and how did they find their way to the Ottoman Empire?

Concerning the circulation of manuscripts to and within the Ottoman Empire, the seals, colophons and additional inscriptional notes in the manuscripts themselves,

<sup>26</sup> I took the chronological definition of “classical poetry” from E. Yarshater. *Some Common Characteristics of Persian Poetry and Art*, *Studia Islamica* 16 (1962): pp.61 - 71, here pp. 62. According to that definition “classical poets” are those living from the 10<sup>th</sup> until the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>27</sup> Richard, 1999: pp. 80 - 81.

provide useful information about the owners of the manuscripts. According to such notes, it is possible to trace the history of precious Persian manuscripts and to conclude that they often changed the possessor. The fact that a quantity of them was kept in the Ottoman royal treasury<sup>29</sup> proves that the sultans and members of the royal family possessed illustrated Persian manuscripts. However, they belonged also to various private collections of the members of the Ottoman elite. Focusing on the illustrated Persian manuscripts, the following section will examine some of these private collections.

### 1.1. Persian manuscripts in private collections

As it has been mentioned previously, it was not only the sultan and members of the royal family, but also members of the Ottoman elite, comprising military and judiciary dignitaries, bureaucrats, scholars and writers were fervent collectors of Persian illustrated manuscripts. They possessed private libraries, some of which were quite large: the grand vezir and son-in-law of Süleyman the Magnificent, Rüstem Paşa (died 1561 / 968h.) is said to have possessed a library containing 5000 manuscripts; the library of Müeyyed-zāde ‘Abdurrahmān Efendi of Amasya, a member of the *ulema* (died 1516 / 922h.) contained 7000 volumes.<sup>30</sup> Of course, not all the private libraries were of such a size. Nevertheless, almost all of them contained at least some Persian manuscripts. One further example of an Ottoman official collecting Persian

---

<sup>28</sup> The production of manuscripts in general started eventually to decrease not after the introduction of the press in the Ottoman Empire in 1727 but in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. See Al – Bagdadi, 2005: pp. 87.

<sup>29</sup> Çagman and Tanındı, 1996: pp. 132. The article does not mention the number of preserved manuscripts but states that a large number of them belongs to the collection of the Topkapı Palace Museum Library. Moreover, it says that a number of precious Persian manuscripts kept nowadays in the Istanbul University Library and some other institutions in Istanbul originated from the same palace collection.

<sup>30</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 87.

manuscripts is Damad İbrāhīm Paşa, grand vezir and son-in-law of Aḥmet III, whose collection enumerated almost 900 books, many of them Persian works, some of which were illustrated.<sup>31</sup> A similar case is that of Meḥmet Paşa, Beylerbey of Rumelia and “royal companion” of Murat III: of the 33 manuscripts taken from him for the palace treasury, roughly one third was Persian. Of these, among which were many famous Persian classics, two thirds are denoted as illuminated and illustrated.<sup>32</sup>

In general, the examples provided by Lale Uluç suggest that numerous private collections contained Persian works, most of them being copies of the *Şāhnâma* of Firdūsī, the *Ḥamsa* of Nizāmī, *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* and the works of Sa‘dī, Cāmī, ‘Aṭṭār and others. Among all Persian works, the works of Persian classical authors are the most frequently illustrated.<sup>33</sup>

However, Lale Uluç suggests that, according to the evidence found in the manuscripts and registers preserved in the Topkapı Palace Museum Archives and the Topkapı Palace Museum Library<sup>34</sup>, the Persian classics belonged not to the collections of *ulema* or *medrese-s*, but rather to the private collections of the military class. One of the reasons for that could be the fact that Ottoman orthodox *ulema* actually refused such kind of literature as literature of unbelievers. Nevertheless, various mystical circles and other educated people in the Empire did not refuse Persian classical literature. This observation raises a question: why were the members of the military elite such fervent collectors of this type of manuscripts?

<sup>31</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 89.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.: pp. 90. The number and kind of manuscripts is known from the confiscation registers.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.: pp. 85-107. Uluç came to this conclusion examining already published material on this issue and doing her own research on Persian manuscripts at the Topkapı Palace Museum Archives.

According to Filiz Cagman and Zeren Tanındı<sup>35</sup>, there have been three reasons for collecting Persian illuminated and illustrated manuscripts. First, the manuscripts, conceived to be precious signs of wealth and culture among the Ottoman elite, functioned as status symbols; secondly, appreciated as such, they were useful as gifts to the sultan and among the members of the elite; finally, the interest and love towards manuscripts and arts by educated people should not be neglected as a reason either.

Hereby it must be mentioned that a large number of Persian manuscripts, which once belonged to the Ottoman elite, were produced in the region of Ḥorasan and Shiraz, and dated from the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>36</sup> Interestingly, the 16<sup>th</sup> century was a period of growing political tensions between the Ottoman Empire and Safavid Persia, which culminated in active Ottoman – Safavid conflicts in 1534-1555 and 1578-1590.<sup>37</sup> The political tension led to more contact between the two states; both of them had embassies in the other country. Consequently, this was a period of intense relations between the Ottoman and Safavid military elite, but also of writers and poets, which made it easier to exchange cultural goods, Persian illustrated manuscripts among them.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> In further text I refer to these institutions as the TPMA and the TPML.

<sup>35</sup> Çagman and Tanındı, 1996: pp. 132 - 148.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.: pp. 132.

<sup>37</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 101. The first Ottoman – Safavid battle took place at Çaldıran in 1514. The period of 1534-1555 was marked by the “Eastern campaigns” (towards Persia) of Süleyman the Magnificent. 1578-1590 was a period of the Ottoman – Safavid war.

## 1.2. Ottoman court collecting Persian manuscripts

Considered to be of great value by Ottoman sultans, numerous precious Persian manuscripts, purchased on the market<sup>39</sup> or in other ways, ended in the royal treasury. The TPML possesses a collection of over two hundred illustrated Persian manuscripts: most of the volumes are in fact copies of Persian literary classics. For a half of them inscriptional notes in the manuscripts testify that they belonged to the private collections before they came into possession of the palace.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, if one takes into consideration that the manuscripts, which once belonged to the inventory of the treasury, are situated in various other libraries nowadays<sup>41</sup>, the number of precious Persian manuscripts possessed by the palace must have been much higher.

The ways by which the Ottoman court came into possession of precious manuscripts have been diverse. Besides the inscriptional notes in the manuscripts themselves, palace records<sup>42</sup>, containing account books (*hesap defterleri*), confiscation registers (*mukhallefat kayıtları*) and gift registers (*hediye defterleri*), as well as separate manuscript lists with the titles of individual works, provide insight into the quantity, genre and origin of manuscripts that found their way into the treasury of the Ottoman sultans.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Çagman and Tanındı, 1996: pp. 132.

<sup>39</sup> Istanbul, as well as other big centers of the Empire, had a developed manuscript market. See Frederic Hitzel. *Manuscripts, livres et culture livresque à Istanbul*, REMMM 87 - 88 (1999): pp. 19 - 38.

<sup>40</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 97.

<sup>41</sup> See footnote 29.

<sup>42</sup> Records from the Topkapi Palace, which are situated now in the TPMA.

<sup>43</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 87.

Above all, confiscation registers, which contain detailed enumerations of confiscated items<sup>44</sup>, testify to a very interesting tendency of the State toward precious manuscripts. According to the law, individuals belonging to the military or administrative class who made illegal fortunes during their careers as employees of the State were to be stripped of their property during their lives. It was also usual to confiscate the property of individuals working for the sultan after their death, arguing that the property of sultan's employees (his "slaves") in fact belonged to the sultan. Lale Uluç even mentions a case of confiscation "under dubious circumstances", whereby the works from a private library were proclaimed to be lies and therefore not allowed to be endowed, as was planned by the owner, but rather were confiscated by the palace.<sup>45</sup> This supports the idea that the palace was very interested in the collection of precious manuscripts. The question is whether sultans had an interest in the content or just wanted them because they knew they were valuable.

The presence of precious manuscripts, enumerated in the confiscation records, in the palace treasury leads to a further conclusion. Although it was a custom that the wealth obtained through the confiscation of illegal property was to be used for the furtherance of the *cihād* (Holy War)<sup>46</sup>, precious manuscripts were not sold, and thus transformed into funds for the *cihād*, but were rather kept in the royal treasury. Thus the confiscation of manuscripts seems to have had an additional purpose: the collectors must have appreciated manuscripts not only because of their market value, but for their spiritual importance and beauty as well.

---

<sup>44</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 88 - 89. According to the author, the procedure of confiscation prescribed that Sultan's employees collected the desirable items on the estate of the individual, who accumulated illegal fortune and brought them to the palace. These items were marked by the letter "*mim*" (Ottoman "*mühim*" > important), upon evidence of which one can draw the conclusion which items were considered valuable to be confiscated. The rest of the property of that individual was given to the relatives or sold out.



Furthermore, the sultans obtained precious Persian manuscripts as gifts. While presenting a gift was anyway part of usual procedure of Ottoman elite in order to maintain personal and political relationships among each other, Ottoman officials were obliged to present a gift to the sultan on different occasions (bayram or circumcision festivities). Thereby, decorated Persian manuscripts belonged to the group of objects, which were considered as precious enough to be presented to a sultan. Aside from that, illustrated manuscripts were also presented as diplomatic gifts of Safavids<sup>47</sup> to the Ottoman sultan or his bureaucrats, generals and provincial governors.<sup>48</sup>

There are written and even visual sources in form of miniatures in certain manuscripts that testify to the presentation of gifts to the Ottoman sultan. For instance, in his *Chronicles*, Seyyid Luqmān mentions that Toqmaq Khān, Safavid ambassador to Istanbul, presented as a gift a *Şāhnāma* (Book of Kings) of Firdūsī and more than sixty divāns of several Persian poets to the sultan.<sup>49</sup> A further example is İbrāhīm Cavuṣ's *Kitāb-ı Ganjina-i Fath-i Ganja*, which contains a list of gifts for the Ottoman sultan sent by the Safavids, where he mentions books as well.<sup>50</sup> Moreover, the *Şāhinşahnāma* (Book of the King of Kings) by Seyyid Luqmān contains a miniature representing the aforementioned Safavid ambassador Toqmaq Khān delivering gifts to the sultan in 1576, among which manuscripts are visible. Similarly, one miniature

---

<sup>45</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 89.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.: pp. 88.

<sup>47</sup> Hereby I do not mean only the *şah* but also Safavid princes and officials.

<sup>48</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 96.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.: pp. 91.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. : pp. 92 - 93.

depicts İbrāhīm Khān, another Safavid ambassador, while presenting manuscripts to the sultan in 1582.<sup>51</sup>

After all, one can conclude that, apart from sultan and the royal family, it was the members of the military elite who collected illustrated Persian classics. But where were these manuscripts produced?

Taking into consideration that numerous precious Persian manuscripts do not have any inscriptional notes, or that these notes are unreadable, it is sometimes difficult to find out the origin of certain manuscripts. Sometimes it took over 100 years to finish a manuscript<sup>52</sup>, so it becomes impossible to determine all artisans who were a part of the production process. There is also the possibility that after a time a binding or pages from a manuscript were changed, so it does not bear all the seals or notes it might have had during the time. Further, according to the style of the miniatures in those manuscripts it can be assumed that the manuscripts were made on the Safavid territory; nevertheless, it can be also a case that a manuscript was a product of a Safavid artist, who moved to the Ottoman Empire.<sup>53</sup>

However, with rare exceptions, Persian classics were not produced in the palace workshop in Istanbul, where Ottoman precious manuscripts were made.<sup>54</sup> The Ottoman sultan and his officials obtained Persian manuscripts, produced under the

<sup>51</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 91 - 92. According to the author, these miniatures are preserved in the TPML.

<sup>52</sup> Çagman and Tanındı, 1996: pp. 139.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.: pp. 141.

<sup>54</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 101. Nevertheless, it is not undoubtedly evident that the palace painting workshop even existed. According to the article "*A Note on the Location of the Royal Ottoman Painting Ateliers*" by Alan W. Fisher and Carol Garrett Fisher (Muqarnas, Vol. 3 (1985): pp. 118 - 120, here pp. 118), there is evidence, which suggests that a palace workshop did not even exist. The authors assume that the manuscripts or parts of them were painted in the city workshops and then collected and bound together in the palace.

patronage of or for Safavid *şahs* and officials, as a gift from the Safavid rulers or purchased them in Persia.<sup>55</sup>

### 1.3. Shirazi manuscripts

Considering the fact that most of the precious Persian manuscripts in the Ottoman Empire come from Shiraz, Lale Uluç connects the influx of these manuscripts to the Empire with the Ottoman – Safavid conflicts. Starting a conflict at the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, in other words with the battle of Çaldiran in 1514, the political relations between the Ottoman Empire and Safavid Persia remained rather hostile for almost the whole century. It is thus interesting that the greater influx of Persian manuscripts, especially those from Shiraz, started after the above mentioned battle and even intensified during the periods of active conflicts in 1534-1555 and 1578-1590.<sup>56</sup> Yet, as if it is not surprising enough that during the time of war precious manuscripts had been exchanged, at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, after the conclusion of peace between the Ottomans and Safavids, the influx of Persian illustrated manuscripts from Shiraz becomes less and stops with the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>57</sup> According to Lale Uluç, there is even evidence that the production of manuscripts in Shhiraz increased because of such an interest for them in the Ottoman Empire. Inscriptional notes in these manuscripts, situated in the TPML, provide evidence that both members of the Safavid and Ottoman elite possessed them.<sup>58</sup> Furthermore, approximately a half of them bear notes confirming that they were in

---

<sup>55</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 102.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid.: pp. 101.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid.: pp. 105. According to the author, none of the illustrated Shirazi manuscripts situated in Istanbul libraries is dated after 1602.

<sup>58</sup> Uluç, 2000: pp. 93, n. 45.

possession of Ottoman notables before they were brought to the palace treasury.<sup>59</sup> Besides that, the members of the royal family possessed also private manuscript collections containing precious volumes from Shiraz.<sup>60</sup> One could ask why illustrated Persian classics, especially those from Shiraz, have been appreciated?

Illustrated Shirazi manuscripts, produced in the second half of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, possessed the usual features of precious manuscripts made in Persia during the Safavid period but differentiated by the high quality from those from other production places.<sup>61</sup> They were made to resemble the royal manuscripts<sup>62</sup> produced during the reign of Şah Tahmasp in order to increase their value.<sup>63</sup> Reflecting the contemporary court fashion and architecture, as well as the general atmosphere, precious Shiraz manuscripts were meant for courtly consumption. Being of large size, having double – folio frontispieces and finispieces, and almost without exception additional decorated bifolios and numerous entire page miniatures, as well as marginal floral and animal decoration, these manuscripts followed the example of courtly production.<sup>64</sup> Their bindings were even lacquered like those of the royal manuscripts. Nevertheless, they had mostly doublures made of leather in contrast to those in royal manuscripts and could not achieve the refinement of those, which allows to distinguish them from the royal ones.<sup>65</sup> Additionally, Shirazi manuscripts do not contain colophons, which refer

---

<sup>59</sup> Uluç, 1999: pp. 85.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.: pp. 86. An example of it is *Hamsa* of Nizāmī possessed by Şah Sultan, the daughter of Selim I.

<sup>61</sup> Lale Uluç. *A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan*, Metropolitan Museum Journal, Vol. 27 (1994): pp. 57 – 69.

<sup>62</sup> The term “royal manuscript” I took over from Lale Uluç’s *Selling to the Court: Late Sixteenth-Century manuscripts Production in Shiraz* (Uluç, 2000: pp. 91, n. 4), determining the manuscripts, which bear notes with the names of the royal owners; in the same manner, the term “courtly manuscript” refers to the manuscripts, which bear no evidence about the owner, but which can be attributed, according to their style, to the Safavid court workshop.

<sup>63</sup> Uluç, 2000: pp. 73. The manuscripts produced during the reign of Şah Tahmasp (1524-74) were famous for their extraordinary quality and beauty.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid..

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.: pp. 77-78.

to the patrons. The absence of patron's names could be explained by the purpose of selling of these manuscripts.<sup>66</sup> It is possible that the Ottoman sultans, their families and the elite wished to have such luxury manuscripts because of their material value and the prestige, and that the production in Shiraz increased because of that.

In sum, precious Persian manuscripts, from Shiraz but also other Persian artistic centers, circulated throughout the Ottoman Empire even after the decrease of production in Persia. Once purchased or received as a gift by Ottoman sultan, members of the royal family and Ottoman officials, they became a part of private collections, the volumes of which were later again presented as a gift or sold on the market. Istanbul was an important place for the book market, where individuals but also sultan's employees purchased precious manuscripts. Moreover, it was possible for foreigners, such as ambassadors of the French king for instance, to purchase precious Persian manuscripts.<sup>67</sup> A number of them found their way to the Ottoman royal treasury even by means of confiscation of private property. Another part was endowed to the libraries of various *medrese-s* and other religious - educational institutions. One further part of illustrated Persian manuscripts was taken with by the owners, while they were moving to new places in order to live and work throughout the Empire. This explains why we do find precious Persian manuscripts in various libraries all over the territory, which once belonged to the Ottoman Empire.

Although mostly considered to be of strategic importance as the bordering province of the Ottomans to the Habsburg Empire, Bosnia was under influence not only of the Ottoman political and economic but also religious and cultural life. It had the Ottoman

---

<sup>66</sup> Uluç, 2000: pp. 90.

<sup>67</sup> Richard, 1999: pp. 80.

educational system and shared, as the following chapter will demonstrate, artistic preferences of the Ottomans. Therefore, the next chapter will deal with the circulation of Persian manuscripts towards and within one of the Ottoman provinces, which was situated at the very Western border of the Empire: the province Bosnia.

## Chapter 2 - Persian Manuscripts in Ottoman Bosnia

The previous chapter has dealt with illustrated Persian manuscripts in the Ottoman Empire, focusing primarily on its center. It showed the ways by which those manuscripts came to the Empire, who the people collecting these manuscripts were and why they collected them. Apart from that, it analyzed the ways in which valuable illustrated Persian manuscripts came into possession of Ottoman sultans and the way the interest for them in the Ottoman Empire influenced the production of such manuscripts in Persia. Finally, it raised the question of the circulation of Persian manuscripts within the Empire, where these manuscripts were presented as a gift, purchased or sold on the market in Istanbul and other big cities. They came into possession of numerous private and public libraries throughout the Empire, not only of those situated in the center but also of those in the periphery. Hereby one further question arises: how did Persian manuscripts come to the periphery, especially to the remote bordering provinces? In order to answer this question, this chapter will deal with the circulation of Persian manuscripts towards and within one of the Ottoman provinces, which was situated at the very Western border of the Empire: the province Bosnia.

Illuminated and especially illustrated Persian manuscripts, which have been precious objects and thus represented a luxury, are very rare in Bosnia.<sup>68</sup> In terms of numbers, only one illustrated Persian manuscript has been preserved in Bosnia, namely *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* dated to the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Nevertheless, Persian manuscripts without illustrations and commentaries on Persian works are not such a rarity in the holdings

of numerous Bosnian private and public libraries from the Ottoman period: they suggest that the ability of reading and writing Persian language was spread among the Bosnian population.

Focusing in general on Persian manuscripts, which have been preserved in Bosnian libraries, this chapter tries to discover who were the people reading and collecting Persian manuscripts in this small country, which is situated so far away from Persia. The following questions arise as well: what were the reasons for collecting Persian manuscripts by Bosnian people? How did these manuscripts come to Bosnia? Do the manuscripts written in Persian language actually originate in Persia or were they copied in Bosnia or elsewhere in the Ottoman Empire? In the attempt to give answers to these questions, and to reconstruct the ways in which the Persian manuscripts came into possession of Bosnians, the examination of the holdings of private and public libraries in Bosnia provided very helpful information.

However, the issue of the education is closely related to the circulation of manuscripts. Therefore, before examining the traces people reading and collecting Persian manuscripts left, and in order to understand the importance those manuscript have had for them, it is crucial to become familiar with the state of literacy and the existence of libraries in Ottoman Bosnia.

---

<sup>68</sup> I came to this conclusion examining the catalogues of the Gazi Husref – Bey Library, the Oriental institute and the Bosniac institute in Sarajevo. See bibliography.



## 2.1. Spread of Ottoman literacy in Bosnia

The spreading of Ottoman literacy in Bosnia, which besides Ottoman and Arabic included the learning of the Persian language as well, was gradual and parallel to the establishment of Ottoman rule and the spread of Islam. Due, at least partly, to the conversion to Islam, the adoption of Ottoman language and script by the Bosnian population progressed relatively quickly, in contrast to certain other Balkan provinces of the Empire. The Ottomans supported the spread of literacy in Bosnia: numerous schools and other educational institutions were founded through *vakıf* (endowment) – institutions<sup>69</sup> from the 15<sup>th</sup> until the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is assumed that by the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century at least five *medrese-s*<sup>70</sup> and over hundred *mekteb-s* existed in Sarajevo alone<sup>71</sup>. Taking into consideration that by that time, according to the census, Sarajevo had approximately 17.000 inhabitants<sup>72</sup>, it is clear that the number of schools was surprisingly high, testifying to the importance of education for the Bosnian population. The same document gives evidence to the fact that the biggest part of the town's population consisted of autochthonous Slavic population, foreigners being

<sup>69</sup> The institution of endowment existed in the Muslim world before and the Ottomans only continued with that practice. To endow a mosque, a *medrese*, a library or other institutions, which served to the population, was considered as a good act and practiced by the sultans, the royal family and the members of the elite all over the Ottoman Empire.

<sup>70</sup> Zlatar, Behija. *Zlatno doba Sarajeva* (The Golden Age of Sarajevo), Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1996, pp. 214. According to Zlatar, five *medrese-s* were built in Sarajevo alone during the 16<sup>th</sup> century: Firuz – Bey's, (1505-12), Mehmet – Bey Isabegović's (1520), Gazi Husref – Bey's hanikah (1531), Kemal – Bey's (1538) and Gazi Husref – Bey's *medrese* (1537). Unfortunately, I was not able to recover exactly the program of these *medrese-s*. Nevertheless, according to Halil Inalcik, *medrese-s* founded in the provinces belonged mostly to the *hāriç* (lower, outside) *medrese-s*, where the students were taught in "fundamental sciences": Arabic grammar and syntax, logic, scholastic theology, astronomy, geometry, rhetoric and literature. See Halil Inalcik. *Osmansko Carstvo: Klasično doba 1300-1600* (Ottoman Empire: Classical Period 1300-1600), Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2002, pp. 211.

<sup>71</sup> Gadžo – Kasumović, 2001: pp. 222.

<sup>72</sup> Kasumović, Ismet. *Školstvo i obrazovanje u Bosanskom ejaletu za vrijeme Osmanske uprave* (School System and Education in Bosnian Eyalet during the Ottoman Rule), Mostar: Islamski Centar, 1999, pp. 37. According to Kasumović, Sarajevo had 4.220 households by the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, which if one counts four persons per household would give the mentioned number.

rare<sup>73</sup>, which supports the claim that it were Bosnians who considered education to be important.

The intense involvement of the Bosnian population within the Ottoman administrative, military, religious and educational system contributed to the spread of literacy in that Ottoman province. Moreover, the economic growth of Bosnia, particularly in some centers of crafts and trade such as Sarajevo, Mostar and Banja Luka, helped to create for the townspeople better material conditions for a more interesting, higher cultural life. The evidence of spiritual endeavors and cultural activities among the Bosnian population is to be seen in the surprisingly numerous libraries, which emerged all over that small and remote bordering province of the Empire, where the level of literacy was always considered lower by the Western scholars than it seems to have been<sup>74</sup>. As it has been mentioned, the autochthonous population was involved in the Ottoman administration and military system: a number of Bosnians were engaged in the governing of the province.<sup>75</sup> They were often educated in the centers of the Empire, where they could become familiar with the cultural achievements and preferences of that time. Besides that, the Ottomans used to send the officials coming from one part of the large Empire to various other places within the Empire, the result of which was the exchanging of diverse cultural goods as well. This could have been also one of the ways in which the Bosnian population

---

<sup>73</sup> Zlatar, 1996, pp. 118.

<sup>74</sup> Istvan Gyorgy Toth. *Literacy and Written Culture in Early Modern Central Europe*, Budapest: CEU Press, 2000, pp. 213.

<sup>75</sup> After the first period of the Ottoman rule (15<sup>th</sup> century), the governors of Bosnia were often appointed among the officials, who came from that province or were somehow related to it. One example of that practice is Gazi Husref – Bey (1480–1541), the grandson of sultan Bayezid II (the son of the daughter of sultan Bayezid II and the Bosnian bey Ferhat), who was three times the governor of Bosnia in the 16<sup>th</sup> century (1521–25, 1526–34 and 1536–41). See Kresevljaković, Hamdija. *Gazi Husrevbeg* (Gazi Husref – Bey) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000): pp. 70.

became familiar with Persian classical literature, which was highly appreciated by the Ottomans. In sum, it can be assumed that there must have been a literate local population who was a likely audience for Persian manuscripts.

## 2.2. The libraries in Ottoman Bosnia

The libraries in the Ottoman Empire can be divided into public (*vakıf*), semi – public (palace) and private libraries.<sup>76</sup> The semi – public libraries were located in the palaces of the sultan and vezirs, therefore only public and private libraries could exist in Bosnia at that time. Hereby one must mention that the most public libraries in the Ottoman Empire were connected to the *medrese-s* or other religious – educational institutions and represented collection of books needed for the education. Nevertheless, these public libraries were not closed for the rest of the population: practically everyone could lend a book. The public libraries in Ottoman Bosnia functioned after the same system as elsewhere in the Empire and were thus the institutions of crucial importance in disseminating culture.

The institution and practice of *vakıf* played an enormously great role in founding libraries in the Ottoman Empire and in Bosnia as well. Even though it is difficult to determine exactly their number, it is evident that libraries existed within mosques, *medrese-s*, *tekke-s* and other religious – educational entities in a number of towns in Bosnia.<sup>77</sup> The libraries belonging to the *medrese-s* of Gazi Husref – Bey<sup>78</sup> in Sarajevo (founded in 1537), Hacı Mehmed - Bey Karağoz – Bey in Mostar (founded in 1569),

<sup>76</sup> Hitzel, 1999: pp. 24.

<sup>77</sup> Lejla Gazić and Ramiza Smajić. *Manuscripts orientaux à Sarajevo*, REMMM 99 - 100 (2002): pp. 34.

<sup>78</sup> Gazi Husref - Bey founded within his *vakıf* numerous institutions in Sarajevo. See Kresevljaković, 2000: pp. 70.

Memi Şah - Bey in Foča (founded in 1675) and Elçi İbrāhīm – Paşa in Travnik (founded in 1704) are only some of the available examples.<sup>79</sup> Like elsewhere in the Empire, the *vākıf* often decided himself about the rules concerning the use of books from the library: the books should not be sold, given away or taken out of the library or the city. Nevertheless, it was not forbidden to copy the manuscripts, which contributed to the spread of the book and culture in general.<sup>80</sup> In his *vakıfnāme* from 8 of January 1537 Gazi Husref – Bey, the founder of the biggest library in Bosnia at that time, said that “...whatever is left over from the costs of the construction be used to purchase good books to be used in the said *medrese*, that they be used by those who will read them and that transcriptions be made from them by those who will thereby gain knowledge.”<sup>81</sup> Although the GHB Library was originally meant to serve to the aforementioned *medrese*, it was available to the broader public since its foundation as well. It contained works on all kinds of knowledge learned in the Ottoman Empire: religious sciences, Islamic law, philosophy, logic, history, geography and philology, medicine, mathematics, astronomy and astrology, literature and others.<sup>82</sup> This proves that Bosnian libraries possessed and distributed all kinds of manuscripts, which could be found in the libraries in the capital and all over the Empire.

Additionally, besides the public ones, a number of private libraries, such as those of families Džinić, Dženetić, Kadić, Svrzo, Hromić and others, existed throughout the

<sup>79</sup> Mehmed Mujezinović and Mahmud Traljić. *Gazi Khusraw Beg Library in Sarajevo* in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 32.

<sup>80</sup> In various *vakıfnāme-s* it is written that the manuscripts should be studied and copied. See: Fajić, 2000: pp. 174.

<sup>81</sup> Gazi Husref – bey’s *vakıfnāme* is preserved as *sicil* I, pp 26ff, in the Gazi Husref – Bey Library in Sarajevo. See Lejla Gazić. *The State of Sarajevo’s Collections of Oriental manuscripts in*: Koller, Marcus and Karpat, Kemal ed. *Ottoman Bosnia: A History in Peril*, Madison: Center of Turkish Studies - University of Wisconsin (2004): pp. 43.

<sup>82</sup> Mujezinović and Traljić, 2000: pp. 33.

centuries<sup>83</sup>. In fact, as the following passages will show, it was mostly private libraries, which contained Persian manuscripts.

### 2.3. Persian manuscripts in Bosnian libraries

As well as in other parts of the Ottoman Empire, Persian has been taught in Bosnian *medrese-s*. Besides that, the fact that the knowledge of Persian language was necessary for Ottoman officials<sup>84</sup> leads to the conclusion that it was probably considered necessary for pursuing a career in service of the state by potential employees from and in Bosnia as well. The examination of the holdings of private libraries, which existed during the Ottoman rule in Bosnia, has shown that, among others, it was the members of the administrative elite and their families who possessed Persian manuscripts.<sup>85</sup> Therefore it can be assumed that the members of the administrative elite in Bosnia were able to read Persian. Moreover, the fact that the members of the administrative elite in Bosnia have been appointed by the sultan, as well as those in the center of the Empire, and that they both have had to pass through the more or less same education in order to achieve the position of sultan's employees, supports the claim that Bosnian administrative elite must have possessed knowledge of the Persian language. Nonetheless, similarly to the perception of that language in the Empire, Persian was conceived of by the Bosnian educated population as the language of mysticism and literature. The fact that Persian manuscripts from private and public libraries of Ottoman Bosnia dealt mostly with issues from the

---

<sup>83</sup> During the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries all aforementioned, as well as numerous other public and private libraries, became a part of Gazi Husref – Bey Library in Sarajevo. Today this library is the most famous oriental library in former Yugoslavia and contains around 10.000 oriental manuscripts. The time of the emergence of the named private libraries is unfortunately unknown.

<sup>84</sup> See footnote 25.

domains of mysticism and literature supports this claim. Moreover, the *tekke-s*, especially those of Mevlevi order, which played the role of cultural centers in bigger towns of the Empire, and which existed in Bosnia as well, were the places of learning of Persian language and literature, even for people not belonging to the order.<sup>86</sup> Drawing upon the example of the Ottoman elite<sup>87</sup>, Persian classics were highly appreciated by the educated population in Bosnia and served as models for the works of autochthonous authors.<sup>88</sup>

#### 2.4. Private collections of Persian manuscripts in Ottoman Bosnia

The examination of the holdings of private and public libraries in Ottoman Bosnia shows that, similarly to the situation in the center of the Empire, it was the members of the elite who possessed Persian manuscripts. Bosnian vezirs endowed manuscripts: besides the already mentioned Gazi Husref – Bey, it is said that Hacı Mehmet Paşa Kukavica (vezir until 1759) and ‘Ali Celāluddīn Paşa (vezir from 1819 to 1821), whose private libraries were turned into *vakıf* and ended in the Elçi İbrāhīm – Paşa library in Travnik, possessed rich and valuable manuscript collections.<sup>89</sup> It was most probably the case with other Bosnian vezirs as well. However, other military and judiciary officials, as well as rich and educated Bosnians, especially writers owned private libraries comprising Persian manuscripts. Moreover, they possessed almost

<sup>85</sup> As stated before, I examined the catalogues of the GHB Library, the Oriental institute and the Bosniac institute in Sarajevo. See bibliography.

<sup>86</sup> Inalcik, 2002, pp. 254 - 255.

<sup>87</sup> Ibid, pp. 255.

<sup>88</sup> Derviş – Paşa Bajezidagić, for instance, or Fevzija Mostarac (from Mostar) wrote poetry upon the example of Rumi or Hafiz in Persian, Ottoman Turkish or Bosnian languages. See Fehim Nametak. *Društveno – historijska uslovljenost divanske književnosti u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Social – Historical Conditions for the Development of Divan Literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina) in: “Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju”, Vol. 41, Sarajevo: Orientalni institut (1991): pp. 314.

<sup>89</sup> Bejtić, Alija. *Elçi Ibrahim - Pašina biblioteka u Travniku* (Elçi İbrāhīm – Paşa Library in Travnik) in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 319.

without exception at least some works of Persian classics, such as Sa‘dī, Cāmī, ‘Aṭṭār and Ḥāfiẓ.

Concerning the collections of Persian classics, the private library of Derviş – Paşa Bajezidagić from Mostar, which, according to his *vakıfnāme*, has been endowed within his *medrese* and thus turned into a public library in 1593, is the oldest and most remarkable one in Bosnia.<sup>90</sup> His library contained only 46 codices, most of them being Persian classics, again *Būstān and Gūlistān* (copied in 1592/3) of Sa‘dī, *Behāristān* of Cāmī and *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* among them.<sup>91</sup> However, considering the fact that Derviş – Paşa himself had been a poet, who wrote in the Ottoman and Persian languages, is it not very surprising to find such an amount of Persian classics in his collection. Although his library did not contain such a number of manuscripts like the other private libraries, the codices he endowed are mostly richly decorated and represent an artistically very valuable collection.<sup>92</sup>

Similarly, the collection of manuscripts of the family Dženetić from Sarajevo, successors of Ismā‘il – Bey Dženetić, which possessed one of the richest and most diverse collections presented as a gift to the GHB Library in Sarajevo at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, contained 26 codices from the domain of literature.<sup>93</sup> According to the seal of the family and the colophons on the first page of the manuscripts coming from this collection, Persian classics like *Būstān* (copied in 1789) and *Gūlistān* (copied in 1513) of Sa‘dī, *Behāristān* (copied in 1790) and *Subḥatu‘l – abrār* (copied

<sup>90</sup> Nametak, Fehim. *Važniji legati u rukopisnom fondu Gazi Husrev – Begove biblioteke u Sarajevu* (Important Legacies from the Holdings of Gazi Husrev – Bey Library in Sarajevo) in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 167.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid.

<sup>93</sup> Nametak, 2000: pp. 170.

in 1628) of *Cāmī* and *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* (copied in 1497) belonged to their family library.<sup>94</sup> The first testimony to the existence of this collection comes from the *sicil* from Sarajevo in 1776 / 7, where the property of the deceased Ismā‘īl – Bey Dženetić has been listed: among other objects he possessed, 97 manuscripts were enumerated on the first place.<sup>95</sup> Nevertheless, it can be assumed that the collection of this family existed earlier than this document attests. The fact that this collection was owned by the successors of a *bey* supports the claim that the members of the military elite owned Persian manuscripts.

One example is also the private library of the family Kadić from Sarajevo, whose members were the successors of one *kadi*<sup>96</sup>. Their collection contained among 17 manuscripts of literary works one *Būstān* of Sa‘dī<sup>97</sup>, one *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* and one Arabic-Persian dictionary from 1467, which has already been in possession of a certain *derviş* Muṣṭafa b. Osman.<sup>98</sup>

Further, the collection of ‘Abdullah – Efendi Kantamiri (Kantamirija), who was *müderris* in the Misri *medrese*, preacher and the secretary of *şeriat* court in Sarajevo, but also a writer of poems in Ottoman language and copist of manuscripts, and who founded one of the oldest independent public library in Sarajevo in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, contained Persian manuscripts as well.<sup>99</sup> The hand painted five-pointed star in his manuscripts allows us to determine the holding of his library. He possessed a

---

<sup>94</sup> Nametak, 1998.

<sup>95</sup> Nametak, 2000: pp.170.

<sup>96</sup> The last name Kadić origins in the Ottoman word “*kadi*” > judge. It is to assume that one of the ancestors of that family, after whom the family took the name, was a *kadi*, which supports the idea that the members of the administrative elite possessed Persian manuscripts.

<sup>97</sup> This manuscript is preserved in the GHB Library under No. 2976.

<sup>98</sup> Nametak, 1998.

<sup>99</sup> Fajić, 2000: pp. 253.



collection of 118 codices containing 170 works from various disciplines<sup>100</sup>, among which 58 works on religious sciences (comprising volumes of Kur'an, Hadith, commentaries on both, and works on tradition, preaching and dogmatism), 32 works on Islamic law, 18 works on linguistics (grammar, stylistics, metrics), 14 literary works, 5 works on history, 3 works on astronomy and occult sciences, 4 on philosophy and sufism, 3 dictionaries (all of them Arabic-Persian, 2 of them originating even from the 13<sup>th</sup> century) and 33 *mecmue-s* (collections of works) on various topics.<sup>101</sup> Among all these manuscripts, Kantamiri possessed 7 Persian works: none of them was a work of the most famous Persian classics, however, that was mostly literary works like divans or sufi poems. It suggests that even though the number of Persian manuscripts from this collection is not great, it was usual for Bosnian judiciary elite to possess at least some Persian works.

However, book ownership did not seem to be restricted to the elite directly involved in the governing of the province. The evidence suggest that other rich and educated people, whose origins and titles are more difficult to recover possessed private libraries. Their libraries contained the works of Persian classics as well.

One example of such a library is the one of the family Džinić from Banja Luka, which has been turned into endowment by Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad Bakī– Efendi Cino – zāde (Džinić) in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and which has been presented as a gift from the family to the GHB Library at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It contained, among over 100 manuscripts, Persian classics as well.<sup>102</sup> *Būstān* (copied in 1616 by Zulfikar b. Ibrāhīm – Efendi in Drniš) and *Gūlistān* (copied in 1592/3) of Sa'dī, and one *Dīvān-i*

---

<sup>100</sup> Fajić, 2000: pp. 255.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.: pp. 256 - 274.

*Ḥāfiẓ*, illustrated with five miniatures, of unknown origin present only a part of Persian manuscripts providing from this collection.<sup>103</sup>

One further example is the collection of the family Sokolović from Sarajevo, also presented as a gift to the GHB Library in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Concluding from the fact that this library possessed several examples of one work, this family seems to have not only read but really collected Persian manuscripts. Among 96 codices from the domain of literature, there were four volumes of *Gūlistān* of Sa‘dī, (one from 1546, one from 1622, one from 1633 and one of unknown origin), two volumes of *Subḥatu‘l – abrār*, one of *Beharistān* (copied in 1624) and one of *Tuḥfatu‘l-ahrār* of Cāmī<sup>104</sup>, one volume of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from 1622/3 (former owner ‘Abdullah Derviş –Bektaşī) and one of *Ḥamsa-i Niẓāmī*<sup>105</sup> from 1583.

The same could be said of the family Svrzo from Sarajevo, well known to have been a wealthy family.<sup>106</sup> Their collection contained over 200 manuscripts with a great number of classical Persian works<sup>107</sup>, two of them being volumes of *Gūlistān* of Sa‘dī, from the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>108</sup>

To mention just one more example, the collection of Osman Şehdi – Efendi Bjelopoljac (from Bijelo Polje), who founded in 1759 the first known independent

---

<sup>102</sup> Nametak, 2000: pp. 170.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid.

<sup>104</sup> This work is part of Cāmī’s *Ḥamsa* (Quintet).

<sup>105</sup> Niẓāmī’s *Ḥamsa* is a work in Meşnevi – style, consisting of 5 parts.

<sup>106</sup> It is interesting to know that the family Svrzo presented one of their old houses in the old town of Sarajevo as a gift to the city of Sarajevo. It is a typical traditional Bosnian house from the Ottoman period, turned into the museum “Svzina kuća” (Svrzo’s House) nowadays.

<sup>107</sup> Nametak, 2000: pp. 171.

<sup>108</sup> Nametak, 1998.

library in Sarajevo<sup>109</sup>, contained among 16 codices of literary works one manuscript of *Gūlistān of Sa‘dī*<sup>110</sup> as well.

From the above mentioned examples, it becomes obvious that the private collections of various people from Bosnian cultural centers like Sarajevo, Mostar and Banja Luka contained Persian manuscripts and classics among them. However, not only families from big towns in Bosnia possessed Persian manuscripts. In order to prove that one needs to consider the collections of families who originated in other, smaller towns and villages.

Thus, the private collection of the family Kuskunović from Travnik contained Sa‘dī’s *Būstān* and Cāmī’s *Tuḥfatu‘l-ahrār*<sup>111</sup>; a copy of *Pend-nāme – i ‘Aṭṭār*, from the 19<sup>th</sup> century was in possession of the family Abdagić from Donji Vakuf<sup>112</sup>; one volume of *Pend-nāme – i ‘Aṭṭār* from the 18<sup>th</sup> century came to The GHB Library even from the private collection of the family Omerčić from the village Babići near Gračanica.<sup>113</sup> The latter is also interesting for other reasons: it had several seals of previous owners, whose identity, due to the fact that they left only their names (Ismā’il, Muṣṭafa, Nū’mān), is unfortunately unrecoverable today; nevertheless, it confirms that the manuscripts have been in various hands before they found their way to certain collections.

<sup>109</sup> Traljić, 2000: pp. 114.

<sup>110</sup> This manuscript is preserved in the GHB Library under No. 2409. See in Nametak, 1998.

<sup>111</sup> Fehim Nametak. Salih Trako ed. *Katalog arapskih, perzijskih, turskih i bosanskih rukopisa iz zbirke Bošnjačkog Instituta* (Catalogue of Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Bosnian Manuscripts from the Collection of the Bosniac Institute), Vol. 2, Zürich: Bošnjački Institut, 1997.

<sup>112</sup> Haso Popara ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev – begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts in Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Vo.13, London and Sarajevo: Al – Furqān – Rijaset Islamske Zajednice u BiH, 2004. This manuscript is preserved in The GHB Library under No. 9682.

Concerning the libraries of persons performing religious and educational duties, there is also evidence that their collections contained Persian classics. For instance, the private library of Mehmet – Razi Velihocaoglu (Velihodžić), şeyh and müderris of Husref – Bey *hanikah* in Sarajevo, contained 149 codices with 199 works.<sup>114</sup> Educated in Sarajevo and Istanbul, he was also scribe, poet, big connoisseur of *şeriat* inheritance law, mathematics and astronomy and he knew Persian.<sup>115</sup> His library contained eight Persian classics or commentaries on them, such as two copies of Beharistān of Cāmī, one of Meşnevi of Rūmī, one Sūdī *Dīvān-i Hāfiz*<sup>116</sup>, one Şerh-i Pend and others.<sup>117</sup> Similarly, ‘Abdurrahman Sirrī from Oglavci near Fojnica, who was şeyh of Nakşibendi *tekke* in Oglavci and a poet writing in Bosnian and Ottoman languages, possessed Persian manuscripts as well. According to the *sicils* of Sarajevo’s court, to the property of the deceased şeyh belonged a collection enumerating 107 codices with 94 works, among which two examples of Sa’dī’s *Gülistān* and some commentaries on Persian works, such as Sūdī *Dīvān-i Hāfiz*, Ismā‘il Haqqī al-Brusavī’s commentary on ‘Atţār’s works.<sup>118</sup>

Finally, the private collection of Hasamuddīn Vaiz-zāde (Vaizović), who was a preacher in several mosques in Banja Luka<sup>119</sup>, contained Persian classics as well. Although not completely accurately, his *vakıfnāme*, which dates from 1638 and bears

<sup>113</sup> Popara, 2004. This manuscript is preserved in The GHB Library under No. 6922.

<sup>114</sup> Mehmed Mujezinović. *Biblioteka Mehmed – Razi Velihodžića, şeyha i muderisa Husref Begovog hanikaha u Sarajevu* (The Library of Mehmet - Razi Velihodžić, Şeyh and Müderris of the Husref – Bey hanikah in Sarajevo) in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 276. However, the number of codices this şeyh possessed is not the same in: Bašeskija, Mula Mustafa Ševki. *Ljetopis* (Chronicles), Sarajevo: Sarajevo Publishing, 1997, pp. 185, n. 10. According to this source, the list of the property of the deceased şeyh Velihocaoglu from 1786 enumerated 188 codices.

<sup>115</sup> Bašeskija, 1997, pp. 185.

<sup>116</sup> Ahmet Sudi al-Bosnevi (d.1596).

<sup>117</sup> Mujezinović, 2000: pp. 276.

<sup>118</sup> Fajić, 2000: pp. 291 - 299.

<sup>119</sup> Muhamed Ždralović. *Vakıfnama Husamudina o osnivanju biblioteke u Banjoj Luci* (The *Vakıfnāme* of Husamuddīn about the Foundation of the Library in Banja Luka) in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 310, n. 1.

the seal and the signature of *kadi* Murat, enumerates almost all the manuscripts from his to be endowed collection, noting their titles, the names of the authors and the number of volumes.<sup>120</sup> The importance *Vaiz – zāde* attributed to these manuscripts from his library is testified by the fact that he, as *vākif-s* often did, wrote down the rules for the created library and appointed a librarian. He wanted him “...to take care of respectful books and protect them from the eyes of those whose reason is limited, and not to lend them outside the town ... not to lend them to nobody in the town, except in exchange for a valuable object or provision, or presenting a trustful witness...”<sup>121</sup> Among over 110 works, *Beharistān* of Cāmī and Sa’dī’s *Gūlistān* belonged to his collection.<sup>122</sup>

As it has been demonstrated, the members of the Bosnian elite owned Persian manuscripts, among which there were the works of Persian classics. However, various *medrese* libraries, although under the strong influence of religious dogmatism, which did not support Persian classical literature, contained also numerous Persian classics. Attempting to discover how this was possible, the next subchapter deals with the libraries, which have been connected to *medrese-s*.

## 2.5. Public libraries in Ottoman Bosnia

One example of public libraries in Ottoman Bosnia is the Elçi İbrāhīm – Paşa *medrese* library, on shelves of which, among various Persian manuscripts containing works on different subjects like ethics, biography, medicine, occult sciences, astronomy and

<sup>120</sup> Ždralović, 2000: pp. 303.

<sup>121</sup> Bašeskija, 1997, pp. 304. “...da čuva časne knjige i da ih štiti od pogleda onih što su ograničena uma, te da ih ne izdaje izvan grada...da nikom u gradu ne izdaje knjige, osim uz skupocjeni zalog ili pouzdanog jamca...”

astrology, one could find the works of Persian classics. Elçi İbrāhīm – Paşa, Bosnian vezir in 1704-05, founded his *medrese* and within his library, containing 103 manuscripts, in 1707.<sup>123</sup> It is not known exactly which manuscripts he endowed, but after his library was transferred to The GHB Library in Sarajevo the following codices were part of it: one of Sa‘dī’s *Būstān*, possessed previously by Mulla Derviş Ahmet Spahi - zāde from Travnik<sup>124</sup>; one of Cāmī’s *Subḥatu’l – ahrār* (from 1628/9 of unknown origin and owner), and three codices of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz* (a first from 1521, a second from 1774 copied by certain Muṣṭafa Tālib and a third of unknown origin).<sup>125</sup> Considering the fact that during the transfer many of the manuscripts from this library disappeared, it can be assumed that this *medrese* library contained many more Persian works.

The second example is the library of the *medrese* of Mehmet – Bey Karağoz in Mostar. His *vakıfnāme* from 1569, where he does not mention any Persian manuscripts<sup>126</sup> is preserved in GHB Library.<sup>127</sup> Nevertheless, the library contained three manuscripts of the commentary on *Meşnevi* from Muṣṭafa, b. Havaga Sa‘ban al-Galibolī, known as Sūrūrī, which previously have been part of the endowment of Derviş – Paşa al-Mostarī. The place and the dates of copying, inscribed in the manuscripts themselves, refer to Mostar and the years 1552, 1555 and 1556: this could suggest that they were copied in this *medrese*, which would further lead to the

---

<sup>122</sup> Ždralović, 2000: pp. 305 - 309.

<sup>123</sup> Bejtić, 2000: pp. 319.

<sup>124</sup> This manuscript is preserved in The GHB Library under No. 5167.

<sup>125</sup> Nametak, 1998.

<sup>126</sup> Hasandedić, Hizvija. *Muslimanske biblioteke u Mostaru* (Muslim Libraries in Mostar) in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 312.

<sup>127</sup> Fajić, Zejnil. *Originali i prepisi vakufnama sauvanih do danas* (Originals and Copies of *Vakifname*-s Preserved until Today) in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 178.

conclusion that Persian classics and commentaries on them were read and copied in Bosnian *medrese-s*.

Considering the fact that Persian classics did not usually belong to the material learned in *medrese-s*<sup>128</sup>, and is thus surprising that the holdings of *medrese* libraries contain such works. One possible explanation for this could be the custom of the endowment, which has been more or less practiced by all wealthy people in the Ottoman Empire: since the endowment of books was considered by Muslims to be a good act, many of the aforementioned private collections, as well as individual manuscripts, ended up in public libraries, which have been mostly parts of *medrese-s*. Thus, *medrese* libraries, although being religious – educational institutions under the surveillance of the orthodox *ulema*, played a role in the dissemination of Persian classical literature.

Concerning the public libraries in Bosnia, one should not lack to mention those, which were not a part of *medrese-s* or other educational institutions, and which emerged in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Osman Şehdi – Efendi Bjelopoljac (from Bijelo Polje) founded his library in 1759 and ‘Abdullah – Efendi Kantamiri in 1774.<sup>129</sup> These two libraries were the first independent public libraries in Bosnia, contributing even more to the spread of the reading culture in this former Ottoman province.

---

<sup>128</sup> Inalcik, 2002, pp. 255.

## 2.6. The circulation of Persian manuscripts

After examining the holdings of the best known private and public libraries in Bosnia and proving that all of them contained manuscripts of Persian classics, one must ask how and from where did these manuscripts come to this Ottoman province. As it has already been mentioned, manuscripts often went through the hands of many people: they were bought, sold, endowed or presented as a gift. The seals and colophons the scribes or owners left in the manuscripts themselves testify to this fact. These remains are the best evidence about the ways in which Persian manuscripts circulated through the Empire and its provinces, and allow one, if not to reconstruct completely the routes the manuscripts have taken, at least to see who produced them and where or in whose possession they have been.

Unfortunately, in the case of most Persian manuscripts preserved in Bosnia it is impossible to discover neither the identity of the scribe and owner(s) or the place of their production. Even if the manuscripts contain seals or colophons, a great number of them are incomplete or not readable, or they provide limited information about the scribe and/or owner(s) giving only their name(s). Nevertheless, those, which could be read, proved that Persian manuscripts in Bosnian libraries, classics among them, originated partly from Persia and partly from all parts of the Ottoman Empire. Additionally, a quantity of them was produced in Bosnia. One example of a manuscript produced in Persia is Rūmī's *Meşnevi*, whose colophon says that it was copied by Husein b. Muḥammad b. 'Ali Husmarddan in Ḥorasan in 1499.<sup>129</sup> Further,

<sup>129</sup> Traljić, Mahmud. *Iz prošlosti Gazi Husrev – Begove biblioteke* (From the Past of Gazi Husrev – Bey Library) in: Kujundžić, 2000: pp. 114.

<sup>130</sup> Lejla Gazić. Ramiza Smajić. *Manuscripts orientaux à Sarajevo*, REMMM 99 - 100 (2002): pp. 41.



one manuscript of *Divan-i Hafiz*<sup>131</sup>, copied by Ca‘far b. Ḥasan b. ‘Alī Ca‘far al-Ḳulustani, which was owned by the family Kadić from Sarajevo, was previously in possession of ‘Abdulḳadir b. Abū al-Misri from Kara Bag in Persia, which suggests that it was produced in Persia as well.<sup>132</sup> Finally, The GHB Library contains a manuscript of Sa‘dī’s *Gūlistān*<sup>133</sup>, which was copied in 1312, only 21 years after the death of the author. Although it is unknown how it came to Bosnia, the date of copying suggests that it must have been written in Persia. Other manuscripts were produced in the center of the Ottoman Empire: one *Pend - nāme – i ‘Aṭṭār*<sup>134</sup>, which was bought in Zenica by Nū’mān b. Muḥammad – Efendi Čaršimović in 1875, was, according to its colophon, copied by a certain İbrāhīm in Istanbul in 1619. One further example of the manuscripts copied in the Empire is one manuscript of Sa‘dī’s *Būstān*<sup>135</sup>: its colophon says that it was copied by ‘Abdulkerim Halil b. İbrāhīm in the palace in Edirne in 1629. As it has been said, some of the manuscripts were produced in Bosnia: one *Būstān* of Sa‘dī<sup>136</sup> contains the evidence that it was copied by a certain Bekir b. Muḥammad from Donji Vakuf in 1627. One further example provides even more information: besides the name of Hacı Derviş Mostarī and the date of 1622, the additional inscriptional note in this manuscript of Sa‘dī’s *Gūlistān*<sup>137</sup> says that the scribe copied it in the coffee bar (*beytü’l kahva*) in Mostar for his friend İbrāhīm – Aga.

In sum, of 166 manuscripts containing works of Persian classics, preserved in the GHB Library in Sarajevo, there is evidence that 11 of them were copied in Bosnia and

<sup>131</sup> This manuscript is preserved in the GHB Library under No. 2743.

<sup>132</sup> Nametak, 2000.

<sup>133</sup> Manuscript No. 1389 in the GHB Library.

<sup>134</sup> Manuscript No. 7620 in the GHB Library.

<sup>135</sup> Manuscript No. 3967 in the GHB Library.

<sup>136</sup> Manuscript No. 2589 in the GHB Library.

11 outside Bosnia; 144 manuscripts do not provide enough information in order to determine their origin, or do not contain any inscriptional notes at all.<sup>138</sup> Similarly, from 213 Persian classics, which have been preserved in the Oriental Institute, 16 were produced in Bosnia, 13 outside Bosnia; the origin of 184 manuscripts remained unknown.<sup>139</sup> The information provided by 26 manuscripts of Persian classics kept in the Bosniac Institute in Sarajevo revealed that 3 were copied in Bosnia, 3 outside the country and 20 codices are of unknown origin.<sup>140</sup>

Although the obtained information provide only superficial insight into the origin of Persian manuscripts, it is interesting that the numbers of manuscripts copied in and outside Bosnia are approximately the same. This suggests that copying, as a private or institutional activity<sup>141</sup>, was, besides the import from famous Islamic centers, an important source for the spread of manuscripts in Ottoman Bosnia. Moreover, the fact that the manuscripts of Persian classics were copied in Bosnia proves that the autochthonous population not only collected them but engaged more deeply with Persian literature and culture in general.

Concerning the reconstruction of the ways the manuscripts of Persian classics have taken, there is evidence that they were purchased on the market or when the property of deceased persons was sold out. The manuscript of *Nigaristān*<sup>142</sup>, copied in 1578,

---

<sup>137</sup> Manuscript No. 6135 in the GHB Library.

<sup>138</sup> Nametak ed., Vol.4, 1998 and Popara ed., Vol.13, 2004.

<sup>139</sup> Trako, Salih. *Katalog perzijskih rukopisa Orijentalnog instituta u Sarajevu* (Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts of The Oriental Institute in Sarajevo), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, 1986. This catalogue is unfortunately the only evidence of 464 Persian manuscripts, which were part of the collection of the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo. The institute burned down during the war in Bosnia 1992-1996 and none of 5263 manuscripts written in oriental languages remained.

<sup>140</sup> Nametak and Trako, 1997, Vol. 1 - 2.

<sup>141</sup> The institutional activity means here the copying of manuscripts within the framework of *medrese-s* of other religious or educational institutions.

<sup>142</sup> This work was written by Kadi Ahmet b. Muhammad b. Ca'far al-Kazvini al-Ca'fari (d. 1567/8).

for instance, was bought in Istanbul by the Bosnian Aḥmet - Aga, who was a commander of the palace security order in Istanbul in 1645/6. It is also known that he bought there one copy of *Leyla va Mecnun*, which he endowed to his *medrese* in Mostar, as well. One example of the purchase of manuscripts from the property of deceased persons is a manuscript of *Külliyyat-i Urḩi Shīrāzī*, copied by ‘Ali b. Muḩaffar in 1599. The colophon says that es-Seyyid ‘Ali al-Vasfī, the scribe of the divan of the Bosnian vezir Hursid - Pasa, bought it from the property of a certain deceased Muteveliċ and then endowed it for the Şehdi Library. There is also evidence of a case when a manuscript was endowed but came after it again in private possession: one *Gūlistān* of Sa‘dī<sup>143</sup>, which came originally from the Şehdi Library and was then endowed to a *medrese* in Sarajevo in 1836, was later again part of private collection. Additionally, there is also evidence of manuscripts composed of several works, which were written or copied in different time periods and by different writers or scribes, and later bound together in one codex, which makes it difficult to reconstruct their history. Such an example is a manuscript containing the *Pend-nāme-i ‘Aṭṭār*, copied in 1628 and *Tuḩfa-i Sahidi*<sup>144</sup>, copied in 1786 by Süleymān Iskopyevī from Gornji Vakuf, which was bought by Bekiraga - zāde for his brother Abdurreuf – Efendi in 1864.<sup>145</sup> It is assumed that the first work is later bound with the second. Later it belonged to the library of the family Sokolović, who presented it as a gift to GHB Library.

One could list numerous further examples. However, those mentioned here allow one to conclude that, even if not in such an amount as manuscripts written in Arabic and

<sup>143</sup> Manuscript No. 2409 in The GHB Library.

<sup>144</sup> *Tuḩfa – i Sahidi* is a Persian – Ottoman dictionary in the *mesnevi*-style, written originally by Ibrahim Sahidi b. Hudai-dede, a Mevlevi - dervish from Anadolia, who died in 1550.

<sup>145</sup> Popara, 2004.

Ottoman languages<sup>146</sup>, at least not illustrated manuscripts of Persian classics were read and collected in Bosnia. They circulated from other parts of the Ottoman Empire towards this province and in the province itself, whereby they were bought, sold, presented as a gift, endowed and copied. According to preserved manuscripts, the works, which most often occurred in Ottoman Bosnia, were *Būstān* and *Gūlistān* of Sa‘dī, *Beharistān* and *Subḥatu’l – abrār* of Cāmī, *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, *Pend – nāme – i ‘Aṭṭār* and *Meşnevi* from Celāluddīn Rūmī.<sup>147</sup>

It is assumed that among Persian manuscripts it were the classics, which were most often decorated and illustrated. It is thus significant that, as it has been previously mentioned, the only known illustrated Persian manuscript preserved in Bosnia is the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* No. 1366 from the GHB Library in Sarajevo. It does not contain any colophons or seals, except the seal of the named library, to which it was presented as a gift from the family Džinić at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; therefore, it is very difficult to determine its origin and the way by which it came to Bosnia. Nevertheless, even though it is the only example, it is a proof that precious illustrated Persian manuscripts found their way to Ottoman Bosnia, and that Bosnia, in this sense, shared the preference of the elite in the Empire for this kind of artistic objects. The next chapters will deal with this manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, first from the literary, and thereafter from the historical and artistic point of view.

<sup>146</sup> *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Vol. 1 - 15.

<sup>147</sup> I concluded this after the observation of the manuscript catalogues of the GHB Library, the Oriental institute and the Bosniac institute in Sarajevo, which I enumerated in the bibliography.

## Chapter 3 - Ḥāfiz' Dīvān and the *Gazel* Genre

This chapter is dedicated to the observation of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiz* from the historical and literary point of view. Starting with a short biography of the author, it will give a short history of the *gazel* as a “genre of the time” and Ḥāfiz' achievements within this context. Considering the fact that the *gazel* was eventually influenced by sufism, the chapter continues with the discussion on symbolism in sufism and on Ḥāfiz's use of sufi symbols. Finally, in connection to chapter 4, which will deal with the images accompanying Ḥāfiz' verses in the manuscript No. 1366 from the GHB Library in Sarajevo, this chapter will suggest two different ways of reading *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiz*, a profane and a mystical one.

### 3.1. Ḥāfiz' Dīvān and the *gazel* genre

*Dīvān-i Ḥāfiz* is the work of Shamsuddīn Muḥammad Ḥāfiz Shīrāzī (1325-1389)<sup>148</sup>, one of the most important Persian classical poets.<sup>149</sup> Being a *ḥāfiz* (from “*ḥāfaẓa*” > “to learn by heart”, “*ḥāfiz*” > “the one who knows Kur'an by heart”), he remained known under the artist name Ḥāfiz throughout the centuries. It is said that his father moved from Isfahan to Shiraz, where he died when Ḥāfiz was a child, leaving the family in dire circumstances and stricken by poverty. Nevertheless, Ḥāfiz probably obtained a thorough education according to the customs of that time; it is assumed that he even worked as a baker's apprentice and manuscript copyist during the years of his adolescence. Most probably he started to write poetry before his thirties. He was the court poet of several rulers in Shiraz, where he was appreciated but also

<sup>148</sup> EI<sup>2</sup>, “Ḥāfiz”. The exact year of his birth is not known. Certain scholars suggest 1320 or even 1317.

temporarily repudiated because of his poetry.<sup>150</sup> The reign of Şah Shuja' (1358-1384) was for Ḥāfiẓ the period of his greatest maturity and his fame spread not only throughout Persia but also abroad.<sup>151</sup>

Among his writings<sup>152</sup>, the *Divān* (collection of poetry) is Ḥāfiẓ' most famous work. It contains around 500 *gazel-s* (from the root “g-z-l” > “to spin”)<sup>153</sup>, a poetic form which, embedded in love lyrics, expresses the principles and methods of sufism. The guiding principle of the *gazel*, such as it is in Ḥāfiẓ' poetry, is manifested through the mystical love towards the object of the poem - the Creator, nature, human being, while the method consists of the use of sufi terms, meaning the expressions and poetic images with mystical meaning. It was not Ḥāfiẓ himself but his pupils who wrote down his verses after his death and numerous compilers eventually enlarged the text of his *Divān*; therefore, it is difficult to estimate the exact number of poems which are his work.<sup>154</sup> Nevertheless, it is assumed that the oldest versions of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* did not contain more than 500 poems.<sup>155</sup> The fact that even the prince Abū al-Faṭḥ Farīdun Ḥusein Khān with his most learned men undertook the enterprise of comparison of then extant manuscripts of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* in order to establish the original text in 1501/2<sup>156</sup> speaks for the importance of Ḥāfiẓ' poetry in his homeland Persia.

<sup>149</sup> See footnote 26.

<sup>150</sup> Ahmed Ananda. *Divani Hafez: sedamdeset sehura s Hafezom* (Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ: Seventy Mornings with Hafiz), Sarajevo: Buybook, 2004, pp.xiii.

<sup>151</sup> EP “Hafiz”.

<sup>152</sup> Ananda, 2004, pp. xviii. Apart from *gazels*, he wrote in genres of *rubā'i* and *kasida*.

<sup>153</sup> *Gazel* (song, elegy of love) is a poetic form with a single end rhyme, composed usually of seven *beyt-s* (distichs), in form and order of the rhyme almost identical with the *kasida* (ode). See EP “Ghazal”.

<sup>154</sup> Robert M. Rehder. *The Text of Hafiz*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol .94, No. .2 (1974): pp. 145 - 156, here pp. 145 - 146.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

Ḥāfīz did not invent *gazel* as a poetic form<sup>157</sup>. *Gazel* developed out of the *nasīb*, elegiac prologue of the *kasida* (ode), emerging as a distinct genre in the 7<sup>th</sup> century's Arabia.<sup>158</sup> The literary concept was that of love, presented in images of the lover and the lady, which existed already in pre – Islamic times.<sup>159</sup> In the 7<sup>th</sup> century, two kinds of the love – poem coexisted: the *Hidjazi* love poem, filled with the light atmosphere and adventures, and the *Udhri* love – poem about the faithful and chaste love for unreachable objects.<sup>160</sup> Already in 8<sup>th</sup> century's Iraq the *gazel*, influenced by the courtly style of Iraq, became more or less fixed by conventions and techniques.<sup>161</sup> *Gazel* was one of most common genres of Persian classical lyrics; between the 10<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> century the element of the mystical experience was incorporated.<sup>162</sup> After that, in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, the *gazel*, combining the originally decorative style with mysticism, achieved its highest point in form and content. It is said that Ḥāfīz was the one who developed this lyric genre to its perfection.

The form of Ḥāfīz *gazel-s* is shaped upon a definite system, which dominated in Persian classical poetry.<sup>163</sup> Writing in that genre, Ḥāfīz was limited by the systems of rhyme and rhythm, as well as by conventional themes, but was, at the same time, completely free to arrange the content and create his own variations within that prescribed formal framework. Using the extant repertory of abstract types and personified ideas<sup>164</sup>, he was able to find a balance between the verbal embellishments of the text and the metaphorical expression of deep mystic thought and emotions.

---

<sup>156</sup> Rehder, 1974: pp.147.

<sup>157</sup> See footnote 148.

<sup>158</sup> Julia Ashtiany ed. *'Abbasid Belles – Lettres*, Cambridge: CUP, 1990, pp. 204.

<sup>159</sup> EI<sup>2</sup> "Ghazal".

<sup>160</sup> Ashtiany ed., 1990, pp. 208.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> EI<sup>2</sup> "Ghazal".

<sup>163</sup> Yarsharter, 1962: pp. 62.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid.: pp. 63. Classical poetry dealt with types rather than with individuals. It introduces also personified ideas such as Beauty, Love, Wisdom, Fate, Life, Death and others.

In Ḥāfiz’ poetry, the main object of the *gazel* “*ma ’shuk*” (earthly beloved) becomes connected to “*ma ’bud*” (divine beloved – God or his representative on earth, the mystical initiator) and even to “*mamduh*” (the praised one– prince or patron).<sup>165</sup> As it is evident in his verses, Ḥāfiz called himself a *sufi*, and it is known that he was a student of *ṣeyh Maḥmud ‘Attār*, who was not an orthodox mystic and whose ideas are supposed to have influenced Ḥāfiz’ thought.<sup>166</sup> Considering the fact that certain poetical images he employed had their roots in sufism and in order to define and explain some of the symbols, which are incorporated in his thought, one should turn first to sufism.

### 3.2. Symbolism in sufism

The symbolism Ḥāfiz used in his *gazel-s* is of crucial importance for the interpretation of images accompanying his verses in the manuscript No. 1366 from the GHB Library in Sarajevo, the issue to which chapter 4 will be dedicated. As it has already been mentioned, a quantity of symbols contained in Ḥāfiz’ verses are borrowed from the *sufi* thought; therefore, in order to discover the meaning that these symbols carry in Ḥāfiz’ poetry, and perhaps even in the images of the aforementioned manuscript, one must have a look at their meaning within sufism.

Sufism (“*tasawwuf*”, from “*sūf*” > “woollen clothes” of early Islamic mystics as a sign of rejection of earthly luxury), as one specific vision of the world, the goal of which is *fanā’* (final absorption in God, cessation of being) - the union of the human

---

<sup>165</sup> EI<sup>2</sup> “*Hafiz*”.

<sup>166</sup> Ananda, 2004, pp.xi.



being with God through the mystical ecstasy<sup>167</sup>, represents an important cultural – religious factor of influence in Islamic art. The final goal of sufism is direct experience of transcendental truths, a kind of experience, which is, while talking about its directness, comparable with the experience of senses rather than with the experience of rational facts. The emphasis on the senses and the tendency towards spontaneity and natural expression of emotions, in contrast to the scholarly prescribed dogma, brings sufism closer to the art of Islam, including Persian poetry.

As it has been mentioned, the guiding principle in *gazel-s* is mystical love towards the object of the poem. The introduction of the element of love, which actually turned Islamic ascetism to mysticism, is ascribed to Rabi'ah al-Adawiyah (d. 801), who was the first to formulate the Sufi ideal of desinterested God's love for men.<sup>168</sup> This ideal of love is, according to mystics, founded upon the statement in the Kur'an that God loves men and they love him, which was the basis for "love mysticism".<sup>169</sup> Since the Truth is revealed in visions, ("mukashafat" > "unveilings" visionary experience), through colors and sounds, namely irrational experiences, in order to convey them to the others sufis used the terminology of the known worldly life such as love and intoxication.<sup>170</sup> Love towards earthly objects was used as the symbol for love towards God and the expression of the hope for the union with Him, which is the final goal of a sufi.

Further elements from the profane world, such as the rose, wine, cup, cupbearer, beautiful young man or girl (beloved), and simply music and beautiful nature are used

---

<sup>167</sup> EI<sup>2</sup> "Tasawwuf".

<sup>168</sup> Ashtiany ed., 1990, pp. 239.

<sup>169</sup> EI<sup>2</sup> "Tasawwuf" (Kur'an V, 54).

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.

in the same symbolic manner to convey mystical messages. Considering the fact that Sufism grew to a theosophical system incorporating traditional elements of neo - Platonism and Gnosticism<sup>171</sup>, the image of God who created the world using the heavenly archetypes emerged.<sup>172</sup> God and the world are observed as a mirror, where everything from the earthly world is in fact the physical manifestation of the pre - extant heavenly archetypes. Thereby, earthly phenomena are seen as a veil, which hinders the human being to see God's real beauty. From the 10<sup>th</sup> century onwards, it was the Persian language that was used for the sufi literature, which was of crucial importance for Persian poetry.<sup>173</sup>

The Sufi themselves explain their way to the truth with the following words: "From time to time the revelation comes in the form of one big wave, from the ocean of Endlessness toward our human world; Sufism is a call, a system and a science of being pulled by one of the waves and of swimming on it to His Eternal and Endless Source."<sup>174</sup> This metaphoric definition reflects one of the basic features of Persian classical poetry: *isti'āra* (metaphor) seen as a process of exchange of one thematic content through another, is able to convey both earthly manifestation and its archetype. Hereby, it is important to mention that the definition of *isti'āra* is not precise and changed throughout the history.<sup>175</sup> Moreover, it included the poetic images that we nowadays call metonymy, trope or simile.<sup>176</sup> According to some Arabic authors, *isti'āra* was praised because it makes possible the illustration of

<sup>171</sup> EI<sup>2</sup> "Tasawwuf". Neo - Platonism and Aristotelianism were known to the Arabic world through the translations since the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Certain authors like Yahya b. habash al - Suhrawardi (d.1191) and Ibn al-Arabi (d.1240) adopted theosophical elements and influenced the sufi thought.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid. Until the 10<sup>th</sup> century sufi literature was written in Arabic language alone.

<sup>174</sup> Lings, Martin *Šta je sufizam? (What is Sufism?)*, Zagreb: Sebil, 1994. pp. 14.

<sup>175</sup> EI<sup>2</sup> "Isti'āra".

<sup>176</sup> Ibid.

abstract concepts with concrete analogies.<sup>177</sup> It creates the double meaning in one artistic expression, where the idea and the image become one entity, and which can be understood in the exoteric, but also esoteric way.<sup>178</sup> The use of the metaphor as a kind of expression, which contains that which is visible at first glance, but also, at the same time, the invisible and the hidden, is typical for Hafiz' poetry. Although Hafiz uses conventional themes and images, which are expressed by profane, earthly words, he focuses not on the external appearance of things, but on their archetypes, their interiority. "*Bāṭin*", the interior side of Islam, in contrast to "*ẓāhir*" (the exterior side)<sup>179</sup> is the common source of sufism and Ḥāfiz' poetry.

### 3.3. Two different readings of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiz*

The various themes and images with mystical meaning Ḥāfiz used in his poetry offer the possibility for two different ways of reading: the profane and the mystical one. The first view on his verses, which talk about love and wine seem to be related only to the earthly, profane world. His poetry refers to images of a young man's love toward a beautiful girl, a disappointed man who finds his consolation drinking wine, good and bad rulers, but also to beautiful mountain and desert landscapes, as well as flower gardens. His verses contain also the images of known narratives and those, which allude to contemporary events, rulers, society and his personal history.<sup>180</sup> When seen from the perspective of a profane reader, these images, though rendering rather a type

<sup>177</sup> EP "Isti'āra". One of the most important discussion on *isti'āra* is 'Asrār al-Balāgha of 'Abdulkāhir al-Djurdjani (d.1078). He defines *isti'āra* as "transfer of terms" and argues that it is a claim that something is identical to something else, which includes a transfer of concept before the transfer of the term.

<sup>178</sup> Sulejman Grozdanić. *Uvod u arapsko – islamsku estetiku* (Introduction to Arabic – Islamic Aesthetics) in: "Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju", Vol. 24, Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut (1974): pp. 55 – 67.

<sup>179</sup> EP "Tasawwuf". *ʿIlm al-bāṭin*, the knowledge of the inner self, is opposed to *ʿilm al-ẓāhir*, the preceptible knowledge.

<sup>180</sup> Ananda. 2004, pp. xi – xii.

(archetype) than an individual person, feeling or event, can be allusions to the real, contemporary world or traditional narratives known by everyone and represent not more than beautiful poetry. Nonetheless, from the perspective of a mystical reading, whereby these images are understood as metaphors, Ḥāfiz' verses contain in fact much more: the reader can discover a multitude of symbols, which bear hidden mystical meanings; after exploring the depths of these meanings, in front of the reader's eyes opens one new, complex world of spiritual truths. The reader understands that the wine represents a symbol of spiritual drunkenness produced through the light of God (intoxication), while the love of a young man toward a girl represents a symbol of enjoyment, ecstasy and movement toward the Absolute Being, whose beauty he admires. According to Ḥāfiz, through love, man achieves the purification of the materiality of this world and succeeds in coming closer to the Truth, to the confrontation with the Beloved with whom he will finally become one.

Consequently, through the means of the metaphor, Ḥāfiz' poetry creates profane, but also mystical images. For Ḥāfiz, the whole world is a part of Absolute beauty, which is in fact a confirmation of God's unity manifested in all its complexity and multiplicity. His ability to universalize everyday life and to connect it to the mystical search for God turned him to the one of the most famous Persian classical poets.<sup>181</sup>

The manuscripts of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiz* have been often copied, illuminated and illustrated. One such example is *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiz* from the GHB Library in Sarajevo, which I will examine in the next chapter.

---

<sup>181</sup> Ananda. 2004, pp. xi – xii.

## Chapter 4 - *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the GHB Library in Sarajevo

The *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* No.1366 from the GHB Library in Sarajevo represents one of the most valuable manuscripts, which are preserved in Bosnian libraries until nowadays. It is of unknown origin and dated to the 16<sup>th</sup> century. The manuscript came into possession of the GHB Library from the family Džinić in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This chapter will first examine the technical features of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* No. 1366. In connection to the previous chapter, which analyzed the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from literary point of view, this chapter will continue with the examination of the conceptual and perceptual relationship between the text and the images of this manuscript. Furthermore, parallel to the literary analysis, it will propose two ways of reading the images contained in this manuscript.

### 4.1. Technical analysis of the manuscript and its miniatures

The manuscript is bound in dark-brown leather, decorated with golden relief-structured vegetal ornamental motive. The central motive of the binding's decoration is framed by a line, in which the geometrical motive is cut. The inner side of the binding is made out of brown leather decorated with abstract vegetal pattern, whereby the central motive consists of a three-parts leave incorporated in a complex scheme of ornamental decoration. This central ornamental figure is painted in black on a piece of blue colored cardboard, which is introduced under the leather - opening left for this purpose. The triangle shaped bookmark is golden and colored with traces of blue, which alludes to it that there was an ornamental pattern with possible vegetal motive.

The size of the binding is 11,5 x 21,6 cm, that of the page 20,7 x 11,0 cm. The manuscript contains 199 pages: the text is written on 197 of them, two additional empty pages being introduced at the end of the manuscript. Besides that, it contains one page of almost transparent paper both at the beginning and the end of manuscript, which is certainly meant for the physical protection of the pages with text. The paper itself is white colored.<sup>182</sup> The text is written in *neshtalīk* style, which was common in use for the texts of literary works, especially the genre of *divān*.<sup>183</sup> The text boxes are framed by two black and one golden lines. First two pages are decorated: the first page starts with one vegetal ornamental figure in gold and blue. The text on both first pages is sporadically decorated with small flowers in red, yellow, dark blue and light blue.

The manuscript contains five miniatures, the size of which is 10 x 5,5 cm. There are situated on the pages: 30, 66, 76, 105 and 139 of the manuscript<sup>184</sup>, always on the left side of the open book. The pages with miniatures have all the same structure and are divided into three zones: the zones on the top and the bottom of the page contain the text, while the central and biggest zone contains a miniature. All three zones are unified by a frame consisting of two black and one golden lines like the text boxes on not illustrated pages.

The five miniatures show at first glance motives, which are typical for Persian miniature painting: we find these representations in other manuscripts too, especially

---

<sup>182</sup> One must take into consideration that the “white” paper from that time was not really white, or what we call “white” today; It was rather brownish. Additionally, the darker appearance the paper of this manuscript has nowadays is due to the age of the manuscript.

<sup>183</sup> Nametak, 1998.

<sup>184</sup> This manuscript does not contain page numbers. These are the page numbers I obtained by counting the pages of the manuscript.

in works of poetry or legends. The first miniature shows a couple sitting on the carpet in a beautiful garden, playing musicians and servants surrounding them. The second one represents a man sitting in a desert, surrounded by animals, while another man with a camel, transporting a woman in a tent on its back, is passing by. Two figures behind the landscape observe them. The third miniature is an erotic scene with a half – naked girl bathing in a river, and a young man sitting on his horse and watching her behind the hill. The middle part of this miniature consists of the landscape with a tree, a tent and girl's horse waiting for her. The fourth miniature represents a scene situated in an architectural setting. Two men, who can be distinguished from the others by wearing different clothes, drink wine, while three other figures are occupied with serving them. The motive of the fifth miniature is the polo – game: two men on horses play polo, while two other men behind the landscape are observing them.

All five miniatures follow the same compositional principle. The two - dimensional surface is divided into three zones, each of which represents one level of depth in the painting: the zone at the bottom is the closest one to the spectator, the one in the middle represents a level behind it and the upper zone is the one, which is most far from the spectator. Thus, although lacking the linear and air perspective, as well as the shadowing, the space in the miniatures possesses certain three – dimensional qualities. The strong but still gracious and sensitive drawing is an important carrier of the composition: all forms are framed by a black line, which gives them their final shape and contributes to the their unrealistic appearance. The spectrum of used colors is very rich, containing practically all of them: pastel colors dominate the background, while the figures, their clothes especially, are painted in strong basic colors such as red, yellow, blue and green. The number of figures in the miniatures varies from two

to seven. They are painted after one scheme, their faces not possessing any portrait characteristics or emotions. The forms of their bodies can be only suspected under the cloths. Their motion is stopped. The background of four miniatures consists of a flowered landscape, which basically plays a decorative role. Only one miniature is set in a room the architecture of which alludes to be an *ivān*; the geometrical pattern of its decoration plays the same role as the flowered landscape does in other four paintings.

#### 4.2. Text – image analysis

According to the limited set of characteristics, which was especially practiced in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when Persian miniature stood on its highest point of development<sup>185</sup>, the scenes are situated in open landscapes, gardens or buildings. Further, as usually in Persian painting<sup>186</sup>, the figures can be divided into three groups: main and additional figures, and witnesses<sup>187</sup>. Considering the fact that the number of figures is relatively low, not all scenes depict, along the main (active) agents, additional accompanying figures. Besides them, three miniatures depict witnesses: the scenes of the miniatures No. 2 and 5<sup>188</sup> both contain two witnessing figures behind the landscape and that of the miniature No. 3 has an witness who, holding his finger on his mouth, indicates that he is the observer of the scene.<sup>189</sup>

These scenes can be narrative, meaning that they illustrate a story, which is through the literature or tradition known to the audience. Nevertheless, they can represent also

<sup>185</sup> Oleg Grabar and Mika Natif. *Two Safavid Paintings: An Essay in Interpretation*, Muqarnas, Vol. 18 (2001): pp.173 - 202, here pp. 173.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid.

<sup>187</sup> Ibid.: pp. 173 - 176. The witnesses observe the scene: they hold sometimes the finger on their mouth, indicating that they are observers, or they are added as figures behind the landscape for compositional reasons without a connection to the scene.

<sup>188</sup> See Appenix B.

<sup>189</sup> See footnote 185.



an allegory, expressing abstract ideas through certain symbols. Here, it must be mentioned that there is a danger, that such scenes can be also just a kind of genre painting.<sup>190</sup> However, even if they are part of the conventional repertoire, this should not mean that they can not convey two kind of messages to the reader.

As it is typical for Persian painting, all five miniatures from the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* have a primary subject matter. Aiming to propose the subject of the scenes, this chapter continues with an analysis of each painting separately. The description of each painting will be followed by the iconographic analysis based on the relation between the image and the text it accompanies. The relation between the image and the text will be discussed first on the level of the narrative, which proposes the profane reading of the images. The second level, however, will be that of allegory: that means, perceived as representing abstract ideas, the images can be read in mystical way as well.

#### 4.2.1. Miniature 1: “Lovers in the Garden”

The first scene is situated in a beautiful flower garden, where, under the blossoming tree, a couple is sitting on a carpet; therefore, I propose to call it “Lovers in the Garden”<sup>191</sup>. The young man and his beautiful woman are surrounded by two servants and three playing musicians. The clothes of men (the young man, two servants and two musicians) do not differentiate: they wear embroidered yellow, red, blue and green tunics with short sleeves over the undergarment and conical white turbans with a baton. However, the clothes the women (the beautiful woman in arms of the young

---

<sup>190</sup> Grabar and Natif, 2001: pp. 176.

man and the harp – player) are dressed in show differences: the harp - player wears the embroidered short sleeves tunic over the undergarment like the men, while the beautiful lady wears a yellow dress; both have golden head jewelry. There is no action in this scene; it seems that the lovers simply sit in a beautiful environment and enjoy the music.

The scene of the couple sitting in a garden surrounded by servants and musicians is not unusual in Persian miniature and existed before the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>192</sup> It is also depicted in the manuscripts of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*: one copy of it painted by Sultan – Muḥammad in Tabriz from 1529 for the Safavid prince Sām Mirza contains the identical scene.<sup>193</sup> It is unfortunately unknown if this scene was a part of canonical repertoire used for the illustration of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* in 16<sup>th</sup> century's Persia<sup>194</sup> and it is possible that this representation was only part of genre painting, a scene depicted to please the spectator. Yet, observing the verses in the middle of which this scene is situated, one can discover a connection of the text and the image. Here the verses say the following:

The rose in the bosom; wine in the hand; and the Beloved to my desire,  
On such a day, the world's Sultan is my slave.

Say: Into this assembly, bring ye no candle for to – night.  
In our assembly, the moon of the Friend's face is full.

In our order, the wine – cup is lawful; but,  
O Cypress, rose of body! Without thy face, unlawful.

<sup>191</sup> Walter Denny. *Music and Musicians in Islamic Art*, Asian Music, Vol.17, No.1 (1985): pp. 37 - 68, my proposal of the title for this scene is taken out from this article.

<sup>192</sup> The identical scene, for instance, is represented in one anthology from Herat from 1427. See *ibid.*: pp. 44.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*: pp. 48 - 61.

My ear is all on the voice of the read; and, the melody of the harp:  
My eye is all on Thy ruby lip, and on the circulation of the cup.<sup>195</sup>

It is obvious that Ḥāfīz talks about his Beloved, the wine and the music, comparing the Beloved with a moonlight. It is possible that the “Lovers in the garden” represent the image of the lover enjoying a delightful moments full of love to his Beloved. Moreover, in Safavid times it was usual to represent the ruler in such a setting<sup>196</sup>, therefore this particular garden setting could have been taken out of the imagination of what the most beautiful scene on earth should look like.

Nevertheless, seen as a metaphor in both text and image, this scene can carry a different meaning and lead to a different reading of the image. Ḥāfīz used conventional themes and images expressed through the profane language in his poetry; yet, introducing the metaphor bearing sufi meaning in his verses, he spoke also the mystical language. In a mystical reading of Ḥāfīz’ poetry, the Beloved thus becomes a symbol for God and the wine a symbol for God’s light. Therefore, upon the example of the mystical interpretation of Ḥāfīz poetry the painting can evoke mystical images as well and thus be read from that point of view. In such a reading, the painted couple becomes a symbol of the union (assembly) of the man (lover) and God (his Beloved), turning the whole image into a symbol of the most delightful moment is one sufi’s life: the union with God.

<sup>194</sup> Denny, 1985: pp. 40

<sup>195</sup> Salehe Salepour ed. *Divan of Hafez*, Teheran: Booteh Press, 1998. All five *gazels*, which are part of this thesis are taken out from this volume., whereby I maintained the transliteration system; therefore, it is partly different from the transliteration system I used in the text of the thesis. This *gazel* is to find in the appendix A under No. 1.

<sup>196</sup> This can be concluded through the observation of the images with the same topic. See Grabar and Natif, 2001: pp. 173 – 202.

Moreover, the depiction of the musicians in this scene can have a mystical meaning too. On the one hand, music played an important role on Islamic courts and was mostly connected to palace luxury and pleasure.<sup>197</sup> The depictions of the musicians can be found on images representing a palace, battle or various festivities. On the other hand, although music was connected to the profane court, its symbolism had religious connotations as well. In mystical poetry the imagery of music is used as the evocation of the Divine<sup>198</sup> and this imagery could have played a role in painting as well. Interestingly, the imagery of music was also connected to the image of the heavenly garden, paradise<sup>199</sup>, where the garden in the depicted scene can stand for.

#### 4.2.2. Miniature 2: “Leyla and Mecnun”

This image, named “Leyla and Mecnun” after the text of Ḥāfız’ gazel which it accompanies, represent a half - naked man sitting in a desert and surrounded by wild animals (deers and rabbits). Behind him, a man with a camel, which carries a baldachin with a beautiful woman, pass by. Two observing figures are situated behind the landscape: they can be there because of the compositional harmony, but their presence can also give an impression of the listeners of a story. According to the verses above and bellow the miniature, this image shows a scene from the saga of Leyla and Mecnun (“the mad one” [“mad of love”]), a story of two lovers, who die because of the pain provoked by too intense love they could not understand.<sup>200</sup> The story is tragic because the failure of their love is not due to external circumstances, as

---

<sup>197</sup> Denny, 1985: pp. 39.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid.: pp. 38.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid.: pp. 40.

<sup>200</sup> Nizami. *Lejla i Medžnun* (Leyla and Mecnun), Sarajevo: Ljiljan, 2002.

one could expect considering the time the saga plays in, but to their own inability to understand love.

Almost all the Persian poets retold the story as placed in the Arabian desert or a tribal camp. The basic structure of the story remained the same, but different authors emphasized different parts of it.<sup>201</sup> Ḥāfīz has chosen the following scene:

Laila's litter – keeper, in whose order is the moon's cradle,  
O God! Into his heart cast that, passing by Majnun, he may cause.

O heart! Desire the spring season. If not, every year, this sword  
A hundred beautiful roses, like the wild rose, and a thousand like the nightingale  
bringeth.

Since, with Thy tress, my wounded heart hath established a covenant, for God's  
sake,  
Order Thy sweet ruby that to rest, its state, it may bring.

In this garden, Hafez, gray of head, asketh God  
That, by the marge of the stream, he may sit; and into his embrace, a cypress may  
bring.<sup>202</sup>

This image can be considered to be narrative because it illustrates exactly that what is written in the first distich. The painter was obviously persuaded that a scene from the well known saga could have been recognized by the spectator. For the contemporaries it was clear that Leyla and Mecnun stood as a symbol of a passionate and unfulfilled love and represented in fact the archetype of the profane love ideal,

<sup>201</sup> Grabar and Natif, 2001: pp. 184. According to the authors, only Nizāmī's version was a subject of iconographic analysis. There is no comparable evidence for illustrations of the versions of other authors.

<sup>202</sup> See footnote 195. This *gazel* is to find in the appendix A under No. 2.

which would be the profane reading of both Ḥāfiz' poetry and painting. However, mystical implications of the saga were used already by Nizāmī in the 12<sup>th</sup> century and later by other authors, Ḥāfiz among them. For a mystic, Leyla and Mecnun represent the symbol of the love between God and man, tragic because the man is not able to understand that love, this being the meaning of the image evoked through the observation from the mystical perspective. Further, in the same verses Ḥāfiz mentions the rose, sufi symbol for God, and the nightingale, a bird of a dawn, which is the symbol for a tragic lover<sup>203</sup>, but an allusion to the auroral prayer as well<sup>204</sup> and compares them with Leyla and Mecnun. These symbols speak additionally in favour of the mystical reading of the image.

#### 4.2.3. Miniature 3: "Bathing woman"

The third miniature, which is here named "Bathing woman" after the subject of the image, represents an erotic scene, where in front of her horse standing under the blossoming tree a half - naked longhaired girl is bathing in the river. A man on the horse behind the landscape, dressed in an embroidered tunic over the undergarment and with a conical white turban with baton on his head, is observing her. His gesture of holding a finger on his mouth indicates his function as observer. The following verses accompany the image:

The messenger of Her Highness Salma – to whom be safety!  
What is it if, with a salutation, our heart joyous, she maketh?

O Lord! Into the heart of that Khusrau Shirin cast

---

<sup>203</sup> The nightingale as a symbol of a tragic lover is connected to the symbol of the rose, which represents God. The two have a mysterious relation to each other. See EP<sup>2</sup> "Ghazal".

That, a passing in mercy, by Farhad, he maketh.

Examine this: "Many a treasure of desire will they give thee",  
"If prosperous, one ruined like me, thy favour maketh".

[For a Sultan better is than hundred years of prayer,  
One day in his life, when he justice distributes]<sup>205</sup>

From the verses it becomes clear Ḥāfiẓ evokes an image of his Beloved. He compares him (lover) and the Beloved (Salma) with Khusrau and Shirin, characters from at that time well known Persian story of the king Khusrau and his Beloved princess Shirin. It is possible that the observing figure in this scene represents Khusrau while Shirin was observed by Khusrau, which would be the profane interpretation of both text and image. However, if one again follows the example of the mystical interpretation of Ḥāfiẓ' verses while observing the image, this scene can evoke the image of God (Beloved) and His appearance in the man's (lover's) imagination.

#### 4.2.4. Miniature 4: "Wine bar"

The fourth scene is situated in an *ivān* - like architectural setting built of bricks, with a vault covered with tiles with combined geometrical – vegetal pattern (pink), and inside walls, which are decorated with geometrical hexagon pattern (green – blue). In the middle of the room in the ivan there is a two-dimensional niche, in which the geometric tile pattern is adorned with a vegetal arabesque. The image depicts five men, serving or drinking wine; therefore, this scene will be called "Wine bar". One of

<sup>204</sup> EF<sup>2</sup> "Ghazal".

<sup>205</sup> See footnote 195. This *gazel* is to find in the appendix A under No. 3. It has to be mentioned that the last distich does not correspond to the *gazel* No. 3 in the appendix A but to the original version from the GHB Library in Sarajevo, which I considered more appropriate.

men, dressed in an embroidered tunic over the undergarment and wearing a conical white turban with baton and additional decoration consisting of a feather, is sitting on a rug. He talks to one another man, who wears a tunic and a long robe, and has a different kind of a turban on his head, and sits beside him. The third man, dressed in a simple long tunic and with white round turban with a red top of the same kind as the second man, sits in the corner near the wine jugs. Two more men are there: they both carry wine jugs and are dressed in similar simple long tunic. However, their turbans differentiate; one of them wears a conical turban with baton while the other has the round turban with red top. Judging after his clothes, the person sitting on a rug seems to be important and could represent a prince. According to the same criteria, the man he talks with could be a seyh. The piece of the image with the two talking men was already depicted in Persian miniature, as an individual painting and as part of bigger scenes both.<sup>206</sup> It is possible that the scene was part of the usual repertoire of genre painting and represented a palace, other three figures being additional. Nevertheless, the look at Hafiz' verses, which frame this image, reveals that the space they are situated in is a wine bar and that the men represent the characters from the poem. Here, Ḥāfīz says:

In the age of the king, fault – forgiving, crime – covering,  
Flagon – drinker, become Hafez; and cup – drinker, the mufti.

Forth from the cloister – corner, the Sufi sate at the wine – jar's foot,  
Since he beheld the muhtasib a wine – pitcher on his shoulder bear.

The state of the shaikh, and of the kadi and of their jew drinking,  
I asked, in the morning, of the Pir, the wine – seller.

---

<sup>206</sup> Denny, 1985: pp. 37 – 68.



He said: “Unfit to be uttered is the matter though thou art a confidant;  
Thy tongue indraw; the screen, preserve, and wine, drink.”<sup>207</sup>

Although it is not completely clear who should be who in the image, it seems that the painter tried to follow Hafiz’ verses: the man on a rug could be the king or the kadi, talking with the seyh. The man sitting near the wine – jars could be the sufi. The man situated on the same level in the image with the king / *kadi* and the *seyh* could be Hāfiz himself, and the second one in the right corner at the bottom of the image could be the “muhtasib” (order keeper). The fact that “Hāfiz”, the “*seyh*” and the “sufi” wear the same kind of turban with red top on their head as they would belong to the class of ulema (religious power), in contrast to the conical turbans with a baton of the “king / *kadi*” and the “order keeper”, who both represent earthly power, can speak in favour of such a distribution of roles of painted figures. It is possible that in the verses accompanying this image Hāfiz alludes to the contemporary ruler and the state of disorder: it seems that the kadi and the seyh drank secretly, which could be an allusion to conspiracy in profane terms. However, with the mystical understanding of the wine as God’s light, this scene can be interpreted in a different way. It can be the image of Hāfiz’ judgement of the orthodox ulema: although drinking wine (God’s light), they do not believe in God at all. The setting, on the one hand, could be a representation of the wine bar or a palace where the wine is drunk, whereby one has to emphasise that wine drinking was not unusual in Persia of that time: there were public wine bars and the wine was served at the court of Persian *şah-s* as well. Therefore, the scene of men drinking wine can be seen as a realistic depiction of it. On the other hand, the wine bar can evoke an image of a place where one can enjoy God’s light and approach Him through it.

<sup>207</sup> See footnote 195. This *gazel* is to find in the appendix A under No. 4.

#### 4.2.5. Miniature 5: “Polo – game”

The fifth miniature represents two men, dressed in embroidered tunics and with the conical turbans with a baton and feather on their head, playing polo. Two gates are situated in the middle of the upper part of the image and the right corner at the bottom, and two figures behind the landscape observe the scene. The polo – game was played in Persia since the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC<sup>208</sup>. It was a game of the nobility and in Persian miniature, the ruler was often depicted playing polo.<sup>209</sup> Ḥāfīz’ verses talk about the polo playing ruler:

Obedient to thee, become beneath the saddle, the *chaugan* – stead of the sphere,  
O royal horseman! Since to the field thou hast come, the ball strike.

The stream of the country is the water of thy sword:  
The thee of justice, plant thou; the root of ill – wishers, up – pluck.

The majesty of Pashang’s son, Afrasiyab, and his world – seizing sword,  
In all king – chronicles, the tale of the assembly is.

After this if, despite the perfume of thy sweet nature, it blossometh not,  
From Iranian’s plain, the musk – pod of the musk of Khutan arriseth.<sup>210</sup>

This image can represent the praised king playing polo, which was usual at that time. Moreover, Ḥāfīz’ verses, which frame this image, imply symbols, according to which the polo – stick (*chaugan*) the symbol for the ruler’s power, under whose hand the heads (ball) of the enemies are rolling. However, according to the mystical

<sup>208</sup> Encyclopedia Britannica Online, article “Polo – game” ( <http://search.eb.com/eb/article-5832>).

<sup>209</sup> Hossein Ziai ed. *‘Arifi of Herat. The Ball and Polo Stick (or Book of Ecstasy)*, Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers, 1999, pp. vii.

<sup>210</sup> See footnote 195. This *gazel* is to find in the appendix A under No. 5.

interpretation of Ḥāfīz' verses, the polo – game, or more exactly the polo – stick and the ball have a different meaning, deriving from the sufi ideal of love.<sup>211</sup> This kind of love was not only unreachable but required the death of the lover as well.<sup>212</sup> The “death” of the lover means in sufi context the annihilation of the selfhood, which is absorbed into the Beloved. Therefore, interpreted from the profane perspective, this scene could evoke the image of the lover who is dying at the feet of his Beloved. Yet, seen through the eyes of a mystic, the image represents a man, whose consciousness or individual soul (head) is rolling away because he achieved the union with God (Beloved), becoming One with Him.

### **4.3. Reconstruction of meaning**

In order to see if these images, as it has been suggested, could be read in two different ways, namely implying the profane but also sufi meaning, it is of interest to examine the contemporary theoretical background, especially the theories focusing on painting.

#### **4.3.1. Theory**

Unfortunately, in contrast to the research of Western art of the same kind and period, where the scholars can find support in a well defined theoretical and philosophical background,<sup>213</sup> the research dedicated to the Persian Islamic tradition stands still without a proper definition of the intellectual, philosophical and ritual framework, which would allow to establish the patterns of thought and categories of symbols

---

<sup>211</sup>Ziai, 1999, pp. ix.

<sup>212</sup> Ibid.

<sup>213</sup> Here we can compare Persian classical miniature with Gothic miniatures.

applicable to the visual arts.<sup>214</sup> However, according to Oleg Grabar and Mika Natif, “We have to assume that any work of art meant something to its patron and creator and that therefore it was conveyed in a language that they shared, but that we probably no longer share with them.”<sup>215</sup> In other words, there must have been criteria for estimating art: all the known artists, the quality and refinement of painters, which have been praised, testify to “a form of visual awareness and a pictorial intelligence”<sup>216</sup> that is not limited to the decorative character of the painting.

Although the painter is compared to the Creator in Persian poetic and biographic literature of the classical period, the contemporary theoretical sources dealing with Persian classical painting are rare and rather unknown to the scholars.<sup>217</sup> Nonetheless, there are two works, which can help to elucidate certain aspects of the Safavid miniature painting as it was perceived by the Persians themselves: Kadi Aḥmet’s *Gūlistān-i hunar* (Rose Garden of Art), a biographical account of calligraphers and painters written in 1596-1606 and fundamental source of the art history of Safavid times, and Sadik Bey Afşar’s *Kanun al – suvar* (Canon of forms) written in 1597.<sup>218</sup> Here it must be mentioned that these texts are not theoretical treatises on the issue of painting, but contain also mythological and literary elements. Yet, two theories, which existed already before and were thus taken over by the named authors, are to find in both texts: the “Theory of two Kalams” and the “Seven principles of painting”.<sup>219</sup> It is of interest to see whether these two theories, incorporated into works of two 16<sup>th</sup>

<sup>214</sup> Grabar and Natif, 2001: pp. 177.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid.

<sup>216</sup> David Roxburgh. *The study of Painting and the Arts of the Book*, Muqarnas Vol. 17 (2000): pp. 1 - 16, here pp. 9.

<sup>217</sup> Porter, 2000: pp. 109.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid.: pp. 109 - 110.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid.: pp. 109.

century's writers, can provide the answer to the question of the language shared by patrons, artists and other contemporaries of 16<sup>th</sup> century's Persia.

According to Yves Porter, the "Theory of two Kalams", which had been originally a chapter on the "Excellence of Art" of 'Abdi Bey Shīrāzī's poem *Ayin-i Iskandarī* (The Rules of Alexander) from 1543, and was later incorporated in works of other authors such as the aforementioned Kadi Aḥmet and Sadik Bey Afşar, represented an attempt to justify the painting in Islamic art linking it with calligraphy.<sup>220</sup> In contrast to the calligraphy, which always played a special role in Islam, the painting obviously had to be justified from the religious point of view. Comparing the calligraphy and painting and thus speaking about the formal relation between text and image, this theory was not a manual for artists and can not be considered as normative.<sup>221</sup> Nevertheless, the importance of it is in its connection of the calligraphy and painting, thus stressing on the ideographic character of painting.<sup>222</sup> Further, the "Seven principles of painting", whose traces go to Kutb al-Din Kissaḥvan in 1557, and which are also incorporated into the works of Kadi Aḥmet and Sadik Bey Afshar<sup>223</sup>, although originally meant for decorative painting and not for figurative representations, were describing the relation between calligraphy and painting as well.<sup>224</sup> As Yves Porter suggests, the theoretical interest in the connection between calligraphy and painting could have been put into practice through the relation of the text and the image on the level of their exterior appearance.<sup>225</sup> However, the ideographic character of painting could also effect the interior relation between the text and the image: their meaning. In order to see

---

<sup>220</sup> Porter, 2000.: pp. 110 - 111.

<sup>221</sup> Ibid.

<sup>222</sup> Ibid.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid.: pp. 113

<sup>224</sup> Ibid.: pp. 114.

<sup>225</sup> Ibid.: pp. 115.

whether the meaning of the images of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz* from the GHB Library can be connected to the meaning of the text they accompany, and whether in that sense the painter of this manuscript applied that what could be called the “common language”, which the artists and the audience of the 16<sup>th</sup> century’s Persia (and Ottoman Empire, comprising Bosnia) shared, one must have a look at the ways in which these theories are put into practice in this particular manuscript.

#### 4.3.2. Practice: exterior harmony

Yves Porter connects the interest in the relation between the calligraphy and painting in the 16<sup>th</sup> century’s Persia with the invention of *neshtālik* script in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, when the relation of calligraphy and painting became technically closer. *Neshtalik* script requires the rulling on the page (*mastar*), according to which the compositions of the illustrations from the classical period<sup>226</sup> started to follow the *maṣṭar* of the page.<sup>227</sup> The united composition of the page comprising both calligraphy and painting lead to the unity of the page and the whole manuscript. The notion of “harmony of the parts and of the whole” could be a result of this unity.<sup>228</sup> In contrast to the late Safavid, Indian and Ottoman painting, where a whole page can consist only of the illustration, in classical painting the text is almost always placed inside or around the image<sup>229</sup>, alluding to the importance of the relation between calligraphy and painting. This produces exterior harmony, which was perhaps one of the unwritten criteria of the contemporaries for estimating art, a part of the language spoken by them.

<sup>226</sup> The classical period in Persian poetry, which is already defined in footnote 26 should not be confused with the classical period in Persian painting. I took over the chronological limits of “classical Persian painting” from 1370 to 1650 from Porter, 2000: pp. 116, n. 4.

<sup>227</sup> Ibid.: pp. 111 – 112.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid.

<sup>229</sup> Porter, 2000: pp. 111 - 112.

Through the observation of the exterior appearance of the pages from the manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the GHB Library in Sarajevo, it becomes obvious that there can be spoken of the notion of the harmony between the text and the images in technical terms. The text is written in neshtalik script and the pages are designed after the *maṣṭar*, creating a harmony between the two. Moreover, a more detailed look at the miniatures shows that the elements of the images cross the physical borders of their own zones, attempting to introduce the pictorial into the calligraphy and contributing further to the impression of the unity of the two. Yet, if the exterior harmony in the relation between the text and the image is achieved in this 16<sup>th</sup> century's Persian manuscript, one question is still left open: one can ask whether there is any intended inner harmony, or the harmony in the meaning of the text and the image in this particular case.

#### 4.3.3. Inner harmony

If the theory, as Yves Porter suggests, was not explicitly formulated in 16<sup>th</sup> century's Persia but yet connected to and put into practice in poetry and painting<sup>230</sup>, it would mean that poetry and painting were closely connected as well. If so, the words of Sadik's Kanun on the painter "who paints two worlds" might suggest that according to this 16<sup>th</sup> century's Persian author, the painting should not seek to copy nature but to reach the world of ideas.<sup>231</sup> This view of the image, where the idea is seen as pre-extant to its material form can be connected to the notions of *bāṭin* (the inner side, the invisible) and *ẓāhir* (the outside appearance, the visible)<sup>232</sup>, which one finds in the classical Persian poetry as well. Although one can not consider it as a rule, the aim to

---

<sup>230</sup> Ibid.: pp. 115.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid.: pp. 112.

reach the world of ideas through a painting should have been known to the artists and it is possible that some of them practiced this view, as the classical poets did.

According to E. Yesertar, there are common features between the poetry and painting, which suggest that the two were related and used the same ideas.<sup>233</sup> Both poetry and painting possess the abstract quality: the objects treated in the poems are not real objects but “abstraction of themselves”.<sup>234</sup> In the same manner, in Persian classical painting, the figures mostly have faces without portrait features and expression, and represent not individuals but types such as the prince, lover, cupbearer or the characters from the stories told in the poetry. Through an impersonal depiction of the figures, such as it is in this manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz*, the painter could have aimed to concentrate on their essence, their archetype.

Furthermore, through the concepts of form, space, time and reality as they are to find in the miniatures of this manuscript, the painter could have aimed to disregard the transitory, passing and ephemeral aspect of the living objects and earthly world, and to create the images of the world which is superior to the earthly matter in the same manner as the poetry does.

#### **4.3.4. Concept of form, space, time and reality**

In order to make visible the implication of the main features of Sufi poetry on the miniatures of “Diwān of Hafiz” from GHB Library in Sarajevo, one must take into

---

<sup>232</sup> Ibid.: pp. 113.

<sup>233</sup> Yarshater, 1962: pp. 61 - 71.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid.: pp. 62.



consideration the relation of these miniatures with the concept of form, space, time and reality.

The concept of form as highly stylised confirm that the painter did not seek to copy natural forms. This leads to the conclusion that the forms for him could bear a meaning, which is different from the usual, profane one. Moreover, the figurative representation, which is ambiguous if considered within the framework of Islamic art, can be seen in this context as well and observed from a different point of view. All forms in the miniatures of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* are simplified and stylised. Human figures are representations outside the logical relations of size and without modelling and shadows. The forms of human bodies are simplified; the clothes of the figures are decorated with ornamental details; their movements are stopped in an eternal moment and their faces do not reveal any characteristic features, or emotions. Such forms do not represent an individual object or person but a type, a “primordial appearance”<sup>235</sup> of those. Therefore, one can say that the miniatures of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* possess forms but they do not possess matter in usual earthly terms. Painted objects remain on the border between the material and non-material, superior world. The colours which are used in the manner one does not find in the nature, like the golden sky on four of five miniatures, emphasise even more this “supramaterial” aspect of the miniatures.

This concept of form is supported by the concept of space in the miniatures, which is a non – physical space: it is not a product of the “imagination”, but it is not real or physical space either. The images show the two – dimensional concept of space but do not exclude completely the perspective. Instead of linear and air perspective, they

---

<sup>235</sup> The concept of “primordial appearances” is similar to Plato’s “ideas”.

contain a division of space into three zones, which represent three different levels of depth in the image. The basis for this kind of perspective is *perspectiva naturalis*<sup>236</sup>, which does not create a three-dimensional but two – dimensional space, which can not be found in nature. Being the result of the implication of *perspectiva naturalis*, the space in the miniatures exists outside the human categories and possesses its own ontological reality, which should not be confused with the reality of the earthly world.

Moreover, the concept of time in the miniatures of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfīz* represents time as a static non-historical category. The movements of the figures are stopped in time. In this way the images suggest a moment of eternity, of timeless and universal idea, the archetype of the depicted scene, whereby the depicted scene becomes the material realisation of the non - material archetype.

Indeed, if we follow the Sufi division into five basic conditions of existence, which in the Sufi language are called “five steps to God”, and which consist of the physical world (mulk), transitory world (malakūt), archangelic world (cabarūt), the world of God’s names and attributes (lahūt) and God’s Essence (Ḍāt)<sup>237</sup>, we become aware of the fact that, observed from the Sufi perspective, the transitional world, known also as “the world of hanging forms”, is the stage of existence for the named miniatures. They become the replication, “recapitulation” of “the world of hanging forms”, in contrast to the physical, profane world. Understood in such a manner, the aforementioned concepts could have been used by the painter in order to create the pictorial metaphor, similar to that in the poetry. This could have been the way for the

---

<sup>236</sup> Seyyid Hossein Nasr, *Islamska umjetnost i duhovnost* (Islamic Art and Spirituality), Sarajevo: Lingua Patria, 2005, p. 195. Geometrical laws of the *perspectiva naturalis* have been developed by the Greek mathematician Euclid (330-270 BC); after him, further development has been led by Ibn al-Haytham.

creation of the transitory world with its own space, time, movement, colours and forms, “where the events occur in a real, but not necessary physical way”<sup>238</sup>.

Moreover, there are the conventionalized characters and themes in both painting and poetry: since it is possible to understand those from the poetry as metaphors, which evoke mystical images, it is also possible to interpret the images in that way. Consequently, these miniatures can be understood as profane, but also as mystical, sacred representations. If one limits his observation to their surface, he can see their profane beauty. Yet, if one reads them as an allegory, expressing abstract ideas, the symbols in the images convey the reader hidden mystical messages and turn the visual observation.

Understood in this manner, the miniatures of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from GHB Library in Sarajevo do not distance themselves from the basic commandment of Islam that God is the only Creator and that man, as a microcosm within God’s created macrocosm, is not able to copy His Creation. While a profane reader would read profane, earthly messages, a Sufi reader would attribute to the miniatures certain religious connotations. The multiplied meaning of Ḥāfiẓ’s verses can be compared to the complex symbolism of the miniatures contained in this manuscript, whereby they become the perfect medium for artistic representation of complex ideas of Islamic esoteric thought. Therefore, the miniatures of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the GHB Library are not in contrast to the Islamic belief, but the visual manifestation of it. Their reading depends on the viewer: an average spectator will enjoy the profane beauty of the painted scenes; but, for a Sufi or other intellectual viewers, it opens the door to a

---

<sup>237</sup> Nasr, 2005, pp. 197.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid., pp. 195.

world of eternal religious truth, which bears the possibility of the introduction into a spiritual way toward God, the union with whom is the final aim of Islamic religious existence.

Unfortunately, at this stage of the research, it is not possible to give evidence to a mystical interpretation of the minatures from the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* No. 1366 from the GHB Library in Sarajevo. This would require the examination of further illustrated manuscripts of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, which would focus on the text – image analysis and the comparison among them. Such an approach would allow us to establish possible similarities among the illustrated manuscripts of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, and to discover whether it exists a kind of canon, which has been applied to the paintings contained in them and whether the paintings have been related to the text they accompany. Moreover, further historical research, which would concentrate on the evidence about the owner (s) of the manuscripts of the *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* and the data about them (profession, for instance, or belonging to a sufi order), including the example from the GHB Library in Sarajevo, would help in establishing the possible relation between the possession and use of this work of Persian classical poetry in general. This could provide an answer concerning the conception and perception of the paintings contained in such manuscripts by their contemporaries and challenge our understanding of these precious artifacts, the fascinating beauty of which still occupies the scholars all over the world.

## CONCLUSION

The only illustrated Persian manuscript in Bosnia is *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*, identified as No. 1366 in the GHB Library in Sarajevo. It is illustrated with five miniatures and dated to the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Its exact place and time of production, its way to Bosnia, as well as the owner (s), except the last one, are unknown. Although it is listed in the catalogues, this manuscript has never been the subject of thorough scholarly research. Yet, being the only example of illustrated manuscripts containing figurative representations in Bosnia and therefore an object of great historical and artistic value, the aim of my thesis was to examine this manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the cultural - historical and art historical perspective. After the technical description of this manuscript, I engaged in a text – image analysis: first, I observed the miniatures as illustrating the narrative, creating the profane reading of them. Secondly, observing them as an allegory, I approached to the aforementioned miniatures from the mystical point of view. Further, using the manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the GHB Library as evidence for the intensive interest in Persian manuscripts, especially works of classical Persian poetry, among native population, I explored the circulation and use of Persian manuscripts in this former Ottoman province. By examining the holdings of private and public libraries I proved that works of Persian classics were collected and popular among the educated population in Bosnia.

By analyzing the data in the manuscripts and about manuscripts I came to the conclusion who were the readers and collectors of Persian manuscripts and which were the works that were their favorite literature: the members of the military and judiciary elite in Bosnia, as in the center of the Ottoman Empire, were among most

fervent collectors. Other well educated people like members of the mystical circles or writers and poets followed them. Both groups shared the same taste concerning the choice of readings: *Būstān* and *Gūlistān* of Sa‘dī, *Pend-nāme* – i ‘Attār, and *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* represent the works most often collected in Bosnia, which corresponds more or less to the works of Persian classics collected in the center of the Empire. Further, as far as the evidence allowed me, I discovered that Persian manuscripts in Bosnian libraries originated partly from Persia and partly from all parts of the Ottoman Empire, and that, additionally, a quantity of them was produced in Bosnia.

Further, by approaching the miniatures from an art historical perspective I pointed out the connection between the artistic elements used in mystical poetry as well as in miniature painting in the aforementioned manuscript. Hereby I suggested two different ways of reading the images: a profane and a mystical one. I propose that the miniatures of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ* from the GHB Library are not to be seen in contrast to the Islamic belief, but that they can even represent the visual manifestation of it. Their reading could have depended on the viewer: an average spectator could have enjoyed the profane beauty of the painted scenes; but, for a Sufi or other intellectual viewers, it could have opened the door to a world of eternal religious truth, which beared the possibility of the introduction into a spiritual way toward God, the union with whom was, and still is, the final aim of Islamic religious existence.

## **Appendix A - Five *gazel*-s from *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ***

All five gazels in this appendix are taken out from:

Salehe Salepour ed. *Dīvān of Hafez*, Teheran: Booteh Press, 1998.

GAZEL No. 1

- 1 The rose in the bosom; wine in the hand; and the Beloved to my desire,  
On such a day, the world's Sultan is my slave.
- 2 Say: Into this assembly, bring ye no candle for to – night.  
In our assembly, the moon of the Friend's face is full.
- 3 In our order, the wine – cup is lawful; but,  
O Cypress, rose of body! Without thy face, unlawful.
- 4 In our assembly, mix not Itr; for our soul,  
Every moment, receiveth perfume from the fragrance of the tip of Thy tress.
- 5 My ear is all on the voice of the reed; and, the melody of the harp:  
My eye is all on Thy ruby lip, and on the circulation of the cup.
- 6 Say ye naught of the sweetness of candy and sugar;  
For my desire is for Thy sweet lip.
- 7 From the time when the treasure of grief for Thee was dweller in my ruined heart  
The corner of the tavern is ever my abode.
- 8 O Shame, why speakest thou? For from my shame is my name:  
O name, why askest thou? For from name is my shame.
- 9 Wine – drinker, distraught of head, profligate and glance – player I am:  
In this city, who is that one who is not like this?
- 10 To the Muhtasib, utter not my crime; for he also  
Is ever, like me in desire of the drinkers of wine.
- 11 Hafiz! Sit not a moment without wine, and the Beloved  
'Tis the season of the rose, and of the Jessamine, and of the Id of Siyam.



GAZEL No. 2

- 1 Plant the tree of friendship, that, to fruit, the heart's desire bringeth.  
Up – pluck the bush of enmity, that countless troubles bringeth.
- 2 When thou art the guest of the tavern, with profligates be with respect:  
For, O beloved, if thou be a dreg – drinker, the intoxication, of wine – sickness,  
this bringeth.
- 3 The night of society, reckon plunder. For, after our time,  
The sphere many a revolution maketh; many a night and day bringeth.
- 4 Laila's litter – keeper, in whose order is the moon's cradle,  
O God! Into his heart cast that, passing by Majnun, he may cause.
- 5 O heart! Desire the spring season. If not, every year, this sward  
A hundred beautiful roses, like the wild rose, and a thousand like the nightingale  
bringeth.
- 6 Since, with Thy tress, my wounded heart hath established a covenant, for God's  
sake,  
Order Thy sweet ruby that to rest, its state, it may bring.
- 7 In this garden, Hafez, gray of head, asketh God  
That, by the marge of the stream, he may sit; and into his embrace, a cypress may  
bring.

GAZEL No. 3

- 1 One day, when recollection of us the musky reed maketh,  
It will take reward: Two hundred slaves that free, it maketh.
- 2 The messenger of Her Highness Salma – to whom be safety!  
What is it if, with a salutation, our heart joyous, she maketh?
- 3 Examine this: “Many a treasure of desire will they give thee”,  
“If prosperous, one ruined like me, thy favour maketh”.
- 4 O Lord! Into the heart of that Khusrau Shirin cast  
That, a passing in mercy, by Farhad, he maketh.
- 5 Now, me from foundation, love’s glance for thee hath taken:  
Let us see, again, what thy sage – like thought maketh.
- 6 Independent of our praise is thy pure essence:  
With beauty God – given, thought of the attirer, who maketh?
- 7 Into Shiraz we traveled not to our desire,  
Joyful the day, when way to Baghdad, Hafiz maketh.

GAZEL No. 4

- 1 In the age of the king, fault – forgiving, crime – covering,  
Flagon – drinker, become Hafez; and cup – drinker, the mufti.
- 2 Forth from the cloister – corner, the Sufi sate at the wine – jar’s foot,  
Since he beheld the muhtasib a wine – pitcher on his shoulder bear.
- 3 The state of the shaikh, and of the kadi and of their jew drinking,  
I asked, in the morning, of the Pir, the wine – seller.
- 4 He said: “Unfit to be uttered is the matter though thou art a confidant;  
Thy tongue indraw; the screen, preserve, and wine, drink.
- 5 Saki! Spring arriveth; and means of wine is none;  
A thought make. For, from grief, into tumult hath come my heart’s blood.
- 6 Love and poverty, and youth, and the new spring, is  
My excuse. It, accept; and, in mercy’s trail, the crime conceal.
- 7 Like the candle, tongue extending how long makest thou?  
O friend! The moth of my desire hath arrived. Silence!
- 8 O King, in form and in truth! Like thee,  
No eye hath seen; no ear hath heard.
- 9 Remain, until the khirke of hypocrisy, accepteth  
The youthful fortune from the old, tattered garment – wearing sky.

GAZEL No. 5

- 1   Displayed from the garden border hath become the diadem of the Sultan, the rose:  
    O Lord! To the cypress and the jessamine, its arrival happy be!
- 2   In his own place, happy was this imperial sitting  
    Since now is his own place, every one sitteth.
- 3   To Sulaiman's seal – ring, news of the happy conclusion give,  
    Whereby, short the hand of ahriman, the ism – i – a'zam made.
- 4   Be prosperous to eternity without end, this house, from the door of which,  
    Every moment, with the perfume of mercy, the breeze of felicity bloweth!
- 5   The majesty of Pashang's son, Afrasiyab, and his world – seizing sword,  
    In all king – chronicles, the tale of the assembly is.
- 6   Obedient to thee, become beneath the saddle, the chaugan – stead of the sphere,  
    O royal horseman! Since to the field thou hast come, the ball strike.
- 7   The stream of the country is the water of thy sword:  
    The thee of justice, plant thou; the root of ill – wishers, up – pluck.
- 8   After this if, despite the perfume of thy sweet nature, it blossometh not,  
    From Iranian's plain, the musk – pod of the musk of Khutan arriseth.
- 9   Expectation of sweet spendour, the corner – takers make,  
    Aslant place the cap; and, from thy face, the veil up – pluck.
- 10   With reason, I consulted. He said: "Hafiz! Drink wine!"  
    O Saki! According to the word of the trusty adviser, wine give.
- 11   O breeze! To the Saki of the banquet of Atabak, prefer the request,  
    That, from that cup, gold scattering, me, a draught he may give.

**Appendix B - Five miniatures from the manuscript of *Dīvān-i Ḥāfiẓ*  
No. 1366 from the GHB Library in Sarajevo**



Miniature No. 1  
**“Lovers in the garden”**



Miniature No. 2  
**“Leyla and Mecnun”**



Miniature No. 3

**“Bathing woman”**





Miniature No. 4

**“Wine bar”**



Miniature No. 5

**“Polo – game”**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary source:

***Divân-i Hâfîz***, No. 1366 in the GHB Library in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Al-Bagdadi, Nadia. *From Heaven to Dust: Metamorphosis of the Book in Pre – modern Arab Culture*, The Medieval History Journal, 8, 1 (2005), pp. 83 – 107.

Ananda, Ahmed ed. *Divani Hafez: Sedamdeset sehura s Hafezom (Divân-i Hâfîz: Seventy mornings with Hâfîz)*, Sarajevo : Buybook, 2004.

Ashtiany, Julia ed. *‘Abbasid Belles – Lettres*, Cambridge: CUP, 1990.

Balić, Smail. *Kultura Bošnjaka* ( The Culture of Bosniacs), Zagreb: R&R, 1994.

Bašeskija, Mula Mustafa Ševki. *Ljetopis* (Chronicles), Sarajevo: Sarajevo Publishing, 1997.

Bejtić, Alija. *Elçi Ibrahim - Pašina biblioteka u Travniku* (Elçi Ibrahim – Paşa Library in Travnik) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem, (2000), pp. 318 - 320.

Bilici, Faruk. *Les bibliothèques vakif-s à Istanbul au XVIe siècle, premises de grandes bibliothèques publiques*, REMMM 87 – 88 (1999), pp. 39 – 59.

Birnbaum, Eleazar. *Turkish Manuscripts: Cataloguing since 1960 and Manuscripts Still Uncatalogued. Part 2: Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Romania*. Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 103, No. 3 (1983), pp. 515 – 532.

Blair, Sheila S. *The Development of the Illustrated Book in Iran*, Muqarnas, Vol. 10 “Essays in Honor of Oleg Grabar” (1993), pp. 266 – 274.

Blair, Sheila S. Bloom, Jonathan M. *The Mirage of Islamic Art: Reflections on the Study of an Unwieldy Field*, The Art Bulletin, Vol. 85, No. 1 (2003), pp. 152 – 184.

Cammann, Schuyler V. R. *Religious Symbolism in Persian Art*, History of Religions, Vol. 15, No. 3 (1976), pp. 193 – 208.

Çagman, Filiz. Tanindi, Zeren. *Remarks on Some Manuscripts from the Topkapi Palace Treasury in the Context of Ottoman – Safavid Relations*, Muqarnas, Vol. 13 (1996), pp. 132 - 148.

Ćehajić, Džemal. *Derviški redovi u Jugoslovenskim zemljama* (Derviş Orders in Yugoslavian Countries), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut, 1986.

Denny, Walter. *Music and Musicians in Islamic Art*, Asian Music, Vol. 17, No.1 (1985), pp. 37 – 68.

Džaka, Bećir. *Historija perzijske književnosti od nastanka do kraja 15. vijeka* (History of Persian Literature from the Origin until the End of the 15<sup>th</sup> Century), Sarajevo: Naučnoistraživački institut „Ibn Sina“, 1997.

-----, *Šta je pomoglo prihvatanju perzijske književnosti u Bosni i Hercegovini* (What contributed to the Acceptance of Persian Poetry in Bosnia and Herzegovina) in : *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, Vol. 41/1991, Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut (1991), pp. 395 - 399.

*Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. “Polo – game” (<http://search.eb.com/eb/article-5832>).

*Encyclopedia of Islam* (2. edition) Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1991.

Fajić, Zejnil. *Biblioteka Abdulah – efendije Kantamirije* (The Library of Abdulah – Efendi Kantamiri) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem, (2000), pp. 253 - 275.

-----, *Biblioteka Šejha Abdurrahmana Sirije sa Oglavka* (The Library of Šeyh Abdurrahman Sirri from Oglavci) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 291 - 302.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 3, Sarajevo: El-Kalem, 1991.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 5, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 1998.

-----, *Originali i prepisi vakufnama sačuvanih do danas* (Originals and Copies of *Vakıf-nâme-s* Preserved until Today) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 175 - 179.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 11, London-Sarajevo: Al- Furqān - Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2003.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Kultur und Alltag im Osmanischen Reich*, München: C.H. Beck, 1995.

Filipović, Muhamed. *Bosna i Hercegovina: najvažnije geografske, historiografske, kulturološke i političke činjenice* (Bosnia and Herzegovina: the Most Important Geographic, Historiographic, Cultural and Political Facts), Zagreb: Epoha, 1990.

- Filozofijski rječnik* (Dictionary of Philosophy), Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod MH, 1984.
- Fischer, Alan W. Fischer Garrett, Carol. *A Note on the Location of the Royal Ottoman Painting Ateliers*, Muqarnas, Vol. 3 (1985), pp. 118 – 120.
- Gadžo-Kasumović, Azra. *Education – Beginning and Development of the Ottoman – Islamic Literacy in the Bosnian Eyalet*, Proceeding of the International Congress on Learning and Education in the Ottoman World, Istanbul, 12-15 April 1999, Istanbul: IRCICA (2001), pp. 207 - 224.
- Gazić, Lejla. *The State of Sarajevo's Collections of Oriental manuscripts in:* Koller, Marcus and Karpat, Kemal ed. *Ottoman Bosnia: A History in Peril*, Madison: Center of Turkish Studies - University of Wisconsin, 2004.
- Gazić, Lejla. Smajić, Ramiza. *Manuscrits orientaux à Sarajevo*, REMMM 99 - 100 (2002), pp. 33 - 43.
- Gombrich, E.H. *The Story of Art*, London: Phaidon Press Limited, 1992.
- Gonzalez, Valérie. *Ljepota i islam: Estetika u islamskoj umjetnosti i arhitekturi* (Beauty and Islam : Aesthetics in Islamic Art and Architecture), Sarajevo: Kult/B, 2006.
- Grabar, Oleg. *Reflections on the Study of Islamic Art*, Muqarnas, Vol. 1 (1983), pp. 1 - 14.
- Grabar, Oleg. Natif, Mika. *Two Safavid paintings: An Essay in Interpretation*, Muqarnas, Vol.18 (2001), pp. 173 - 202.
- Grlić, Darko. *Leksikon filozofa* (Lexicon of Philosophy), Zagreb: Naprijed, 1982.
- Grozđanić, Sulejman, *Uvod u arapsko-islamsku estetiku* (Introduction in Arabic-Islamic Aesthetics), in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, Vol. 24, Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu (1974), pp. 55 - 67.
- Hadžiosmanović, Lamija. *Porijeklo mudželitskog obrta u BiH* (The Origins of Bookbinders in Bosnia and Herzegovina), Sarajevo: Anali Gazi Husref-begove biblioteke, Knj. XV-XVI (1991), pp. 257 - 266.
- Hasandedić, Hizvija. *Muslimanske biblioteke u Mostaru* (Muslim Libraries in Mostar) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 311 - 317.
- Hitzel, Frederic. *Manuscrits, livres et culture livresque à Istanbul*, REMMM 87 - 88 (1999): pp. 19 – 38.
- Hospers, John (ed). *Introductory Readings in Aesthetics*, USA: The Free Press, 1969.



Inalcic, Halil. *Osmansko Carstvo: Klasično doba 1300.-1600.* (Ottoman Empire: Classical Period 1300-1600), Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2002.

Ihsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin. *Historija Osmanske države i civilizacije* (History of Ottoman State and Civilisation), Sarajevo - Istanbul: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu - IRCICA, 2004.

Jahić, Mustafa, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 6, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 1999.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 8, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2000.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 12, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2003.

Janc, Zagorka. *Islamska minijatura* (Islamic Miniature), Zagreb: Spektar, 1985.

Kasumović, Ismet. *Školstvo i obrazovanje u Bosanskom ejaletu za vrijeme Osmanske uprave* (School System and Education in Bosnian Eyalet during the Ottoman Rule), Mostar: Islamski Centar, 1999.

Kleiner, Fred S., Mamiya, Christin J., Tansey, Richard G. ed. *Gardner's Art through the Ages*, USA: Harcourt Inc., 2001.

Kreševljaković, Hamdija. *Esnafi i obrti u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Guilds and Artisans in Bosnia and Herzegovina), Djela, Knjiga XVII, Sarajevo: Naučno Društvo NR Bosne i Hercegovine, 1961.

Lavić Osman, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 1, Sarajevo: Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 1963.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 2, Sarajevo: Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 1979.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 10, Sarajevo: Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2002.

----- . *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 14, Sarajevo: Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2005.

----- . *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 15, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Rijaset Islamske zajednice u BiH, 2006.

Leaman, Oliver. *Islamska estetika: uvod* (Islamic Aesthetics: An Introduction), Sarajevo : Kult/B, 2005.

Lings, Martin. *Šta je sufizam?* (What is Sufism?), Zagreb: Sebil, 1994.

Lovrenović, Ivan. *Labirint i pamćenje* (Labyrinth and Memory), Sarajevo: Oslobođenje, 1990.

Mantran, Robert (ed). *Istorija osmanskog carstva* (History of Ottoman Empire), Beograd: CLIO, 2002.

Mujezinović, Mehmed. *Biblioteka Mehmed – Razi Velihodžića šejha i muderisa Husrev - Begova hanikaha u Sarajevu* (The Library of Mehmed – Razi Velihodžić şeyh and müderris of Husrev – Bey Hanikah in Sarajevo) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 276 - 290.

Mujezinović, Mehmed. Traljić, Mahmud. *Gazi Khusraw Beg Library in Sarajevo* in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 28 – 41.

Nametak, Fehim. *Divanska književnost Bošnjaka* (Divan Literature of Bosniacs), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut, 1997.

----- . *Društveno – historijska uslovljenost divanske književnosti u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sociological – Historical Conditions for the Divān Poetry in Bosnia and Herzegovina) in: Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju, vol. 41/1991, Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut (1991), pp. 311 – 318.

----- ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 4, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 1998.

----- . *Važniji legati u rukopisnom fondu Gazi Husrev – Begove biblioteke u Sarajevu* (Important Legacies from the Holdings of Gazi Husrev – Bey Library in Sarajevo) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 166 - 174.

Nametak, Fehim. Trako Salih, ed. *Katalog arapskih, perzijskih, turskih i bosanskih rukopisa iz zbirke Bošnjačkog instituta* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of the Bosniac Institute), Zürich: Bošnjački institut, 1997.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Islamska umjetnost i duhovnost* (Islamic Art and Spirituality), Sarajevo: Lingua Patria, 2005.

Pelidija, Enes. *Osnovni rezultati bosanskohercegovačke historiografije osmanskog perioda (od 1463. Do kraja XVIII stoljeća) u posljednje dvije decenije XX stoljeća* (The Essential Results of the Bosnian – Herzegovinian Historiography of the Ottoman Period (from 1463 to the End of the Eighteen Century) in the Past Two Decades of the Twentieth Century) in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, Vol. 29/2000, Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut (2000), pp. 89 – 109.

Popara, Haso. Fajić Zejnil, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 7, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2000.

Popara, Haso, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 9, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2001.

-----, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa Gazi Husrev - Begove biblioteke* (Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts of Gazi Husrev - Bey Library), Vol. 13, London-Sarajevo: Al-Furqān-Gazi Husref-Begova biblioteka, 2004.

Porter, Yves. *From the “Theory of the Two Qalams” to the “Seven Principles of Painting”: Theory, Terminology and Practice in Persian Classical Painting*, Muqrnas, Vol. 17 (2000), pp. 109 - 118.

Purinton, Nancy. Watters, Mark. *A study of the Materials Used by Medieval Persian Painters*, Journal of the American Institute for Conservation, Vol. 30, No. 2(1991), pp. 125 – 144.

Redžić, Husref. *Islamska umjetnost* (Islamic Art), Zagreb: Spektr, 1982.

Rehder, Robert M. *The Text of Hafiz*, Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 94, No. 2 (1974): pp. 145 - 156,

Richard, Francis. *Lecteurs ottomans de manuscrits persans du XVIe au XVIII siècle*, REMMM 87 - 88 (1999), pp. 79 - 83.

Rizvić, Ismet. *Illuminirani rukopisi u Gazi Husrevbegovoj biblioteci* (Illuminated Manuscripts in Gazi Husrev - Bey Library in Sarajevo) in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, Vol. 32 - 33 (1982/83), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu (1984), pp. 212 - 222.



Ritter, Hellmut. Reinert, Benedikt. *Die Persischen Dichterhandschriften der Fatih-Bibliothek in Istanbul*, Oriens, Vol. 29 (1986), pp. 110 – 258.

Roxburgh, David. *The Study of Painting and the Arts of the Book*, Muqarnas, Vol. 17, (2000): pp. 1 - 16.

Salepour, Salehe ed. *Divān of Hafez*, Teheran: Booteh Press, 1998.

Smailagić, Nerkez. *Leksikon islama* (Lexicon of Islam), Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1990.

Sučeska, Avdo. *Osnovni rezultati poslijeratne bosanskohercegovačke istoriografije o osmansko – turskom periodu i njeni dalji zadaci* (The Essential Results of the Bosnian – Herzegovinian Post – War Historiography of the Ottoman - Turkish Period and its Further Requirements) in: *Savjetovanje o istoriografiji Bosne i Hercegovine 1945-1982* (Sarajevo, 11/12.02.1982), Sarajevo: ANUBiH (1983), pp. 37 – 53.

Šurković, Kenan. *Ideja islamske umjetnosti* (Idea of Islamic Art), Sarajevo: BCA Company, 2004.

Šarif, M.M., *Historija islamske filozofije* (History of Islamic Philosophy), Zagreb: August Cesarec, 1990.

Toth, Istvan Gyorgy. *Literacy and Written Culture in Early Modern Central Europe*, Budapest: CEU Press, 2000.

Trako, Salih ed. *Katalog perzijskih rukopisa Orijentalnog instituta u Sarajevu* (Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts of The Oriental Institute in Sarajevo), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu, 1986.

Trako, Salih. Lejla Gazić, ed. *Katalog rukopisa orijentalnog instituta: lijepa književnost* (Catalogue of the Manuscripts of the Oriental Institute: Belles – Lettres), Sarajevo: Orijentalni institut, 1997.

Traljić, Mahmud. *Iz prošlosti Gazi Husrev – Begove biblioteke* (From the Past of Gazi Husrev – Bey Library) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 112 – 115.

Uluç, Lale. *A Persian Epic, Perhaps for the Ottoman Sultan*, Metropolitan Museum Journal, Vol. 27 (1994), pp. 57 – 69.

-----, *Ottoman Book Collectors and Illustrated Sixteenth Century Shiraz Manuscripts*, REMMM 87 - 88 (1999), pp. 85 - 107.

-----, *Selling to the Court: Late-Sixteenth-Century Manuscript Production in Shiraz*. Muqarnas, Vol. 17 (2000), pp. 73 - 96.

Yarshater, E. *Some Common Characteristics of Persian Poetry and Art*, *Studia Islamica*, No. 16 (1962), pp. 61 - 71.

Ziai, Hossein ed. *'Arifi of Herat. The Ball and Polo Stick (or Book of Ecstasy)*, Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers, 1999.

Zlatar, Behija. *Zlatno doba Sarajeva* (Golden Age of Sarajevo), Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1996.

Zukić, Kemal, *Islamska arhitektura, slikarstvo i primijenjene umjetnosti* (Islamic Architecture, Painting and Fine Arts), Sarajevo: Bošnjački Institut, 2001.

Ždralović, Muhamed. *Vakufnama Husamudina o osnivanju biblioteke u Banjoj Luci* (The *Vakıfnâme* of Husamudin about the Foundation of the Library in Banja Luka) in: Kujundžić, Enes ed. *Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka* (Gazi Husrev – Bey Library), Sarajevo: Gazi Husrev – Begova biblioteka and El – Kalem (2000), pp. 303 - 310.

------. *Prepisivači djela u arabičkim rukopisima* (Copyists of Oriental Manuscripts), Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1988.

