Marijana Mišević

THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND LINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF THE EMERGENCE OF *ALJAMIADO* LITERATURE IN SIXTEENTH- AND SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY BOSNIA: THE CASE OF A LEXICOGRAPHER AND POET, MEHMED HEVĀ'Ī USKŪFĪ

MA Thesis in Comparative History, with a specialization
in Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies

Central European University

Budapest

May 2013

THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND LINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF THE EMERGENCE OF *ALJAMIADO* LITERATURE IN SIXTEENTH- AND SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY BOSNIA: THE CASE OF A LEXICOGRAPHER AND POET, MEHMED HEVĀ'I USKŪFĪ

by

Marijana Mišević

(Serbia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____

Chair, Examination Committee

_____

Thesis Supervisor

_____

Examiner

_____

Examiner

Budapest

May 2013

THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND LINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF THE EMERGENCE OF *ALJAMIADO* LITERATURE IN SIXTEENTH- AND SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY BOSNIA: THE CASE OF A LEXICOGRAPHER AND POET, MEHMED HEVĀ'Ī USKŪFĪ

by

Marijana Mišević

(Serbia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU.

_____

External Reader

Budapest
May 2013

THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND LINGUISTIC CONTEXT OF THE EMERGENCE OF *ALJAMIADO* LITERATURE IN SIXTEENTH- AND SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY BOSNIA: THE CASE OF A LEXICOGRAPHER AND POET, MEHMED HEVĀ'I USKŪFĪ

by

Marijana Mišević

(Serbia)

Thesis submitted to the Department of Medieval Studies,

Central European University, Budapest, in partial fulfillment of the requirements

of the Master of Arts degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in

Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies.

Accepted in conformance with the standards of the CEU

_____

Supervisor

_____

External Supervisor

Budapest
May 2013

I, the undersigned, **Marijana Mišević**, candidate for the MA degree in Comparative History, with a specialization in Interdisciplinary Medieval Studies declare herewith that the present thesis is exclusively my own work, based on my research and only such external information as properly credited in notes and bibliography. I declare that no unidentified and illegitimate use was made of the work of others, and no part of the thesis infringes on any person's or institution's copyright. I also declare that no part of the thesis has been submitted in this form to any other institution of higher education for an academic degree.

Budapest, __ May 2013

_____

Signature

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I want to thank my supervisor, Prof. Tijana Krstić, for her competent guidance, inspiring instruction, and admirable patience, not just in the process of this thesis production, but throughout my two-year study at CEU. I would also like to express my special thanks to Prof. Tolga Esmer, for his support and advice.

Studying at CEU has been a pleasant experience for me, among other reasons, thanks to the kindness and support of many faculty and staff members of CEU Medieval Studies and History Departments that I had a chance to meet. Prof. Katalin Szende, Prof. Nadia al-Baghdadi, Prof. Judith Rasson, Ferenc Csirkes, and Annabella Pal, are some of the names I want to mention on this occasion.

I would also like to express gratitude to my family who support all of my "projects," including this one.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

At the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century in the social and political context of Ottoman-ruled Bosnia, a body of texts written in Slavic language but in Arabic script started to emerge. The first scholarly reactions and accounts about these texts appeared only in the nineteenth century, thanks to the collection work of Alexander Hilferding,[1] a Russian linguist and folklorist, and Otto Blau,[2] a German orientalist who served as consul in Bosnia and Herzegovina. After Blau's publication, this corpus started to attract more and more scholarly attention which, in turn, led to new discoveries and widening of the primary source base. Searching for a blanket term to designate this—in terms of genres, function and social status of the authors very diverse literary production, scholars came to a solution by employing an analogy with a roughly similar literary practice from the late medieval/early modern Iberian context (Spanish language written in Arabic script). Since, approximately, nineteenth-thirties, [3] the designation of texts written in Slavic language but in Arabic script as Bosnian *aljamiado*[4] literacy or, more often, literature became broadly accepted in the scholarly circles.

The relationship among language, culture and power in the context of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire and other medieval and early modern contexts in

[1] Minka Memija, "Dosadašnja istraživanja alhamijado prakse i šta dalje" [Previous Investigations of *Aljamiado* Practice and Future Research Directions], *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 39 (1990): 211-217.
[2] Otto Blau, *Bosnischturkische Srachdenkmaler*, *Abhandlungen fur die Kunde des Morganlandes*, vol. 5, no. 2 (Leipzig, 1868).
[3] See Abdurahman Nametak, *Hrestomatija bosanske alhamijado književnosti* [Anthology of Bosnian Aljamiado Literature] (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1981), 7; Fehim Bajraktarević, "O našim mevludima i mevludu uopšte" [Of Our *Mevlid*s and *Mevlid* in General], *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* 17 (1937): 83-87.
[4] The term *aljamiado* initially came into use in Spain. It is a romanized form of an Arabic word meaning, primarily, "foreign," "non-Arabic." The romanized version of the term underwent some semantic modifications and lost part of its original connotations to finally become a purely technical term denoting "Spanish texts written in the Arabic alphabet." By extension, it has been applied to similar phenomena outside Spain, in particular to Portuguese, Slavic, Greek and Albanian written in the Arabic alphabet. Furthermore, it is applied by analogy to all cases where the Arabic alphabet is used for the transcription of language currently written in a different script, i.e. where its use is not "standard*"* within a language community. See Ottmar Hegyi, "Minority and Restricted Uses of the Arabic Alphabet: The Aljamiado Phenomenon," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 99, no. 2 (1979): 262-269.

which Islamic scriptural culture came into contact with other scriptural traditions is the broader problematic which this thesis seeks to address through a more focused, case study. This line of inquiry is inspired, among other scholarship, by works in the cultural history of the Ottoman Empire, Sheldon Pollock's thinking about the "cosmopolitan" vs. "vernacular" forms of literacy and relations between culture and political power,[5] as well as the framework recently developed by Ronit Ricci in her work on "Arabic cosmopolis" in South Indian, Javanese and Malay contexts.[6] In addition to these studies, in this thesis I am also building on the conceptual and methodological frameworks used in linguistic anthropology and studies of language ideology.[7] One of the possible definitions of language ideology, of particular interest in my case, combines criteria regarding speakers' awareness of their linguistic and discursive resources and their political-economic position in socioeconomic systems.[8]

It is within this broader framework that I tend to observe the Bosnian *aljamiado* literature as a particularly interesting case-study and an adequate vantage point for investigation of the language politics in the Ottoman Empire and its relation to social and political realities. However, considering the volume and purpose of an MA thesis, I will focus on the literary output of Mehmed Hevāʾī Uskūfī (d. after 1651), one of the earliest, and according to the secondary literature, the most important authors of *aljamiado* literature

[5] Sheldon I. Pollock, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006).
[6] Ronit Ricci, *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion, and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).
[7] Some of the key concerns of linguistic anthropology are speech community, language contact and variation, modes of language performance, socializing role of language, and the power in language. Linguistic anthropology, among the other, builds on theoretical findings of sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication. Interdisciplinary scholarship on language ideology has been very productive in the last few decades. Language ideology is a cluster concept consisting of a number of converging dimensions or layers of significance. It is a concept that is designed to treat language ideologies as beliefs about language and to assist in studying of those beliefs. Its definition can be based on combination of few partially overlapping but analytically distinguishable levels: group or individual interest, multiplicity of ideologies, awareness of speakers, mediating functions of ideologies and role of language ideology in identity construction. For conceptual development, see Alessandro Duranti, ed., *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2004); Kathryn Woolard and Bambi Schieffelin, " Language Ideology," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23 (1994): 55-82; Kathryn Woolard, Bambi Schieffelin and Paul Kroskrity, eds., *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).
[8] Paul V. Kroskrity,"Language Ideologies, " in A. Duranti, ed., *A Companion*, 496-518.

known by name. This thesis is, therefore, intended to be a focused theoretical-methodological exercise informed by broader reflections, some of which I will try to outline in what follows.

The Arabic alphabet was introduced to the region today designated as the Balkans, and therefore to Bosnia, by the Ottomans. Instances of *aljamiado*-style literacy are, in more or less clustered manner and in various periods of time, present all over the Ottoman Rumeli[9] (instances of Hungarian, Croatian, Greek and Albanian written in Arabic script are well documented), as well as in other cultural contexts that came into contact with "Arabic cosmopolis."[10] Although I will not be able to address it here, it is important to note that the question that emerges from this fact is how *aljamiado* literature from different Ottoman contexts (and beyond) can be compared and what insights this would lead to regarding the relationship between language and power in the Ottoman Empire.

The corpus of literary works in a Slavic dialect spoken in Ottoman Bosnia (anachronistically referred to in secondary literature as either "Serbo-Croatian" or, more recently, "Bosnian" language) and written in Arabic script was produced by the local Muslim authors in the period between, approximately, the late sixteenth and twentieth centuries. The number of works of this kind grew during the course of time but the period in which these texts begin to appear in more significant numbers is the beginning of seventeenth century, some hundred and fifty years after 1463, the year taken as the date of the "final" Ottoman conquest of Bosnia.

Bosnian *aljamiado* literature attracted significant attention of scholars, primarily in the period of existence of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (1943-1990), but after as well. Thus, there exist numerous articles treating the phenomenon as a whole, a few

[9] Rumeli is Ottoman designation for the European part of the empire. In this thesis, I prefer to use this term instead of the anachronistic term "Balkans."
[10] See R. Ricci, *Islam Translated*, 1-31.

anthologies of *aljamiado* texts and few monographs on individual authors.[11] Besides Blau's nineteenth-century publication, there are also several works in German dealing primarily with the linguistic aspects of the issues, for example the problem stemming from application of a single alphabet to phonetically and phonologically different languages, the question of metrics, etc.[12] As for Ottoman studies, the existence of Bosnian *aljamiado* literature is a well known fact, mentioned (typically in passing) in various overviews dealing with cultural and linguistic realities of the Ottoman empire as a whole.[13] In my opinion, however, the social, political and linguistic reasons behind this type of literature have not been entirely explored to date.

Studies on this topic within the Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav contexts assert that Bosnian *aljamiado* is an idiosyncratic type of literature that testifies to an exclusively Bosnian cultural identity. However, its poetics, genres, internal dynamics and diachronic dimension have not been examined in the way that would make clear what exactly is idiosyncratic about it. On the one hand, the "Slavic side" of these texts is seen rather as a sign of continuity with linguistic practices of pre-Ottoman Bosnia than in light of the changing, contemporary social, political, cultural and linguistic circumstances. On the other hand, the fact that these texts were written in Arabic script has usually been taken as a self-evident consequence of Islamization, itself being a contentious issue in Balkan historiography.

[11] See, for example, Muhamed Huković, *Alhamijado književnost i njeni stvaraoci* [Aljamiado literature and its creators] (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1986); Abdurahman Nametak, *Hrestomatija;* Jasna Šamić, *Dîvan de Kaimî: Vie et œuvre d'un poéte bosniaque du XVIIe siècle, Synthèse no. 24* (Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes, 1986).

[12] See Werner Lehfeldt, *Der Serbokroatische Aljamiado-Schrifttum der Bosnisch-Hercegovinischen Muslime: Transkriptionsprobleme* (Dr. Rudolf Trofenik: München, 1969); Hendrik Boeschoten, "Bosnische Metrik," *Beläk Bitig-Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Marcel Erdal (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 1995), 33-49; Teufik Muftić, "Arapsko pismo kod nas" [Our Arabic Script], *Treći Program Radio Sarajeva* 24 (1979): 547-560.

[13] Christine Woodhead, "Ottoman Languages," in *The Ottoman World*, ed. Christine Woodhead (London and New York: Routledge, 2012), 143-158; Ekmeleddin İhsanoğlu, ed., *History of the Ottoman State and Civilization* (Istanbul: IRCICA, 2002).

Bosnian *aljamiado* literature has also been characterized as an "inferior cousin" of the more "valuable" literary forms, be they Ottoman or Slavic. It is my contention that the closer scrutiny of both correspondences and variations between *aljamiado* and the related types of literature (in Arabic, Turkish and Persian or Slavic languages) would provide a better understanding of the social and cultural meanings of each of these literary practices in the Ottoman context, and eventually do away with the assumption that they existed in complete isolation from each other.

On a different level, as a literary practice that partially adopts "imperial" cultural routines, but remains rooted in the "local, Slavic" milieu, *aljamiado* phenomenon has significant socio-political implications. A better insight into the rationale behind the creation of this particular cultural/literary form, the meaning assigned to it by its practitioners and the changes it went through during the course of time could be acquired by reconstructing social and literary networks in which this practice was embedded. Central to this inquiry is also the question of the modes of communication in Bosnia in the context of the gradual establishment of new Ottoman and Islamic imperial rule and creation of educational/bureaucratic institutions between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. Second is the question of translation, translators, bilingual persons, intermediary role of converts, and in general the people who disseminated Ottoman and Islamic culture locally and mediated between local and imperial modes of literary expression.[14]

Mehmet Hevāʾī Uskūfī whose literary output will be the main subject of this thesis, authored a versified dictionary of Slavic/Bosnian and Turkish languages in which he styles himself as Uskūfī Bosnevī, as well as several *aljamiado* poems in which he uses the pen name Hevāʾī. In this thesis, I will try to put Uskūfī Bosnevī's dictionary in a historical perspective and see what insights can be gained by placing it into the Ottoman context rather

than a limited regional Bosnian context as nearly all extant literature does. In a further attempt to move beyond discussions that are typically concerned with linguistic and literary analysis of the dictionary, I will focus particularly on the preface (*sebeb-i te'līf*) to this work in search of information about the social and historical circumstances and the intended audience that prompted the author to produce this fascinating bilingual dictionary. I will further argue that the autobiographical elements of Uskūfī's *sebeb-i te'līf* provide significant insights into issues of patronage, literary trends, and literacy, as well as the complex question of language politics and its role in regional practices of self-identification in the early modern Ottoman Empire. While analyzing Mehmet Hevā'ī Uskūfī's poems, I will focus more on their *aljamiado* aspect, the questions of genre, contents and audience. Furthermore, the religious coloring of these poems can serve as a prompt for analyzing the question of their function against what is known about prevailing religious sentiments in Ottoman Rumeli of the seventeenth century, and Ottoman empire in general. Finally, I will try to draw some conclusions about the possible benefits of the approach to this topic thatI am proposing hereby.

The questions that emerge in light of the linguistic complexity of Uskūfī's output (he used Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Slavic languages) are, among the other, those pertaining to the temporal/spatial variations in the use of and competence in the "three Ottoman languages" (Turkish, Arabic and Persian), "imperial" language ideology, and the status of languages other than "three Ottoman languages" in the Ottoman Empire. This is why I found it necessary to, first of all, provide an inevitably brief overview of the complex linguistic picture in the early modern Ottoman Empire and elucidate some of the issues in this regard that directly concern the overall topic of my thesis.

[14] Particularly useful in this sense is the concept of "literary network" as applied by Ronit Ricci. See R. Ricci, *Islam Translated*, 1-2.

CHAPTER I:
SLAVIC DIALECT(S) WRITTEN IN ARABIC SCRIPT AS A "LINGUISTIC OPTION" IN EARLY MODERN OTTOMAN RUMELI

A comprehensive and systematic application of theoretical findings of linguistic anthropology in early modern Ottoman context goes far beyond the scope and aims of this thesis. However, I find it necessary to provide a brief overview of several postulates and concepts that informed my, inevitably, short overview of the linguistic situation characteristic of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Ottoman empire and the selection of references to scholarly literature that, in my opinion, illustrate the main direction in which sociolinguistic and language anthropology-minded considerations could go. Later in the discussion, I will situate the subject of emergence of the *aljamiado* literature in the seventeenth-century Ottoman Bosnia in light of these considerations.

One of the shared concerns of linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics is a definition of speech community as a unit of analysis. Most simply put, speech community is to be understood as "a group of people who share something about the way in which they use language." Other important issues linguistic anthropology addresses are those of linguistic homogeneity and heterogeneity within both mono- and multilingual communities, whereby the homogeneity, commonly assumed by linguists, philologists and philosophers of language, historically proved to be an ideological construction.[15] Language anthropology instead proposes a focus on diversity and a definition of speech community not as an already constituted object of inquiry but as "the product of the communicative activities engaged in

[15] For more details about this discussion and particularly important notion of *heteroglossia* developed by Mikhail Bakhtin that addresses, among other issues, the question of "imposition" of one language variety or code and the related question of "centripetal and centrifugal forces" in a social system see Alessandro Duranti, *Linguistic Anthropology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 72-83.

by a given group of people."[16] This definition recognizes the constitutive nature of speaking as a human activity that not only assumes but builds a community. The study of language is thus directed towards differentiation "presupposed or brought about by linguistic options and linguistic choices," and, consequently, towards linguistic ideology and a wide array of questions implied by this notion.[17] However, the question that is of utmost importance in terms of application of this framework in historically- minded research is how the various ideas about language can be recovered from the extant sources. There are, roughly, two possibilities in discerning cultural variation in ideas about language and cultural variations in "speech" forms themselves: one is analysis of metalinguistic discourse, and second is tracing the "self-evident-ideas," the ideas that can be discerned by the analysis of language use and behavior.[18] Furthermore, it is important to have in mind while tracing the language ideas, especially in historical studies, the extent to which a language ideology could be formal, conscious, and politically strategic. Finally, linguistic anthropology postulates that power significantly affects literacy strategies, and, therefore the forms of graphic representation of language.[19]

The gradual expansion of the Ottoman Empire meant a gradual introduction of Ottoman institutions into the broad, linguistically diverse geographical regions. Ottoman institutions themselves were in the making as of the fifteenth century and undergoing constant transformation until the beginning of the twentieth century. This inevitably caused numerous overlaps between speech communities and creation of the new ones, both being the broad issues providing incredible spectrum of questions to be analyzed, especially now when

[16] Ibid., 82.
[17] For a review of a wide variety of issues studied under the flexible framework of the language ideology, conceptual and "disciplinary" issues see Woolard, Schieffelin "Language Ideology," 55-82.
[18] Ibid., 57. For an analysis of a historical-linguistic context particularly interesting in terms of linguistic ideology see Maria Angeles Gallego, "The Languages of Medieval Iberia and Their Religious Dimension," *Medieval Encounters* 9, no. 1 (2003): 108-139; Consuelo López-Morillas, "Language and Identity in Late Spanish Islam," *Hispanic Review* 63, no. 2 (1995): 193-210.

a statement that "the equation of language and nation is a historical, ideological construct" became a truism.[20]

A. The "Three Languages" of the Early Modern Ottoman Empire

A recent essay written by Christine Woodhead reminds of the immense complexity of the linguistic picture of the Ottoman Empire and provides a useful overview of relevant facts and scholarly concerns. The linguistic universe of the Ottoman Empire involved, approximately, one hundred spoken languages and dialects, only several of which, namely, Ottoman Turkish, Arabic, Greek, Armenian, Hebrew (together with Judeo-Spanish Ladino) and Church Slavonic were written languages. All of these but Ottoman Turkish and Ladino were, in Woodhead's words, "long-established liturgical and scholarly languages with more or less fixed forms." Within all of the mentioned languages there existed a significant variation between written and spoken forms, which "gave rise to a form of diglossia."[21] The working description of Ottoman language with which Woodhead opens her essay emphasizes the fact that Ottoman language was an imperial project and summarizes a commonly accepted view of the Ottoman language:

> The Ottoman Turkish language was a product of empire, a consciously developed political and cultural tool. By around 1600 formal, written Ottoman had evolved from its base in the colloquial Turkish of Anatolia into a prestige language dominated by elements from Persian, the inherited language of early administration and literature, and from Arabic, the first language of religion and scholarship. This amalgam was considered a natural and appropriate reflection of Ottoman imperial status in relation to the Islamic cultural heritage, appearing in varying degrees of complexity in both chancery documents and literary works.[22]

---

[19] Woolard, Schieffelin "Language Ideology," 65. For an example of application of some of these postulates in Iberian context see Kathryn Woolard, "Bernardo de Aldrete and the Morisco Problem: A Study in Early Modern Spanish Language Ideology," *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History* 44 (2002): 446-480.

[20] Woolard, Schieffelin, "Language Ideology," 60.

[21] Diglossia is a linguistic situation in which learned language is virtually unintelligible to speakers of its own vernacular.In case of diglossia written language usually assumes the function of "high language." Some of the questions posed related to this linguistic situation concern the amount of structural distance between the oral and written language; and opportunities opportunities available in the community for learning the "high language." Though diglossia, strictly speaking, refers to systems of language which embrace much more than lexicon, differences of register are often lexically marked and linked to specific social groups. See Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier, Peter Trudgill, eds., *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 536.

[22] C. Woodhead, "Ottoman Languages,"143

Finally, Woodhead poses a general question of "why Ottoman Turkish assumed the form it did, in what ways and how widely it was used, and to what extent its use promoted or prevented the spread of specifically Ottoman literary culture."[23] Question that logically complements this one concerns the diachronic dimension of this process. Furthermore, it can be asked, in light of postulation of Ottoman language as an imperial project, how local, indigenous linguistic practices and literary cultures influenced or overlapped with the imperial ones.

The above quoted and related questions are an ongoing issue indisciplinarily diverse scholarly circles applying different frameworks and problematizing the issue from various aspects.The question of Ottoman language(s) has been subject to studies of scholars from the wide variety of fields such as linguistics, philology, literary history and history. As Woodhead's further considerations show, none of the concepts and labels employed in the above-quoted definition of Ottoman language are self-evident. The findings in various fields of study are not yet joined, which makes the deliberations on social and political aspects of linguistic issues somewhat difficult. The field of Turkish linguistics, for example, was, and to an extent still is, under the strong influence of the ideology and methodology of Turkish scholars from the early Republican period who treated Ottoman Turkish as an artificial product characterized by an "unnatural" influx of Arabic and Persian influences juxtaposed in a sharp opposition to the pure Turkish" that survived above all through folk poetry.[24] This position significantly delayed the investigation of important linguistic activities in the Ottoman Empire, such as translation, for example.[25]

[23] Ibid., 147.

[24] Folk poetry is a tradition usually separated by Ottoman literary historians from the divan and mystical poetry, while the later is divided into divan and folk versions, see Sooyong Kim, *Minding the Shop. Zati and the Making of Ottoman Poetry in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century* (unpublished PhD-thesis), (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 2005), 10.

[25] See Saliha Paker, "Translation, the Pursuit of Inventiveness and Ottoman Poetics: A Systematic Approach," in *Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Hommage to Itamar Even-Zohar*, ed. Sela-Sheffy, Rakefet and Gideon Toury (Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, Unit of Culture Research, 2011): 459-474; Tijana

The literary and linguistic turn in cultural history has also left the impact on the Ottoman history writing, and the interdisciplinary approach in this field has gradually gained pace in a direction that is positive in terms of study of sociolinguistics and language ideology in the Ottoman context. The cultural turn in Ottoman history brought about a novel approach to source analysis, did away with many dichotomies deeply rooted in Ottoman historical writing and introduced new themes.[26] Illustrative for the purpose of this chapter is Gottfried Hagen's application of the framework developed within the translation studies to the Ottoman context, especially in light of the question of how theoretical frameworks developed for studying modern contexts can be adjusted to historical studies.[27] The seminal work of Walter Andrews on social and (imperial) ideological aspects of the sixteenth-and (beginning of) seventeenth-century Ottoman poetry traces the features of a particular sociolect[28] embodied in the language of *divan* poetry, and, most importantly, emphasizes it horizontal aspect.[29]

All of these works, in dialogue with studies related to other artistic forms,[30] emphasize the role of a developing imperial ideology that run parallel to gradual processes of

Krstić, "Of Translation and Empire-Ottoman Imperial Interpreters as Renaissance Go-Betweens," in C. Woodhead, ed., *The Ottoman World,* 130-142.

[26] Cemal Kafadar "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature," *Studia Islamica* 69 (1989): 121-151; Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541-1600)* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986); Tijana Krstić, "Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Self-Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 1 (2009): 35-63.

[27] See, for example, Gottfried Hagen, "Translations and Translators in a Multilingual Society: A Case Study of Persian-Ottoman Translations, Late 15th to Early 17th Century," *Eurasian Studies* 2, no. 1 (2003): 95-134.

[28] In sociolinguistics, sociolects are commonly defined as varieties of language determined by social environments or associated with a particular social group. A central problem here is to establish a valid categorization of social class with which linguistic behavior may be correlated. See Ammon, Dittmar et al., eds., *Sociolinguistics*, 201-202;

[29] Andrews's emphasis on horizontal dimension of the "language of divan poetry" goes beyond its limitations to a small (ruling) elite group and highlights its appeal to broader audience. In this sense, Andrews analysis has more to do with ideological aspect of the language of divan poetry than its relation to a specific social class. See Walter G. Andrews, *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song* (Seattle, London : UW Press, 1984); Walter Andrews and Irene Markoff, "Poetry, the Arts, and Group Ethos in the Ideology of the Ottoman Empire," *Edebiyat* NSI:1 (1987): 28-70; See also, S. Kim, *Minding the Shop*, 7-55.

[30] Most notably architecture, see, for example, Gülru Necipoğlu, *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, MA: MIT press, 1991); Gülru Necipoğlu, *The Age of Sinan* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

centralization, bureaucratization and confessionalization[31] in the Ottoman Empire, and a development of a specific, Ottoman identity.[32] Although none of these processes went uncontested, it is commonly taken that one of the results of the imperial project of Ottoman dynasty and its supporters' was a particular linguistic amalgam called Ottoman Turkish, which was the language of Ottoman judicial, military and administrative officials, or more concisely, "the language of power."[33] Below, I will emphasize some of the points related to this process and provide some examples that implicitly or explicitly touch on the question of language ideology. Before that, it is important to note that the period best studied along these lines is that between the fourteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries.

As of the second half of the fifteenth century, the growing consciousness of imperial power in the Ottoman court and among the ruling elite was paralleled by the appearance of certain stylistic registers such as official correspondence and elite literature. The (Anatolian) Turkish linguistic base of these registers[34] was almost submerged by the borrowings of elements from Arabic and Persian at all levels: lexical, morphological and syntactic. The role of Arabic as a language of religion in this context needs no special emphasis, but it is important to note that Persian as well established itself by this time as both language of prestige and language of religion.[35] Both the heavy borrowing from these two languages and patronage of works written in both Arabic and Persian reflect the ideology adopted by the

[31] See C. Fleisher, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*; Colin Imber, *Ebu's-su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997); Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011); Derin Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-Building and Confessionalization," in C.Woodhead, ed., *The Ottoman World*.

[32] See Cemal Kafadar, "A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum," *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 7-25.

[33] S. Pollock, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men*, 1-30.

[34] For an overview of the historical development of Turkic literature and related questions of language see Alessio Bombaci, "The Turkic Literatures. Introductory Notes on the History and Style," in *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*, ed. Louis Bazin et al, vol 2 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964), 11-71.

[35] Persian as a literary language and a coherent literary tradition was already in place in perhaps by the 11th-12th century. The 13th century and the Mongol conquest was when Persian started to become the language of the bureaucracy, or, in Pollock's words, "the language of power." See Gernot L.Windfuhr, "Persian," in *The World's Major Languages*, ed. Bernard Comrie (London, New York: Routledge, 2009), 446; Gilbert Lazard,

Ottoman elite, which aimed at promoting and legitimizing itself as a part of Islamic high culture.[36] The stylistic registers detected in the extant texts from the period between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries ranged from very simple ones assumed to approximate the spoken idiom of the day to "highly elaborated styles which were comprehensible only to the effectively trilingual elite."[37]

The language of these highly elaborated styles can be taken as an identity marker of the Ottoman elite, but the question remains as to what extent this language was a spoken language, even among the elite. The (theoretical) assumption of an ideal Ottoman who is competent in all three Ottoman languages on the one hand, and in the registers close to vernacular, on the other, is very instructive in the sense that it suggests the existence of various levels and, therefore, ways of Ottomanization of Turkish language. It, therefore, might be fruitful to think of the process of Ottomanization of Anatolian Turkish in terms of the social and political base of this process, but also in terms of generations of speakers, especially in light of the fact that the Ottoman empire, just like majority of other early modern states, was a predominantly oral society and in light of the presupposed importance of literacy for upward social mobility.

Nevertheless, the adjective "Ottoman" was a non-linguistic term until the nineteenth century *Tanzimat* reforms when it was first applied to the official language of the state. Prior to that, the "official language" of the Ottoman Empire was simply called Turkish (*Türkçe* or *Turkī*).[38] The term that did exist was *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* (the three languages) and was used to

"The Rise of the New Persian Language," in *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4, ed. Peter Jackson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 595-632.

[36] For reflection of this orientation on historiography, see Sara Nur Yıldız,. "Ottoman Historical Writing in Persian, 1400-1600," in *Persian Historiography*, ed. Charles Melville (London; New York: I. B. Tauris, 2012), 436-502.

[37] Celia Kerslake, "Ottoman Turkish," in *Turkic languages*, ed. Lars Johanson and Eva A. Csato (London, New York: Routledge, 1998), 180. The logical conclusion would be that the number of this "effectively trilingual elite" members was comparably small. Also, the question can be asked of what is the necessary minimum for an effective trilingualism in the given ideological and linguistic situation, and how different levels of competence manifest itself in the various forms of the written texts.

[38] C. Kerslake, "Ottoman Turkish," 180.

designate the linguistic trio that served as a basis for Ottoman elite culture. This term, therefore, implies the existence of the Ottoman Turkish as a particular linguistic construct, but does not ignore the fact that all three languages had relatively independent functions and statuses in Ottoman society. Besides that, as Hagen points out, the option for one of the 'three languages' is not self-evident but requires analysis in context. He also states that "Ottoman authors tended to give a justification for writing in Turkish, while Arabic seems to have appeared to them as the natural choice." The characterization of the choice of Arabic for certain genres of texts, especially in prose (related to the inherited canon of law, theology, philosophy, science, and Arabic philology as taught in the *medreses*) as natural is also related to the fact that, since the late fifteenth century Ottoman state acquired an increasingly Sunni-Hanafi character. Besides that, all of the mentioned genres of prose were used as "text books" in gradually developing and expanding network of Ottoman *medreses*.[39]

It is often held that (Ottoman) Turkish had no place in traditional Islamic schools (*medrese*s) the curriculum of which was concentrated exclusively on Arabic. This is supported, contradictorily, by non-existence of dictionaries and grammars of "Ottoman Turkish,"[40] and probably by the idea that *medrese*s were mainly concerned with religious education. Statements like this neglect the fact that Persian as well was considered a language of religion in the Ottoman realms and blur the distinction between the Ottoman as a social, political and historiographical concept and "Ottoman" as a theoretical linguistic concept. Considerations of this kind, however, point to the question of language acquisition in the Ottoman Empire and the educational system.

[39] For Arabic see Gottfried Hagen, "Arabic in the Ottoman Empire," in *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, ed. Kees Verstegh (Leiden, Boston: Brill). Forthcoming.

[40] C. Kerslake, Ibid. Regarding this comment related to existence of grammars as indication of a status of Turkish in medreses, I would say that a glance at the existing, modern grammars of Ottoman Turkish written with the aim of instructing scholars in a "dead language" can serve as an illustration of difficulties in composion such a grammar stemming from the above outlined nature of "Ottoman Turkish." Besides that, not all Ottomans were educated in medreses.

The status of "simpler," "plane" or "pure" Turkish within the *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* group has been discussed within the so-called plain Turkish (*Turkī-i basit*) movement debate. The proponents of the existence of such movement in the first half of the sixteenth century focus mainly on parts of the opuses of few poets composed in the simpler version of Turkish, and see it as a conscious attempt to change the poetic vocabulary by replacing the Arabic and Persian words with their Turkish counterparts. This "endeavor" that received a positive response, but did not attract any followers, was interpreted as an expression of Turkish "national sentiment." Sooyong Kim's convincing argument opposing this interpretation emphasizes the fact that in that time the "classical" Ottoman style was still in the making and that the case of these few poets testifies to the existence of different styles that, first of all, conformed to current tastes and expectations of audience that were far from being uniform, then, and probably in all times.[41] This argument can serve as an instructive warning against essentializing and the dangers of lack of sensibility for the synchronic context in analysis of literary practices and the underlying language ideologies.However, Sooyong Kim also comments that poetry was the field in which one demonstrated (prestigious) linguistic skills and that the "facility with Ottoman, as opposed to simpler Turkish, afforded opportunities for social mobility of the literate."[42] At this point, it should be noted, related to the reasons for initiation of the above-mentioned debate, that "simpler" Turkish is not to be equated with vernacular.

The examinations of translation practice in the Ottoman Empire are particularly indicative of the language ideology that stood behind the *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* cluster. Dealing with the question of the development of language consciousness in the Ottoman Empire, İhsan Fazlıoğlu bases his analysis of the status of (Ottoman) Turkish in Ottoman culture on scientific works and looks at the status of Arabic as scientific language and one of the

[41] S. Kim, *Minding the Shop* , 215-224.
[42] Ibid.

languages the forms of which represent the "truth."[43] There he states that both original works in Turkish and works of translation to Turkish were done based on the author's consciousness of the "interlocutor" (*muhatab*) and the linguistic competence in Turkish of the intended audience. The profiles of the intended audience delineated by Fazlıoğlu could overlap in one single work.[44] Fazlıoğlu's definition of the various target groups for translations to Turkish is based on analysis of metalinguistic discourse.

The social and intellectual world as reflected in the translation activity is the subject of Hagen's article in which he addresses, among other issues, the question of linguistic competence, the ideas guiding the analyzed acts of translation, the question of equivalence and multifunctionality of several works of translation from Persian to Ottoman Turkish in the period between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries.[45] A conclusion of particular relevance for the purpose of this chapter points to the fluent nature of the Ottoman Turkish culture in the given period and the fact that translations in question "are not only a transformation of the source text for the purpose of inserting it into an otherwise static target culture but also result in a transformation of the target culture itself."[46]

An aspect of linguistic situation in the Ottoman realms that deserves special emphasis is the issue of translation/communication of Islam at the grassroots level of society where the number of those competent in "religious languages proper" (Arabic and Persian) was, at least initially, comparatively small. The question of particular interest is what kind of strategies

[43] Others are Persian, Latin, and later, French.

[44] In Fazlıoğlu's interpretation the "interlocutor(s)" were people of various social profiles who spoke *only Turkish*: students starting their education; sultan or high-rank officials to whom the work in question is submitted; a member of bureaucracy, usually of lower rank that could use the information in his professional life; a wider population of speakers of Turkish that is expected to benefit or that should know the information provided in the work; center of political power to which the work is dedicated (the use of its language serves the purpose of emphasis of the established hegemony); the experts in the field in which the work is written; broad reading public with the note that the very choice of language can help the in this case Turkish; speakers of Turkish without any practical goal, and this is based on the awareness of the existence of such people; See Ihsan Fazlıoğlu, "Osmanlı döneminde 'bilim' alanındaki Türkçe telif ve tercüme eserlerin Türkçe oluş nedenleri ve bu eserlerin dil bilincinin oluşmasındaki yeri ve önemi" [The Place and Importance of the Scientific Works Written in or Translated into Turkish in the Formation of Language Consciousness in the Ottoman Period] (2003), available at: http://www.ihsanfazlioglu.net/yayinlar/makaleler/1.php?id=40.

[45] G. Hagen, "Translation and translators," 95-134.

and literary genres the Ottoman learned men employed in communicating the Ottoman brand of Islam.[47] One can also ask what was the role of (Ottoman) Turkish in communication of Ottoman imperial Islam to only Turkish speaking subjects and what the manifestations of this activity were. Monopoly on "translating Islam," for sure, was not limited to the members of the Ottoman *ulema.*[48] Members of the *ulema* acted as teachers in the network of *mekteb*s and *medrese*s where Ottoman subjects could first learn Arabic script, how to read and pray (in Arabic), later, maybe, continue their education. The *ulema* networks, however, frequently overlapped with Sufi networks that played significant role in the process of state-building and confessionalization.[49]

In spite of the fact that support and patronage of educational institutions was an integral part of the imperial image-making of the Ottoman dynasts, the gap between the educated elite and broad population in terms of linguistic and literary competence remained current. The above quoted considerations of both Fazlıoğlu and Hagen reveal the long-lasting presence of consciousness among the educated Ottomans from various backgrounds of a need for disseminating "truth" to the broader public. Although these statements might be both expression of a sincere concern and a simple rhetorical trope, one of the crucial issues is what kind of truth is being disseminated, in what period of time, and by what (literary) means. Finally, one can ask what kind of ideology is betrayed by a particular combination of linguistic choices in the process of dissemination of various kinds of knowledge. As a conclusion, then, it might be said that there did exist a group of people in the Ottoman empire

[46] G. Hagen, "Translation and Translators," 127.
[47] See Marcus Dressler, "Inventing Orthodoxy: Competing Claims for Authority and Legitimacy in the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict," in *Legitimizing the Order*, ed. Hakan T. Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 151-173. See also G. Hagen, ibid., 95: "Between the 14th and the 17th century the Ottoman polity was developing from a local tribal community into a bureaucratic world empire. Its worldview changed from a non-scriptural "popular" religion" to an official form of Islamic orthodoxy embedded largely in the social networks of dervish lodges. Its cultural outlook increasingly separated an educated cosmopolitan elite from the local cultural contexts of the population."
[48] T. Krstić, *Contested Conversions*, 1-26.
[49] D. Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-Building and Confessionalization," 86-102.

who did not know Arabic or Persian, but were considered literate and competent in Turkish, and the best label for that variant is Ottoman Turkish.

B. Language Use in Early Modern Ottoman Bosnia

The number of languages spoken within the borders of the Ottoman Empire that progressively expanded throughout the sixteenth century certainly left the Ottoman government in a situation that required different solutions and strategies aimed at solving the resulting communication difficulties. The question as to what extent the Ottomans devised a specific "language policy" remains open, as there seem to be no sufficient evidence of any systematic attempt at encouraging the use of Ottoman and Turkish as tools of integration. Ottoman and Turkish were rather tools for communication and most probably established itself as a *lingua franca* used in various transactions throughout the empire. As Woodhead points out, the question of Ottoman "language policy" was probably "as complex a subject as their attitude to conversion to Islam, to which language use is obviously related."[50]

Ottoman conquests in Europe facilitated the spread of imperial ideology and the spread of Islam that was faster than the process of establishment of the Ottoman educational institutions and the imperial, more specifically "Ottoman" culture. Numerous peopleof Ottoman Rumeliwho converted to Islam participated with different levels of agency in all of these processes. This makes converts a particularly interesting case in terms of language use, and consequently language ideology, especially in light of the fact that Islamization was a long, gradual and diverse process affected by regionally specific conditions and changing trends in the politics of the Ottoman government.[51]

More specifically, it can be said, that a particular form of Islamization known as the *kul* system encompassed a significant number of people of Ottoman Rumeli from different

[50] C. Woodhead, "Ottoman Languages,"147.
[51] See Anton Minkov, *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans. Kisve Bahasi Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670–1730* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); T. Krstić, *Contested Conversions*.

social classes. The majority of the *devshirme* recruits were subject to a systematic acculturation, the first step of which was learning Turkish, usually in Anatolia. These converts who filled the high and low echelons of the Ottoman juridical, military and bureaucratic structures were coming from diverse linguistic settings, and more often than not, kept or revived the links with their home regions. As of the earliest period of Ottoman history they acted as both intermediaries in the process of integrating various regions into the Ottoman empire and as promoters of the imperial project, and were at least, bilingual.[52]

The "new Muslims" not involved in the *devshirme* system were, at least at the beginning of the process of Islamization, allowed to speak their mother tongues. Since no known official politics forbade them to use their mother tongues, Ottoman Christian subjects as well maintained and developed certain forms of literary production in different scripts. However, there are some indications that counter this generalization, since there exists the evidence that converts were forbidden or at least discouraged from speaking the language of their former Christian co-religionists. Several *fetvas* related to the region of Bulgaria, notably from the beginning of the eighteenth century, can be quoted as evidence to thiseffect. These *fetva*s testify that the Ottoman *ulema* of the time were in no way indifferent to or ignorant of the importance of language as identity marker, but the question is to what extent this practice was region- and context- specific.[53]

All of the above general comments are valid for Ottoman Bosnia. What can be added is that Bosnia, as a frontier region, has often been depicted as a province with a special status within the Ottoman empire. Another, questionable, and hotly debated characterization of

[52] For a monoghraph on a devshirme recruit see Theoharis Stavrides, *The Sultan of Viziers: The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vizier Mahmud Pasha Angelović (1453-1474)* (Leiden: Brill, 2001). For the role of *devshirme* recruits in Ottoman state building see, for example, Heath Lowry, *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003).

[53] See Strashimir Dimitrov, "Fetvi za izkorenyavane na bulgarskata mirogledna sistema sred pomohamedanchenite bulgari." *Vekove* 2 (1987): 27-39, and by the same author, "Some Aspects of Ethnic Development, Islamisation and Assimilation in Bulgarian Lands in the 15th-17th Centuries," in *Aspects of the Development of the Bulgarian Nation*, ed. G. Yanakov (Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1989), 36-59;

Bosnia concerns an "unusually high rate" of conversion to Islam. As this debate is too broad to be addressed here in detail, I will limit myself to expressing the awareness of these issues, point to some further references and return to it throughout the thesis where I come across the aspects of these issues that are directly connected to my topic.[54]

The linguistic situation in Ottoman Bosnia is also far from being an uncontested subject. Much ink has been spilled over this issue, in many cases without keeping in mind the traps of anachronism when using linguistic labels with ethnic overtones. I will add a few comments that I find relevant for the purpose of my thesis. The spoken language of Ottoman Bosnia can most safely be labeled as South Slavic. Different, geographically distributed dialects of this language that was understandable to the population from the Adriatic coast in the west, Hungary to the north, Bulgaria to the east, and Albania to the south, were spoken by various confessions in Ottoman Bosnia (Orthodox Christians, Catholics, Muslims).[55] It is also known that, parallel to flourishing of the *devşirme* practice, but thanks to a complex combination of political and economic conditions, Slavic language enjoyed a special status of a diplomatic language in the first centuries of the Ottoman Empire, at least until the reign of Süleyman I.[56] Extant diplomatic documents but also language instruction material, including a dictionary that appears to have served as a device for learning Slavic language in the court, figure as evidence for this.[57] Throughout the period of the Ottoman rule, and even after,the

Evgeni Radushev, "The Spread of Islam in the Ottoman Balkans: Revisiting Bulliet's Method on Religious Conversion," *Oriental Archive* 78 (2010): 363-384.

[54] Lopašić, Alexander, "Islam in the Balkans: the Bosnian Case," in *Religious Quest and National Identity in the Balkans*, ed. Celia Hawkesworth, Muriel Heppell and Harry Norris (Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 141-157.

[55] All of these communities had different liturgical languages: (Old)-Church Slavonic, Latin and Arabic, respectively. A Jewish community of Bosnia should also not be forgotten, but at this point of research I do not have a study from which I could find details about the languages they *spoke* in Bosnia. Their liturgical language was certainly Hebrew.

[56] Franc Miklosich, *Monumenta serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii* (Viennae, apud Guilelmum Braumüller, 1858); W. Lehfeldt, *Der Serbokroatische Aljamiado-Schrifttum*, 49; Franc Babinger, *Mehmed the Conqueror and his Time* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), 44.

[57] A. Caferoğlu, "Note sur un manuscrit en langue serbe de la bibliothèque d'Ayasofya" *Revue International des Etudes Balkanique* 1, no. 3 (1936):185-190; Mirjana Marinković, "Srpski jezik u osmanskom carstvu/primer četvorojezičnog udžbenika za učenje stranih jezika iz biblioteke sulatana Mahmuda I" [Serbian Language in the Ottoman Empire, an Example of Four-Language Textbook for Learning Foreign Languages from the Library of Sultan Mahmud I], *Slavistika* 14 (2010): 280-298.

spoken Slavic of Bosnia was being recorded in Latin alphabet, variants of Cyrillic alphabet (one particular variant being called *bosančica*), and in Arabic alphabet adjusted in a non-standardized way to the Slavic language.[58]

As it was mentioned in the introduction, the last mentioned practice, well attested to through a number of texts whose number grows as of the first half of the seventeenth century has been referred to under the umbrella term of "Bosnian *aljamiado* literature." This practice was limited to Bosnian Muslims who learned the Arabic script in *mekteb*s and *medrese*s but continued using Slavic language for communication and writing, usually parallel to one or more "oriental languages,"[59] namely Arabic, Turkish or Persian.

A part of the literary corpus in three Ottoman languages that was produced by Muslims originating from Bosnia or adopting this region as their permanent place of living has sometimes been designated as "*divan* literature." In addition to this, Ottomans living in Bosnia authored numerous works in all genres typical of Ottoman literary culture.[60] The literary output of Bosnian Muslims can thus be seen comparatively in terms of center-periphery dynamics, as well as from the angle of broader Islamic literary networks that spread all over the Ottoman empire. It can be said at this point that there is a significant number of prose, and particularly, poetry authors who did address local themes and showed the signs of regional affiliation, particularly in the most developed urban areas and

[58] For introduction to the use of different alphabets in Bosnian context see: Vojislav Bogićević, *Pismenost u Bosni i Hercegovini* [Literacy in Bosnia and Herzegovina] (Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1975). About the literary production in Bosnian context during the Ottoman period, see, for example, Ivo Lovrenović, *Bosnia: A Cultural History* (London: Saqi Books, 2001), 81-147. For a particular use of *bosančica* among the Muslims of Ottoman Bosnia see Lejla Nakaš, *Jezik i grafija krajišničkih pisama* [Language and Orthography of the Frontier-Lords' Letters] (Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet, 2010) and Muhamed Nezirović, ed., *Krajišnička pisma* [The Frontier Lords' Letters] (Sarajevo: Preporod, 2004).

[59] This label is commonly employed by scholars who dealt with the topic in Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav context. Most of them were oriental philologists.

[60] See Hazim Šabanović, *Književnost Muslimana BiH na Orijentalnim Jezicima* [The Literature of Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Oriental languages] (Svjetlost: Sarajevo, 1973); Amir Ljubović, *Prozna književnost Bosne i Hercegovine na orijentalnim jezicima* [Prose literature of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Oriental Languages] (Sarajevo:Oriental Institute in Sarajevo, 1995).

educational centers.[61] The valid question is, therefore, how specifically "Bosnian" this production was and how it developed in the first place. It is also important to note that literacy in three Ottoman languages took root in Ottoman Bosnia prior to the seventeenth century and that this process was closely related to urban development, development of educational and patronage networks supported by Ottoman officials who were either appointed to the posts in Bosnia, or were of Bosnian origin.

Although the instances of the *aljamiado*-style literacy prior to the considerable spread of this practice in Bosnia are well attested,[62] Bosnian *aljamiado* literature is held to be, next to the Albanian *aljamiado* that emerged in the eighteenth century, the most developed example in terms of the size of the Muslim communities involved, literary output and number of writers and composers, and are the best studied until now.[63] As mentioned in the introduction, this practice has been seen as, on the one hand, a manifestation of Islamization of Slavic language as a consequence of overall socio-political and cultural tendencies, and as a sign of continuity of pre-Ottoman identities, on the other hand. *Aljamiado* literature has sometimes been treated as an idiosyncratic phenomenon of the imperial peripheries, a hybrid form embedded in the "peripheral Islam."[64]

My question is, however, why this phenomenon arises in the first place? What exactly is it a manifestation of? Testing the benefits of rejection of a single-dimensional interpretation of these texts as isolated, and "peripheral" sort of literature, I aim to see what kind of historical, social and political circumstances in this borderland area of the Ottoman empire stood in the background of this practice. In the following discussion about the

[61] For an account of Mostar school of *divan* poetry, see Omer Mušić, "Mostar u turskoj pjesmi iz XVII vijeka" [Mostar in Turkish Poetry of XVII Century], *Prilozi za Orijentalnu Filologiju* 14-15 (1964-65):73-100.
[62] The above mentioned text-books can be taken as one such example. For some of the earliest examples of the *aljamiado* literature from the Ottoman borderlands, poems with religious content (for example poems on unity of God in parallel Hungarian, Latin and Turkish versions), see F. Babinger, R. Gragger, E. Mittwoch, and H. Mordtmann eds., *Literaturdenkmäler aus Ungarns Turkenzeit* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1927).
[63] Next come the Greek and West-Bulgarian/Macedonian *aljamiado*. See Yorgos Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye: A Turkish Greek Dictionary from the Late Ottoman Period," *Journal of Turkish Studies* 31, no. 1 (2007), 241.

lexicographical and literary work of Mehmed Hevāʾī Uskūfī, I will try to emphasize the importance of the fact that Bosnian *aljamiado* literature emerged as a distinct practice exactly in the first half of the seventeenth century when the configurations of power[65] in the Ottoman empire changed significantly.[66] My questioning of the combination that involves writing in Slavic dialect by the use of Arabic script as a conscious and, thus, ideologically motivated choice, will inevitably remain limited in scope, but I will try to show that placing this particular case in the broader context of the seventeenth- century Ottoman empire can contribute to the delineation of some possible avenues of research on this phenomenon.

[64] See, for example, Matthias Kappler, "Ottoman Versified Dictionaries for Balkan Languages: a Comparative Analysis," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 37 (2001):10-20.

[65] The case of the Spanish Muslims can serve as illustration of the importance of power-consideration in discussing linguistic issues. The case of Iberian *aljamiado* literature, has been discussed either as the evidence of cultural resilience of a Muslim minority or as evidence of a loss of identity, see Maria Angeles Gallego, "The Languages of Medieval Iberia and Their Religious Dimension," *Medieval Encounters* 9, no. 1 (2003): 108-139; Consuelo López-Morillas, "Language and Identity in Late Spanish Islam," *Hispanic Review*, 63, no. 2 (1995):193-210.

[66] See Leslie Peirce, *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire* (New York: Oxford University Press: 1993); Baki Tezcan, *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

CHAPTER II:
THE PLACE OF *MAḲBŪL-I ʿĀRIF* IN THE OTTOMAN TRADITION OF VERSIFIED DICTIONARIES

In this chapter, I will present the genre of versified dictionaries in Islamic and Ottoman contexts by addressing the basic questions of form, content, and function, and introduce the question of the social background of the authors and profile of the audience. Keeping in mind the close relationship between the lexicographical production and the questions of language use and language ideology, I will introduce some general remarks regarding these two issues that seem to be reflected in the versified dictionary genre.

A. Versified Dictionaries in Islamic and Ottoman Contexts

The genre of versified dictionaries was common to most multi-lingual Islamic settings, in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. In Yorgos Dedes's words, versified dictionaries are "all those bilingual compositions which are written in verse … and which serve as *aide memoire* for assorted vocabulary in the target language."[67] They started to appear in the Middle East only after the rise and establishment of the New Persian as a literary language, as discussed in the previous chapter, and during the period of the Turkish ascendancy in the central Islamic lands. The first example seems to have appeared in the thirteenth century.[68] The genre of versified dictionaries served to promote learning Islamic languages and existed parallel to the genre of full-fledged, "prose" dictionaries compiled to "aid complicated tasks of composition." The dynamics of the development of both of these genres as well as the question of source-target language combinations has a great deal to do with the status of each

[67] Y. Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye," 239.

[68] It is commonly taken that the first bilingual versified dictionary in an Islamic context was *Nisābu's-Ṣibyān* (Persian-Arabic), composed by Bedrüddīn Ebū Naṣr Mesʿūd b. Ebī Bekr el-Ferāḥī (Sajīstānī) in thirteenth century, see Atabey Kılıç, "Klâsik Türk edebiyatında manzum sözlük yazma geleneği ve Türkçe-Arapça sözlüklerimizden Sübha-i Sibyán" [The Tradition of Versified Dictionary Writing in the Classic Turkish

of the "major" languages of Islam, Arabic and Persian, as well as that of the "newcomers" (Turkish and Urdu), in different polities and in different periods of history.[69]

The recognition of the genre of versified dictionaries across the different languages and cultures of the Islamic world was somewhat belated due to the fact that no common name was used for their designation. In each of these traditions, products of the genre were known by a label borrowed from the title of the most famous work.[70] Likewise, in Ottoman dictionaries the form was often designated by the term *tuḥfe* (gift), according to the title of the work taken to be the first of this kind in the Ottoman context.[71] The oldest example of an Ottoman versified dictionary is *Tuḥfe-i Ḥüsāmī*, by a certain Hüsam b. Hasan el-Konevī. *Tuḥfe-i Ḥüsāmī* (Persian-Turkish, composed before 1399), characterized as one of the first products of particularly Ottoman lexicography, together with the widespread and popular *Luġat-i Ferişteoğlu* (Arabic-Turkish, 1392) authored by a jurist, ʿAbdüllaṭīf ibn Melek from Tire/Izmir.[72] *Tuḥfe-i Ḥüsāmī* served as a model for a large number of versified dictionaries in Anatolia. Yet, Şāhidī İbrahim Dede's *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī*, which cites Hüsamī's work as a model, iscommonly mentioned as one of the most famous and broadly circulated examples of this

Literature and Sübha-i Sibyán, one of our Turkish-Arabic Dictionaries], *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 20 (2006), 67; Y. Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye," Ibid.

[69] Several other points related to versified dictionaries in Arabic or Persian language as well as further references can be found in Y. Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye…," 238-280. Dedes designates this genre as "versified glossaries" since he finds that the occasionally used label of "rhyming dictionaries" sounds too "ambitious." In this thesis, I prefer to use the term "versified dictionary."

[70] For example, the label *Nisāb,* borrowed from *Nisābu's-Sıbyān.*

[71] This label was usually, but not exclusively employed for Persian-Turkish dictionaries, and was occasionally used for other forms of literary works, too; for dictionaries, Arabic-Turkish *Tuḥfe-i Āsim* (eighteenth century) and *Tuḥfe-i Fedāi* (seventeenth century, 1624) can be quoted as two examples. The latter is also interesting in the sense that it belongs to some sort of local tradition of versified dictionary composition, namely, that of Antep, whose poets produced six versified dictionaries and two commentaries on versified dictionaries. See Halil I. Yakar, "Manzum Sözlüklerimizden Tuhfe-i Fedāī" [*Tuhfe-i Fedāī,* One of Our Versified Dictionaries], *Turkish Studies* 2, no. 4 (2007): 1016-1025. Yakar also provides a long list of scholarly articles related to individual examples of the genre in the Ottoman context by 2007. Numerous articles published before, and after, usually in the quoted periodical, testify to the significant interest of Turkish scholars in this genre.

[72] See Janos Eckmann, "Turkish Lexicography," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Second edition, vol. 4, 527:528; Ibrahim Delice, "Luġat-i Ferişteoğlu ve Luġat-i Kânūn-i İlâhi'nin neşri üzerine" [Comment following publication of Luġat-i Ferişteoğlu ve Luġat-i Kânūn-i İlāhi], *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları* 3 (1996):195-232.

genre in the Ottoman realm.[73] It was used and commented upon all over the Ottoman Empire. The number of copies found in Bosnian libraries can serve as a good illustration of its popularity.[74]

The Ottoman tradition of versified dictionaries flourished from the sixteenth to the early twentieth century. The counterpart of *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī* in terms of popularity is *Tuḥfe-i Vehbī* (Persian-Turkish) composed in 1782/3 by a *medrese*-educated poet, judge (*kadı*), and clerk, Sünbülzade Vehbī (d. 1809), and printed in 1798.[75] *Şāhidī*'s work was also reprinted several times in the nineteenth century.[76]Although the internal dynamics of the genre of versified dictionary as well as its relation to prose dictionaries has yet to receive a more systematic analysis, the fact that the versified dictionary as a form maintained its utility for centuries deserves to be noted and analyzed. Reliable generalizations in this sense probably require a comparative analysis that would address the history of the two lexicographical genres, but also the social profiles of both authors and users, the settings in which each form of these genres was utilized, and the ways they were copied and circulated.

Though much about the place of versified dictionaries in the whole system of Ottoman education has yet to be determined, the scholars dealing with individual examples have been able, based on the form, nature of the corpus included, and the information provided by the authors themselves, to draw several important conclusions related to the conventions of the genre, its function, and audience. I will now briefly outline the characteristics of *Şāhidī*'s work because it is directly quoted as the model for *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif*

[73] J. Eckmann, Ibid., see also Atabey Kılıç, "Klâsik Türk edebiyatında manzum sözlük yazma geleneği ve Türkçe-Arapça sözlüklerimizden Sübha-i Sibyán" [The tradition of versified dictionary writing in classic Turkish literature and *Sübha-i Sibyán*, one of our Turkish-Arabic Dictionaries], *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 20 (2006): 65-77.

[74] See, for example, Haso Popara and Zejnil Fajić, eds., *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa: Gazi Husrev-Begova biblioteka u Sarajevu. Svezak sedmi* [Catalogue of the Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts: Gazi Husrev-Beg Library in Sarajevo, Volume 7] (Sarajevo: Rijaset Islamske zajednice u BiH, 2000).

[75] E. J. W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 4 (London: Luzac, 1905): 243-260.

[76] For a comment on the introduction of the printing press in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire and the subsequent interest in lexicographical and grammar works, see Y. Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye…," 240.

and also for some later examples. The examination of this dictionary can serve as an exemplary background for further relevant considerations and conclusions.

Tuḫfe-i Ṣāhidī is just one of the works written by Ṣāhidī.[77]Thetext of the dictionary contains an introduction (*muḳaddime)* of61 couplets, the main body of the dictionary comprised of 26 stanzas/chapters (*kiʿa*) of different length and different metres, and a conclusion (*hatime*). Each stanza/chapter presents a group of words organized in different meters that are announced in the title provided at the beginning. Every chapter is concluded by a formulaic indication of the meter in Arabic, and a "royal couplet" (*beyt-i hümayūn*) whereby half a line is in Persian and half a line is in Turkish. The introduction to this work is written in the form of *meṣnevī*[78] and contains a conventional part in which the author praises God and the Prophet and expresses his gratitude (*ḥamdele* and *ṣalvele*), as well as a part that explains the reasons for writing (*sebeb-i teʾlīf*).[79] Other examples of versified dictionaries contain more or less the same parts presented in a similar manner. The clear formal connection to the *divan* poetic tradition is also maintained in other examples of the genre.[80]

İbrahim Dede Ṣāhidī was born in Muğla, in 1470. Apparently, he was from a modest background and, after losing several members of his family including his father, he left his benefactor and his mother and went to seek knowledge in Istanbul. There he became a student at the *Fātiḥ Medresesi*, but not being able to "stand the arrogance of his teachers," he

[77] He wrote, for example, three mystical/"gnostic" poems (*Gülşen-i Esrār*, *Gülşen-i Tevḥīd* and *Gülşen-i Vaḥdet*), and a commentary on a Persian classic (*Gülistān Şerḥi*), see Adnan Kadrić, "Originalnost izvan ili/i unutar leksikografske tradicije: komparacija Uskufijinoga rječnika i rječnika Ibrahima Šahidije" [Originality outside or/and within a lexicographic tradition: Comparison between Uskūfī's and İbrahim Ṣāhidī's dictionaries], *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju*, 52-53 (2002-2003), 79; Antoinette C. Verburg, "*The Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī*: A Sixteenth-Century Persian-Ottoman Dictionary in Rhyme," *Archivum Ottomanicum* 15 (1997), 6.

[78] Poetry composed in rhymed couplets with each couplet in a different rhyme, but the whole in one meter.

[79] A. Verburg, "*The Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī*…," 8-9.

[80] All questions related to Ottoman/*divan* poetics, translation, originality/ imitation, source/target systems can equally be applied to versified dictionaries as a genre. For instructive general considerations on this point see S. Paker, "Translation, the Pursuit of Inventiveness and Ottoman Poetics: A Systematic Approach."

went back to his hometown, gradually associated himself with the Mevlevī order and died in 1550 as a *şeyḫ*inhis own *Mevlevī-hāne.*[81]

In the introduction to his *Tuḥfe,* Ṣāhidī provides details related to his motives for composing the work and the very process of composition. He also promotes its utility and indicates the future audience. Ṣāhidī establishes a connection with his predecessor by saying that Hüsami's was the first versified dictionary (*manẓūm luġat*) he read "as an innocent child" and "with great effort" upon being ordered to do so by his benefactor and second father, a certain Hüdāyī. After that, he read many versified dictionaries that in turn facilitated his learning of "whatever science (*îlm)* (he) started" and especially the "divine science which sultan Celāleddīn (Rūmī) called the heart of the Koran." Ṣāhidī designates children as a target group that will benefit from his dictionary by learning the Persian language and meters and by becoming "skillful in the science of Mevlānā." The "secondary" audience was the teachers, who should be clever and skillful, should not "teach" the book poorly, and should not make children read "insignificant and badly composed poetry" because that might have negative consequences on their natures. He prays to God that his book does not fall into the hands of a small-minded person.[82]

This sketch illustrates several important aspects of the versified dictionary genre. First of all, there is general agreement that the primary functionof rhymed dictionaries was to facilitate learning. One of the phases of the process of learning consists of memorizing words, clearly not in the sense of just learning them by heart, but learning them "with understanding." Proper understanding of the words was to be facilitated with the help of the "good teacher" who is, at the same time, expected to be familiar with the poetic conventions. The emphasis on the teaching method partially explains the fact that there are numerous examples of commentaries (*şerḥ*s) to the versified dictionaries. Based on numerous examples

[81] A. Verburg, "*The Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī*," 6-7.

of versified dictionaries, the scholars have concluded that the target group of these works in general were children attending (elementary) schools (*mekteb*s), who were, parallel to reciting the Qur'an, striving to learn the basic rules of prosody (*ʿarūż*) and understand the meanings of Arabic and/or Persian words. This relates the versified dictionaries to the very beginning of the process of learning an unknown language**,** in these cases (Arabic/Persian-Turkish) bynative speakers of Turkish.

Regarding the functions and ways of using versified dictionaries, it has been suggested, in addition to the above, that these dictionaries were used in the process of teaching literature, correctness of speech, and eloquence (*belāġat* ve *feṣāḥat*), and for explaining (*şerḥ)* "difficult words."[83] Since most of the words are explained by one equivalent, rarely two or three, explanations here can be taken as definitions which are, actually, very rare.[84] However, none of these suggested activities are necessarily related to the initial phase of learning a language, or, for that matter, to elementary schools. In addition to information about the intended audience provided by the authors themselves, a look into the nature of the linguistic corpus included in a versified dictionary provides additional insights into the question of audience and the utility of these works.

The linguistic corpus included in all versified dictionaries is relatively limited.[85] The words included in the vocabulary part of the dictionary were selected by author in accordance with his intentions related to the future use of his work. ʿAbdüllaṭīf ibn Melek's *Luġat-i*

[82] A. Verburg, "*The Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī*," 17.
[83] Mehmet Dursun Erdem suggests that versified dictionaries were different in terms of the level at which the language was learned. See Mehmed D. Erdem, "Manzum Sözlükler ve Tuhfe-i Âsım"[Versified Dictionaries and *Tuḥfe-i Āsım*], *International Journal of Central Asian Studies* 10, no. 1 (2005), 199.
[84] An example of one such definition is an explanation of the Persian word *Amun*: "*Buḫara canibinde bir ova*" [a valley in the region of Buhara], A. Verburg, "*The Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī*," 42.
[85] Şāhidī's dictionary contains "more than 1200 Turkish, and more than 1350 Persian words." Ibid., 8.

Ferişteoğlu (Arabic-Turkish) aims at teaching the words necessary for understanding the Qur'an and hadith.[86] Şāhidī's own explanation of the corpus reads as follows:

> 31. No matter how many jewels there may be over *there*
> I have brought them *hither* because they are rare indeed
> 32. I have left out those that are not in use
> But there are also many *here* which are not *there*
> 33. I have taken many strange things from the Mesnevi
> In order that the Mevlevis will long for it [the book]
> 34. The existing meters are presented *there,* but *here*
> Are even more numerous beautiful meters.[87]

The dictionary, therefore, contains selected Persian words from Hüsāmi's dictionary excluding some of those that were not in use, a number of new ones, plus the "strange words" from Celāleddīn Rūmī's *Meṯnevī.* Şāhidī thus expresses a certain awareness of the contemporary use of various Persian words and expands his target group to those who are willing to understand the *Meṯnevī* better. Besides pointing to the fact that a versified dictionary, in this case his *Tuḥfe,* can serve the purpose of learning an unknown language and meters, Şāhidī's statement leads to conclusion that these dictionaries could serve for tackling the difficult terms related to a certain field, in his case "the divine science of Celāleddīn Rūmī." This points back to the above-mentioned suggestion that versified dictionaries served as auxiliary glossaries aiming to elucidate difficult terms from particular literary or religious works for students at different educational levels, including adults who may or may not already know some Persian.[88] In conclusion, the use of versified dictionaries was not limited to primary schools, *ṣıbyān mektebs*; they were used in dervish lodges and convents, as well as

[86] *Sübḥa-i Ṣıbyān* (Arabic-Turkish) by an anonymous author can be cited as another similar example. A. Kılıç, "Klâsik Türk edebiyatında manzum sözlük yazma geleneği ...," 87.
[87] This is a reference to the Persian words from *Tuḥfe-i Ḥüsāmī.* See A. Verburg, "*The Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī*…," 16. The emphasis is mine.
[88] And so they did in India and Safavid Iran, too, where there was a long tradition of glossaries of the difficult words in ʻAli Şīr Nevāi's poetry.

colleges (*medreses*).[89] It seems reasonable to suggest that they were used for self-education as well, as is, after all, suggested by Ṣāhidī himself.[90]

All of the above adds to the explanation of the popularity of these multifunctional dictionaries that were either copied as separate manuscriptsor integrated into collections commonly designated as *mecmūʿa*s.[91] The commentaries on these works were written not just for the sake of explaining the grammatical/lexical rules but also for interpreting either forgotten or difficult/metaphorical meanings, or, as in the example of a commentary from 1688-89, for the sake of correcting mistakes or imprecision that had occurred in copying.[92] The last example points to the fact that these dictionaries were, at least occasionally, copied simply as tokens of erudition. Finally, these dictionaries were not the only form that could contain explanations of difficult words since the practice of writing thematic dictionaries was also widespread.[93]

It has already been suggested that lexicographical practice is closely related to the question of language use and the status of a particular language within a society and that the practice of the genre of versified dictionaries should be considered in relation to this fact. The relation of source and target language is one of the first issues addressed in this kind of discussion and here it deserves further comment. The differentiation between the source and the target language in contemporary lexicography is quite straightforward and, naturally,

[89] A. Kılıç, "Klâsik Türk edebiyatında manzum sözlük yazma geleneği," 69.
[90] A. Verburg, "*The Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī*," 15 (line 18 of Ṣāhidī 's Introduction).
[91] *Mecmūʿa* is a term referring to various kinds of "scrapbooks" existing in all Ottoman manuscript libraries. The basic principle is collection and binding of miscellanies used by one or more persons for different purposes. They can contain personal notes, anecdotes, poetry, etc. *Mecmūʿa*s composed of various dictionaries or parts of them can therefore be considered a particular type of this kind of source. Kılıç mentions one such *mecmūʿa* of versified dictionaries from the Library of Konya Mevlānā Museum (no. 4026), which he used for publishing the text of *Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī*. See A. Kılıç, "Türkçe-Farsça manzum sözlüklerden Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī," 516. Many instances of similar "lexicographic *mecmūʿa*s" can be found in Bosnian libraries.
[92] See Zehra Gümüş, "Klâsik türk edebiyatında manzum sözlük şerhleri" [Commentaries on Versified Dictionaries in the Classic Turkish Literature], *Turkish Studies* 2, no.4 (2007): 297-312. For a dozen examples of commentaries on Ṣāhidī's *Tuḥfe* from Bosnian libraries, see Popara, Fajić, eds., *Katalog*, 450-460.
[93] A *mecmūʿa* kept in Gazi Husrev-Beg library in Sarajevo (R-7746), for example, contains a Persian-Turkish "dictionary" entitled *Muşkilāt-ı Ṣāh-Nāme* (copied in 1494) and the Arabic-Persian section is titled *Kitābu't-taḳadduma* (copied in 1412, in 12 sections, each dealing with words grouped according to meanings: animals and plants, clothing, etc.), Popara, Fajić, eds., *Katalog*, 460-461.

related to the modern ways of learning a foreign language as well as the very layout of different kinds of dictionaries and thesauruses.[94] The target language would, according to modern bilingual lexicography, be the language known to a person learning the source language. In addition, the target language is often the mother tongue of the language student and the language of translation. This differentiation is usually reflected in the titles of modern dictionaries (Source-Target). Things are somewhat more complicated when it comes to bilingual dictionaries like the subject of this chapter. In the secondary literature, *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī,* for example, is designated as Turkish-Persian dictionary,[95] Persian-Turkish dictionary,[96] and Persian-Ottoman dictionary.[97] All of these labels can be justified due to the fact that the form and syntax of the vocabulary part of the versified dictionaries does not necessarily allow for a distinction between the source and target languages. Some anecdotal evidence of the ways they were used also serves to illustrate the blurring of the line between the two.[98] However, the "author's intention" related to this issue can often be discerned from the introduction. Based on this, *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī* is most adequately described as a Persian-Turkish dictionary since this kind of labeling, although somewhat anachronistic, emphasizes the role of Turkish as the language of translation, and Persian as the source of words being learned.

Although discussing at length the strict philological and linguistic analysis of the vocabulary part of versified dictionaries is beyond the scope of this thesis, based on the existing scholarly works on the topic it seems that an analysis of these works from different periods in terms of the relations between borrowings of lexical units within the *elsine-i s̲el̄ās̲e*

[94] In bilingual lexicography the *source language* is the language whose lexical items are provided with equivalents in the lexicographic definition. In translation theory, the term is used to denote the language of the original oral or written text. The *target language* in bilingual lexicography is the language whose translation equivalents are provided as definiens (the word or words serving to define another word or expression) in the entries. In translation theory the *target language* is the language into which an oral or written text is translated.
[95] A. Kılıç.
[96] Y. Dedes.
[97] A. Verburg.

group would yield interesting results, especially in light of their popularity and clearly broad use. When it comes to *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī*, it can be said that its Turkish is not under heavy influence of Arabic and Persian, and thus can be considered close to the vernacular.

Saying that Turkish is the language of interpretation in a number of Ottoman versified dictionaries points to the conclusion that the primary function of these dictionaries was learning the rest of the *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* group. However, the scope of the vocabulary included in the main body of these works and the fact that lexical units are given isolated from the context seem to exclude the possibility of achieving full competence as a speaker of the source language. What seems as a quite feasible outcome is a certain level of "Ottomanization" of the Turkish vernacular, whether one is speaking about children learning *Kur'ān*ic Arabic or Persian, or newly admitted members of the social networks of Ottoman Sufi orders, especially in light of *Şāhidī* 's comment that he himself had read a number of these dictionaries. Leaving aside their relation to prose dictionaries, it can be said that the nature of the linguistic corpus included in the versified dictionaries, as well as the preliminary conclusions about the ways they were used, points to one of the multitude of directions in which the process of the "Ottomanization" of the Turkish vernacular could go, the importance of the social and religious context in which the process evolved, and, in light of the commentary practice, of the fluctuations in that process related to generations.

B. The Fourth Language to Enter the Ottoman Tradition of Versified Dictionaries?

Numerous Ottoman versified dictionaries composed in the European part of the Ottoman Empire (Rumeli) do not involve the *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* trio. They are, sometimes,

[98] Dedes notes that Evliyā Çelebī read *Tuḥfe-i Şahidī* to a Greek-speaking person, posing the question of which language was Evliyā actually trying to teach. See Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye," 241[16n].

anachronistically designated as "versified dictionaries for Balkan languages."[99] These dictionaries are formally similar to the *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* examples of the genre and a few of them directly quote *Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī* as a model. Extant scholarly works on the topic usually treat versified dictionaries for languages other than major languages of the literary traditions of the Islamic world as a distinct, mutually comparable group of works, structurally rooted in the *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* tradition, but different regarding the motivation for their composition.[100] Besides the criterion of the genre they are also grouped together as products of respective *aljamiado* literatures that developed in various parts of Rumeli.[101]

The motives for composing these works are usually sought in the introductions provided by the authors. One of the rare comparative analyses of the formal and contextual motivation for several Ottoman versified dictionaries for "Balkan" languages, made by Matthias Kappler, encompasses a sample of three dictionaries written in the nineteenth century in which (Cretan) Greek, Albanian, and Bulgarian figure as target languages,[102] while "Ottoman" figures as a source language. Kappler juxtaposes two of these dictionaries that actually have an introduction (in Greek and Albanian) to introductions of two "classical *tuḥfe*s," *Tuḥfe- i Ṣahidi* and *Tuḥfe-i Vehbī*, and concludes, among other things, that "what fundamentally distinguishes the two Balkan lexicons from the Persian *tuḥfes* is the fact that a

[99] See, for example, M. Kappler, "Ottoman Versified Dictionaries for Balkan Languages," 10-20. Since Kappler deals with the examples from the nineteenth century, it might be argued that in this case the label "Balkan" was not used in an anachronistic fashion.
[100] Y. Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye," 243.
[101] Some of these works have also been analyzed from the point of view of the history of different Balkan languages whereby the questions of transliteration, orthography, and dialect features of the lexical units included in the vocabulary part become central. This is understandable if one knows that these dictionaries are often rare, if not the only,documents that bear witness to the features of relevant vernaculars at the times they were composed.
[102] The broader context in which Kappler places his analysis is the study of language acquisition in Muslim societies of Southeastern Europe during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this article, however, he does not deal much with practicalities of language acquisition, but rather with motives for composition and the religious setting in which these dictionaries were composed. See Kappler, "Ottoman Versified Dictionaries for Balkan Languages."

new, not a traditionally established language, must be introduced" and, therefore "an important part of the motivation is to justify the necessity to compose such a work."[103]

The examples provided by Kappler, however, are not the earliest attempts at introducing a traditionally "unestablished" language into the literary culture of the Ottoman realm.[104] Mehmed Hevāʾī Uskūfī's *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif,*composed in 1631, is, to the best of my knowledge, the first versified dictionary for a language that does not belong to the group of major languages of the literary traditions of the medieval and early modern Islamic world, and the only one in a Bosnian context. The first versified dictionary chronologically following Uskūfī's in the context of Rumeli was the Turkish-Albanian dictionary authored by Nezim Frakulla (ca.1680-1760) some hundred years later.[105] Although the conventions of the genre certainly allow for comparisons of these works within a broad time framework, treating the contemporary contextual circumstances in which each of these works appeared might shed additional light into the particular linguistic experience of each author and implicit or explicit ideas about language reflected in their works. However, here I will focus on the formal and functional aspects of Uskūfī's *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif,* building on the discussion in the first part of this chapter, to see how it resembled or differed from its Ottoman predecessors in terms of genre.

According to the author's own words, *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* was composed on the model of Şāhidī İbrahim Dede's *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī.* It contains a preface of 102 verses (51 couplets), thirteen chapters composed in different meters of the Arabic-Persian ʿ*arūż* type (a total of 330

[103] Ibid., 14.

[104] Kappler does not include *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* in his comparison, although he mentions it in a footnote as a work that had been elaborated in H. Boeschoten, "Bosnische Metrik," 33-49. But, Boeschoten's article mainly deals with the application of Arabic metric rules to Slavic languages.

[105] Between 1731 and 1735, besides the dictionary, Nezim Frakulla composed a divan and various other items of poetry in Albanian (written in Arabic script). Frakulla is the first major poet of Albanian *aljamiado* literature, in that context also called *Bejtexhinj* literature. The oldest known poem belonging to Albanian *aljamiado* is dated 1725. See Robert Elsie, "Albanian Literature in the Moslem Tradition: Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth CenturyAlbanian Writing in Arabic Script," *Oriens* 33 (1992): 287-306; Robert Elsie, *History of Albanian literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995).

verses), and an afterword.[106] The poetics of this work bear strong resemblance to its model. At times,one can even find similarities in wording.[107]

The introduction is written in Ottoman Turkish and betrays Uskūfī's good understanding of *naẓīre* conventions.[108] In spite of the fact that "everything, good or bad, has already been said,"[109] Uskūfī does not give up contemplating how he can compose a creative work. Thinking of something that has never been done or imagined before, he came up with the idea of composing a dictionary in the language of Bosnia (*Bosna dilince*) because none of the existing "excellent dictionaries," in poetry or prose, had undertaken this task.Uskūfī's vague comment on many "excellent" dictionaries (*luġāt)* that are all "beloved and desirable like pearls" (*cevher gibi maḥbūb ve merġūb*) points to the fact that he was aware of the genre as a whole, and maybe of the realities of lexicographical practice at the time and not just Ṣāhidī 's *Tuḥfe* that served him as a model.[110]

The structure of the vocabulary part of the dictionary is also similar to the model and thus other examples of the genre. Explanations are rarely in the form of a definition; most are of the word-by-word type and have very basic syntactic structure.[111] Each stanza/chapter of the vocabulary part ends with a witty proverb or saying (*laṭīfe*) with a pedagogic-didactic tone, which, in general, prevails throughout the work. This part corresponds to the "royal couplet" inṢāhidī's model and serves to illustrate the application of meter. These lines are of particular interest since they illustrate how Uskūfī applied the rules of Arabic meter to the

[106] The preface and afterword are not copied in all extant manuscripts, but it is exactly the afterword that contains the dating of the manuscript. All critical editions of the dictionary that bring the afterword do it based on Blau's edition in which he used two manuscripts that are now lost.
[107] For a comparison between the two in terms of imitation and correspondences, and an interpretation of originality of this dictionary see A. Kadrić, "Originalnost izvan ili/i unutar leksikografske tradicije."
[108] *Naẓīre* means "similar thing," and more specifically, an imitative piece of poetry. For broader implications of *naẓīre* related to Ottoman poetics see S. Paker, "Translation, the Pursuit of Inventiveness and Ottoman Poetics," esp. 466.
[109] "*Murād itdüm ki düzem bir risāle/ Hiç evvelden alınmaya ḫayāle/ Velī yoḳdur cihānda denmedik söz/ Beyān olmuş ḳāmū eyü ve yavuz*." Ahmed Kasumović, Svein Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko Turski Rječnik. Muhamed Hevai Uskufi, 1631* (Tuzla, 2011), 65.
[110] Ibid., 66.

Bosnian/Slavic language.[112] Another way in which Uskūfī advertises his creativity is by pointing to various signs (*rumūz*), signals (*işārāt*), insinuations and allusions (*ġumuż*) that are expected to be properly understood by a wise person, although anenvious critic can always find a reason to object.[113] This part seems to be a *topos*, but it is easy to imagine that it could serve to attract the attention of both a potential patron, and the audience, provided the latter was able to read the author's introduction.

Again, the principles of modern bilingual lexicography are not much help in determining the source-target language relation with certainty and one has to go beyond the arrangement of the lemmata to figure out which language was meant to be learned by the use of this dictionary. In secondary literature on this work both-direction labels are used. Uskūfī's note that he is writing a dictionary in the language of Bosnia would suggest that target language, i.e., language of interpretation/translation is Bosnian/Slavic, in which case the dictionary could be safely designated as Turkish-Bosnian and seen as a tool for learning Turkish. Yet, informing the reader of the intended audience, Uskūfī specifies two profiles of people: the first encompasses people of Bosnia who would benefit from a knowledge of Turkish, while the other consists of all the open-minded (of an open nature, temperament) people and who would like to learn Bosnian, one of "the languages of the world" and thus

[111] The glosses are incorporated in simple Turkish sentences with the help of the auxiliary verb "*imek*" (to be) and different forms of the verb *demek* (to say).

[112] For a discussion of meter and suggestions for further research in this direction, see H. Boeschoten, "Bosnische Metrik," esp. 43-47.

[113] "*Kemāl ehil olan rumūzı/ O fehm eyler işārāt u ġumużı/ Ḥasud olan bulur elbet bahāne/ Ḫoda içün kelbdür ol cihane/*or a variant version of this verse/ *Ḥased içün gelipdür o cihane*." See Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 67. The figurative side of the dictionary can be subject to a separate analysis. Secondary literature points to the fact that words in the dictionary are organized in a way that each chapter tells a small story (for example, A. Kadrić, "Originalnost izvan ili/i unutar leksikografske tradicije."). According to one interpretation, Uskūfī used a part of a chapter to, indirectly, explain what amount of money he was expecting as a reward for his work. See Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik,* 47. At first sight, he does sometimes combine pairs of words semantically loosely connected in one verse to achieve a certain effect (like:"*Papaz hem ne poptur, ve govno ne bokdur*, " ibid., 116), and the verses preceding the *laṭīfe* might be interpreted as connected to this point at the end of each chapter. The fact is, however, that none of these meaningful suggestions is backed up by adequate examples that would strengthen this argument.

increase their knowledge.[114] Uskūfī does not mention children as his target group, nor does he comment on the corpus from which he selected the words for the vocabulary part of the dictionary. It seems that he consciously excluded children as a possible audience,[115] which in turn excludes the classroom as a setting in which his work was supposed to be used.

The distinction between the two audience groups specified by the author requires additional comment about the function of the dictionary. The first group might be understood as an indication that, in the first half of the seventeenth century, there were people in Bosnia who did not know Turkish, the *lingua franca* of the empire, and who would have done well to learn it. If they used Uskūfī's dictionary for that purpose they would have had to be literate to an extent, i.e., be able to read Arabic script and thus use at least the vocabulary part of the dictionary on their own. Another possibility is one person reciting the parts of the dictionary and another person memorizing them. Although the second option is possible to imagine, the questions are how much the Arabic *ʿarūż* meter could have facilitated memorizing words for a Slavic-speaking person unfamiliar with it and in what kind of "pedagogical" setting this transfer of knowledge could have been practiced.

The second group would be people who already knew (Ottoman) Turkish, but were curious to learn the language of Bosnia. Looked at from the angle of this group, Uskūfī's dictionary might be labeled Bosnian-Turkish. Therefore, Uskūfī's further comment regarding this group can be interpreted as an address to people who should not hesitate to learn Bosnian, the "traditionally unestablished language;" it can also be taken as a sign of his understanding of the multifunctionality of the genre of versified dictionaries.

The next question that can be asked is what kind of Bosnian or Turkish could be "learned" by the use of Uskūfī's dictionary. The corpus of words included in the main part of

[114] "*İki kimse bulur (bunda) ifāde/ Biri Bosna biri ṭabʿi küşāde/ Ki Bosnaya olur Türkī müfâde/ O ġayrinun olur ʿilmi ziyāde.*" Kasumović, Mønnesland,eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 69-70.

[115] This conclusion, emphasized in all works on Uskūfī's dictionary, is based on the fact that a few lascivious words appear in the vocabulary part of the dictionary.

the dictionary does not correspond with any literary or religious text written in any of the three Ottoman languages. The number of words related to religious beliefs or practices is negligible, although specific and interesting in terms of interpretation.[116] The Bosnian words Uskūfī included in his dictionary came from the realm of vernacular, spoken language, semantically deeply ingrained in the rural way of life. Besides that, the number of loan words from Turkish, the so-called "turcisms" that, at least later, became an integral part of the Slavic language(s) of the region, is negligible in the Slavic part of the corpus, which is also a curiosity considering the year of composition.[117] Uskūfī's Turkish corpus contains words of mainly Turkish origin, with only a small number of loan words from Arabic and Persian.

Uskūfī's dictionary appears to have become known quickly among his contemporaries. No autograph of *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* is preserved, but it is believed that copies began to appear soon after the year 1631, when the dictionary was written. This conclusion is usually supported by quoting Evliyā Çelebi, who traveled through Bosnia in 1659/1660.[118] In the section in which he describes local people and their language, next to the numbers from one to ten, Evliyā refers to sample words from Uskūfī's dictionary.[119] Evliyā does not mention the name of the author, but gives a general comment that "knowledgeable people and poets from Sarajevo,"[120] which he is describing in this particular section, had composed a

[116] One such line is: "*Zāhide hem ṣūfī dirler, samsidi(t)dür ḫalvetī.*" The only Slavic word is *samsidi(t)*. Its meaning is not clear, but it seems to imply isolation. This is also one of the rare cases when two non-Slavic words are paired as equivalents.

[117] The year 1463 is taken as date of final conquest of Bosnia, but it is not the date that marks the beginning of Ottoman presence in this region.

[118] Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality. The World of Evliya Çelebi* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004), 4.

[119] In the section entitled "*Der-fasl-ı lisān-ı Boşnak ve kavm-i Hırvat*," Evliyā provides a total of 28 lines from three different chapters of *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* which are structurally identical with all known copies of the dictionary (minor variations concern the orthography). See Ibrahim Sezgin, Seyit Ali Kahraman and Yücel Dağlı, *Evliyā Çelebi Seyahatnāmesi*, vol. 5 (Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001), 218-19.

[120] As was already mentioned, Uskūfī was not from Sarajevo, one of the most important centers of the cultural life in Bosnia, but from Tuzla. Tuzla could not be considered one of the main centers of learning in Uskūfī's time. However, for the reasons I already explained, his itinerary cannot be determined with much precision, see Alija Nametak, "Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici" [Handwritten Turkish-Croatian/Serbian Dictionaries], *Građa za povijest književnosti Hrvatske* (1968), 234.

dictionary on the model of Şāhidī's Persian dictionary.[121] Evliyā's encounter with Uskūfī's dictionary is intriguing, especially since the author was possibly still alive at the time,[122] but one can only guess what kind of "copy" Evliyā used.[123] Judging from the library catalogues, the dictionary had a place in the libraries of Bosnian literate circles beside all the other popular Ottoman versified[124] and prose dictionaries. It was mainly copied separately, but there are examples of its being part of *mecmūʿa*s and different types of codices.[125]

Finally, the main point at which *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* diverges from the previous tradition of Ottoman versified dictionaries in *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* concerns the introduction of a new language, vernacular Bosnian/Slavic. In this sense, *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* can be considered exceptional, at least for the period prior to the eighteenth century.It goes without saying that the Slavic words in Uskūfī's dictionary were written in Arabic script with certain adjustments conditioned by differences in the phonetic systems of these two languages, Slavic on the one hand, and Arabic, on the other hand.[126]As previously noted, this way of recording texts in

[121] "*Ve bu Şehr-i Sarāy'ın ārifān-ı nāzikān musannifī-nleri lugat-ı Fārisī'de Şāhidī kitābına nazīre lisān-ı Bosnevī üzre bir lugat etmişler kim bir iki bahri böyle tahrīr olunmuşdur:…*," see I. Sezgin, et al., *Evliyā Çelebi Seyahatnāmesi*, 218.

[122] In one of his poems, Uskūfī mentions the year 1651 as the date when he wrote it.

[123] One could ask, for example, if he copied the excerpts he included in his *Seyahatnāme* or just heard them. Clinging to the fact that he does not give the name of the author, we might presume, first, that he did not find it important, second, that he did not know it or was not told the name by the person who drew his attention to it. The fact that he collectivizes the authorship of the dictionary might be a matter of his own choice (ignorance) or the influence of his local informants. If he copied the excerpts, the copy might be the one without the introduction in which Uskūfī presents himself, or a partial copy that contained only some chapters of the main part (because Uskūfī mentions his name here and there in the vocabulary part). Hypothetical answers to these questions would add to the understanding of the itinerary of Uskūfī's work in the period of twenty-eight years after it was composed, about the attitude of the contemporary audience towards the "author" as against the attitude towards "the work," and finally about what (functional) features of this work were that made it last and be present in learned circles or memory of a certain community as opposed to those that might have been forgotten during the course of time. Whichever of these options was valid, Uskūfī's dictionary is apparently the only work that has been referred to in another work, namely, other than "standard" Ottoman bibliographical dictionaries (*tez̲kire*s). See Y. Dedes, "Luġat-i Rūmiye…," 242.

[124] Adnan Kadrić, "The Phenomenon of Conceptual Lexicography in Ottoman Bosnia," in *Perspectives on Ottoman Studies: Papers from the 18th Symposium of the International Committee of Pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Studies*, ed. E. Čaušević, N. Moačanin and V. Kursar, (Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2010), 317-329.

[125] The manuscript catalogued as R-2961 in the Gazi Husrev Beg library, for example, contains a nineteenth-century copy of this dictionary, and a copy of a Turkish-Bosnian word-by-word dictionary by an anonymous author. For a description of two, now probably lost, codices containing Uskūfī's collected works see Alija Nametak, "Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici," 233.

[126] Uskūfī's dictionary has been studied as a work of *aljamiado* literature and the topic of adjusting the Arabic alphabet alien to Slavic phonetic/phonological system has received considerable attention.

languages other than Arabic, Persian and (Ottoman) Turkish was far from original in Ottoman Rumeli in the seventeenth century, but *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* deserves special attention as, first of all, a conscious and systematic lexicographical enterprise that was embedded in the *aljamiado* literary culture.

CHAPTER III:
USKŪFĪ BOSNEVĪ'S "REASONS FOR WRITING" *MAḲBŪL-I ʿĀRIF* AND THE DICTIONARY'S RECEPTION BY THE CONTEMPORARIES AND MODERNS

In the first part of this chapter, I will contextualise Uskūfī Bosnevī's introduction to his dictionary. In the second part I will provide several considerations based on what is known about the reception of his dictionary in the Ottoman times. Finally, I will adress the way this dictionary was used for modern scholarly arguments.

A. Why Write a Bosnian-Turkish Dictionary in Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Rumeli?

The only facts we have about Uskūfī's life are derived from the information he himself left in his work. Therefore, we know that he was born in 1601 in a village of Dobrnja close to Tuzla (Sancak of Zvornik). It is here, presumably, that he lived a part of his life and began his career. Itseems that he was son of a *beğ* andthat he lost his parents at a very young age. As we learn from his *sebeb-i teʾlīf* (lit. "reason for writing')–the customary introduction to the work where the author typically elaborates on his reasons for writing—at some point he ended up at the Ottoman court where he spent a certain amount of time, but it can only be speculated how and under what circumstances this happened. Secondary literature suggests that he was "some kind of a clerk" in the sultan's service, or even a janissary soldier.[127]

Uskūfī then tells us that he was observing the pages in the Sultan's palace (*ġılmān-ı Derūn*), most of whom were superior (*ġālip*) in comparison to those "outside" (those who are in *bīrūn).*[128] Some of these pages were poets, writing *ḳaṣīde*s, some of them were scribes/calligraphers, and those virtuous/well educated ones (*fāżil*) were creating good

[127] Derviš M. Korkut, "Makbūl-i 'Arif Uskufi Bosnevije" [Makbūl-i 'Arif by Uskufi Bosnevi], *Glasnik hrvatskih zemaljskih muzeja u Sarajevu* (1942), 379; Alija Nametak,"Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici," 234; Ahmed Kasumović; Muhamed Huković and Ismet Smailović, *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi* (Tuzla: Univerzal, 1990), 75-81.
[128] Central public administration with offices outside the Palace.

dictionaries (*yaḫşī luġatlar*). Each of them presented his work to the sultan and was illuminated by his mercy.[129] Uskūfī states that he came"to this paradise" more than twenty years before the time he was writing the dictionary,[130] but did not seem to be very satisfied with his lucky star.[131] Probably in attempt to change his fortunes, he decided to join the group of all those who were presenting "something" to the sultan. Considering the fact that "everything, good or bad, has already been said," his attempt at being creative is interesting, above all, considering the type of the work he undertakes to compose:a dictionary in/for Bosnian language (*Bosna dili*).[132]

Uskūfī opens the preface to his dictionary by mentioning the name of God (*Ḫoda)* and invoking the divine guidance and help of the Almighty so that he can finish his work. After the salutation to God's beloved (*ḥabīb*) and his companions (*aṣḥāb*) he calls for the attention of the generous reader (*ṣāḥib-i kerāmet*) to his own persona and presents himself as Uskūfī Bosnevī—the slave of the world-conquering king of kings (*şehinşah-ı cihāndārūn*). He then informs us about what inspired him to compose the work, praises the sultan as patron of literary works, explains the process of composition and specifies potential users of the dictionary.[133] Thus, the impression is that one of Uskūfī 's important goals was to be rewarded for his work. Recommending himself and his composition, Uskūfī plays a double game: although he asks for understanding from the knowledgeable and the wise for his

[129] The sultan in question is Murād Ḫān ibn Aḥmed Ḫān, i.e., Murat IV (r.1623-1640): "*Bi hamdillah ki bir sultana irdük/ Murad Han ibn Ahmed Hana irdük/ Vücudın saklasun Allah hatadan/ Hiç unutmaz o kulların 'atadan,* " Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 64.

[130] Uskūfī was born around 1601, this means he was at around the age of 30 when he was writing the dictionary, in 1631.

[131] "*Sitarem gün gibi ger olsa berrāk/ Ki men deh sāle olmazdum oturak/ Hücecden hem füzūn oldu ʿişrūn/ Ki üftādem der īn cennet ze bīrūn/ Bi hamdillāh ki bir sulṭāna irdük/ Murād Ḫān ibn Aḥmed Ḫāna irdük/ Vücūdın ṣaklasun Allāh ḫaṭādan*," Kasumović, Mønnesland,eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 64.

[132] See Chapter II.

[133] Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 61-72.

humble enterprise, he does not miss to note how hard it was to create a work of this kind and to denigrate, in advance, the prospective envious commentators.[134]

Uskūfī's preface can beread as one of those *sebeb-i teʾlīf*s that contain elements of the first-person narrative, besides the autobiographical fragments.[135] Although some of his statements can be interpreted as conditioned by literary convention, we can still get some insight into his inner or social experience. In general, he was not satisfied with his situation and he presents himself as a mere observer in the court. Another "negative" side to the "paradise" in which he arrived twenty years before, according to the writer, is a certain atmosphere of competition based on which one can easily imagine him standing between a just and merciful sultan on the one hand, and many a jealous and envious person, on the other. This situation might be one of the reasons why he goes to a great length to persuade the wise ones (*ʿārif*) of the worthiness of his work. Uskūfī certainly was not a high-profile learned man, but he did seem to know the rules and conventions employed by others that belonged to that group. Although he can be considered a *literatus* of a "more modest sort" (possibly as a soldier/janissary), he is undeniably a man who witnessed and participated in "the expansion of book collections and the proliferation of middle brow literature in vernacular Turkish."[136] Coming to his language skills, it can be concluded based on this dictionary that, besides having a good command of his mother tongue and of Turkish,[137] Uskūfī displays competence in Persian and someknowledge of the laws of Arabic prosody.

[134] "*Hasud olan bulur elbet bahane/ Hoda içün kelbdür ol cihane*," Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 67.

[135] Various forms of self-narrative and autobiographies in the Ottoman context have been pointed at by Cemal Kafadar as sources that can help us develop "fresh perspectives on Ottoman social life and mental attitudes in the post-Suleymanic age," see Cemal Kafadar, "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature," *Studia Islamica* 69 (1989), 125.

[136] Derin Terzioğlu, "Autobiography in Fragments: Reading Ottoman Personal Miscellanies in the Early Modern Era," in *Autobiographical Themes in Turkish Literature: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives*, ed. D. O. Akyıldız, H. Kara and B. Sagaster (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag in Kommission, 2007), 6 (89).

[137] This is a conclusion based on reading of the second part of Uskūfī's opus, namely several religious poems (*ilāhi*s) in Slavic dialect, recorded in Arabic script. He also wrote a few poems in Turkish. See Alija Nametak, "Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici," 233-4.

Uskūfī writes that in producing the dictionary of the *Bosna dili* he encountered a serious challenge in the fact that Bosnian words are not easy to versify, that they are extremely big/huge (*iri*) as the stature of the Bosnians themselves, and as inelastic as an iron arch.[138] Uskūfī was not alone in juxtaposing particular features of speakers with the characteristics of their language. The closest example can again be found in Evliyā Çelebi's work where, speaking of Bosnians, he states that their language is as pure and appreciable as they themselves.[139] This kind of parallelism between people and language might have been informed by the authors' knowledge of the *ʿilm-i ferāset or ʿilm-i ḳıyāfet*, a branch of knowledge dealing with physiognomy elaborated in many a treatise composed between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries, and usually titled *ḳıyāfet-nāme*, or *ferāset-nāme*.[140]

Even if Uskūfī did not read these treatises, he must have been aware of the importance of physiognomy in Ottoman society of the time, or at least of some anecdotes containing allusions to this kind of knowledge. As an indicative illustration, it can be added that Muṣṭafā'Alī, an Ottoman historian and bureaucrat of the sixteenth century, explained how physiognomy became a practical aid in the art of government, by saying that an expert in physiognomy was included in the selection of the young Christian recruits to the army and Ottoman bureaucracy.[141] It is possible that in physiognomy manuals Bosnians were characterized as men of huge stature that recommended them for high military and administrative positions—something that men from Bosnia themselves may have wanted to

[138] "*Çu Bosnalu* (variant*: Bosnalar) olur iri be-kāmet / İri bil hem luġatların be-ġâyet/ Pes imdi bunları vezne getürmek/ Demür yaydür değil mümkin çekmek* (variant*: çekilmek*)," Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 67-68.

[139] "*Hakkā ki lisānları ve kendüleri pāk ve kadir-şinās ādemlerdir…*," I. Sezgin, et al., *Evliyā Çelebi Seyahatnāmesi*, 218.

[140] Miri Shefer-Mossensohn, *Ottoman Medicine: Healing and Medical Institutions, 1500-170* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 93-100; Bekir Çınar, "Niğdeli Visālī ve Hamdullah Hamdī'nin kıyāfetnāmeleri üzerine bir inceleme" [An Examination on Physiognomies of Niğdeli Visālī and Hamdullah Hamdī], *Birinci Uluslararası Niğde Dil, Kültür ve Tarih Sempozyumu* 3-6 (May, 2012), available at: www.diewelt-dertuerken.de

[141] M. Shefer-Mossensohn, *Ottoman Medicine*, 96.

advertise as a trope.[142] The ideological side of *ʿilm-i ferāset or ʿilm-i ḳıyāfet* can be viewed in light of a luxury work entitled *Kıyāfetü'l-İnsānıyye fī Şemāili'l-Osmānıyye* of Seyyid Loḳmān Çelebi (d.1601), the court poet, eulogist and teacher of royal princes. This work dates from 1588/9 and deals with the physiognomy of the Ottoman sultans (the last of them being Murad III). In this work, limited to the Ottoman realm, the stature is connected to the faculty of intelligence in a somewhat ambiguous way.[143] Nevertheless, the obvious ideological background of this knowledge, at least in the sixteenth century, makes the idea of connecting it to whatever language even more intriguing.

Coming to the utility of his enterprise, Uskūfī informs us that he intended his work for two types of persons: one of them is a Bosnian who will be able to express himself in Turkish, and the other one is anyone who would like to broaden their horizons.[144] At this point he elaborates more on the reasons why a person with broad horizons might want to learn Bosnian. First, there is no harm in knowing the languages of all people, and second, wise men had said that it is *mubāḥ* (permitted, i.e., neither commanded nor forbidden) by religious lawto speak in a language in which a holy book is revealed, and since Bosnian is the same as Latin, in which the gospel was revealed to Jesus, there is no harm in learning it.[145]

Interestingly, Evliyā also makes a comment that the language of Bosnia is close to Latin. Uskūfī's comment is more elaborate but it is striking that they both bring this idea up.

[142] And this especially in light of the competition that had a proto-ethnic base. For Muṣṭafā'Alī's comment with a tone that is very illustrative in this sense see: C. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire*,157; According to Fleischer, 'Alī had a particular tendency to praise Bosnians, but see *op.cit.* 165n, for a more elaborate comment.

[143] Entry on Height (Ḳāmet) reads: "Very tall persons are rarely intelligent. Scholars say," Short people are very clever, but those of them who are tactless are simpletons. However, though of rare occurence, there are some among the tall and short who are intelligent, irrespective of theri height. On the other hand, he who is moderate of stature has a good temper as well as an intelligent mind." See Seyyid Loḳmān, *Kıyāfetü'l-İnsānıyye fī Şemāili'l-Osmānıyye* (Ankara: Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Turkish Republic, 1987), 18. It is interesting that Sokollu Mehmed Pasha, who was Lokman's patron, had a nickname "Tavīl" (the Tall One).

[144] "*İki kimse bulur (bunda) ifāde/ Biri Bosna biri ṭabʿi küşāde/ Ki Bosnaya olur Türkī müfâde/ O ġayrinun olur ʿilmi ziyāde,*" Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 69-70.

[145] "*Zarar mı ki bir ṭaḥṣil ḳılaydın/ Ḳāmū nāsun lisānundan bileydin/ Mubāḥ oldu tekellüm dedi fāżıl/ Kitābu-'llah o dilce ki oldu nāzil/ Çu İncil Ḥażreti ʿİsāya geldi/ Ḫodādan kullara bir sāye geldi/ Nüzūl etti luġatlardan Latince/ Latin dili veli (bir)dir Bosnaca/ Bilinmekte yokdur anun ḫaṭāsı/ Ki kim bilür ola lāzım edāsı*," Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 70-71.

Elsewhere in his *Seyahatnāme* Evliyā says in his description of Dubrovnik: "To be sure, they are Christians, but they have translated the Gospel into Latin and recite it like this. They go so far as to claim, preposterously, that the Gospel was revealed by God to the prophet Jesus in their own Latin language, and they take pride in this. Indeed, Latin is the most correct and eloquent of the various languages in Christendom…" [146] The interest in the languages of the world shown by Evliyā can be seen as part of the broader change in the "Ottoman worldview" in the seventeenth century. Another example related to travel of ideas and a particular vision of the "others" is that of a well known contemporary of Mehmed Hevā'ī Uskūfī, Kātib Çelebi (1609-1657). Kātib Çelebi was a small time clerk in the financial bureaucracy, but also a polymath and innovator in geography, who used European sources translated for him from Latin. His interest in geography originated in the Ottoman war against Venice over Crete, in 1645,[147] one of the many events from the first half of the seventeenth century that resounded around "the world" and were subject to literary accounts in various linguistic communities.[148]

Uskūfī's designation of a "Bosnian" as a person who might benefit from his dictionary and learning Turkish deserves further consideration. The intriguing question is who might those Bosnians be who, in Uskūfī's opinion, did not know Turkish, but would do well to learn it. It is known that a comparatively large number of Ottoman subjects were at least to some extent bilingual, and that one of these languages was the *lingua franca* of the Ottoman empire, i.e. Turkish, in its different levels of complexity. It has already been pointed out that a particular group of these bilingual individuals were the Christian boys who were

[146] Robert Dankoff and Sooyong Kim, eds., *An Ottoman Traveler: Selections from the Book of Travels of Evliya Chelebi*. (London: Eland, 2011), 205. For Evliyā's ideas about different languages of the world see Robert Dankoff, "The Languages of the World according to Evliya Çelebi," *Journal of Turkish Studies* 13 (1989): 23-32.

[147] See Gottfried Hagen, "Afterword: Ottoman Understandings of the World in the Seventeenth Century," in Robert Dankoff, *An Ottoman Mentality* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 207-248.

[148] One of the most prominent examples in the Slavic region is an epic poem *Osman*, composed by Ivan Gundulić from Dubrovnik and inspired by 1622 regicide in the Ottoman realm.

being collected through the *devşirme* system ever since the beginning of the fifteenth century, subjected to compulsory learning of Turkish in the court or in Anatolia, but still preserved basic competence in their mother tongue. It is often asserted as well that Bosnian Muslims were in a special position in that their children were eligible for the *devşirme* although they were Muslims, and were thus given the chance to climb the social ladder, i.e., avoid the status of the tax-paying *reʿāyā*.

However, things changed by the first half of the seventeenth century and the institution of the *devşirme* lost its previous importance. One of the unresolved, hypothetical questions is whether this fact, or other social, political and economic circumstances surrounding it, had any bearing on the (quality of) education and learning in Bosnia in general.[149] In spite of the changes in the *devşirme* system, many Bosnians were still part of the ruling circles, and took active roles in an increasing factionalism at the Ottoman court.[150] One of the aspects of this factionalism (and nepotism) was the so-called *cins*, proto-ethnic or regional solidarity among those who filled the highest ranks of the Ottoman ruling elite. This solidarity was supposedly based on the place of origin and might have been strengthened by the unforgotten common language that reinforced the sense of belonging together.[151]The presence of "Slavonic" in the heart of the Ottoman state did not escape attention of western observers from the end of the sixteenth and well into the seventeenth century. Noel Malcolm provides examples of a commentator who "noted in 1595 that "Slavonic" was the third language of the Empire (After Turkish and Arabic), because it was the language of the janissaries; and another observed in 1660 that theTurkish language is hardly ever heard at the

[149] For example, Aga-Dede, a Bosnian janissary from the first half of seventeenth century, while explaining his intellectual oeuvre, complains about the fact that he had to pursue his education on his own, without much help from the "outside." Osman A. Sokolović, "Pjesnik Aga-Dede iz Dobor-grada o svome zavičaju i pogibiji Osmana II" [A Poet, Aga-Dede from Dobor-grad, on his Homeland and the Death of Osman II], *Anali Gazi-Husrev Begove Biblioteke* 1 (1972), 16.

[150] See for example: Caroline Finkel, *Osman's Dream, The Story of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1923* (London: John Murray, 2005), 152-253; Günhan Börekçi, *Factions and Favorites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-17) and his Immediate Predecessors* (unpublished PhD dissertation, The Ohio State University, 2010).

Sultan's court because…the whole court and the majority of magnates" were "renegades": from Slav-speaking lands."[152] Parallel to this, the first half of the seventeenth century witnessed the transformation in the provincial elites that were, at least in Bosnia, held to be less and less loyal to the Istanbul court.[153] Uskūfī does not betray much about the social network he was part of, but we can imagine he was an observer aware of some of these processes, which may have in turn influenced his work. Near-contemporary examples provide insights into how regional solidarity operated in terms of patronage, [154] and Uskūfī seems to be more than aware of this practice.

I have already pointed out that Slavic language lost its status as one of the official diplomatic languages of the Ottoman court by the seventeenth century. Yet, Slavic was freely spoken, used in various kinds of transactions, and labeled in numerous ways depending on who attached the label. Anecdotes scattered in contemporary sources offer a glimpse into how languages in general, and among them Slavic spoken by Bosnians, was used in different situations and to different effects, including as a basis for demanding special status and privileges in the age that was witnessing a boom in group identity differentiation and demands for accompanying legal and other rights, both within the Ottoman Empire and beyond.[155]

The example from 1582 of two Bosnian merchants in Venice, Hassan and Risuan, serves as a good illustration of this. The mentioned merchants, hoping to rid themselves of a

[151] Metin Kunt. "Regional (Cins) Solidarity in the Seventeenth Century Ottoman Establishment," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 5, no. 3 (June 1974): 233-239.
[152] Noel Malcolm, *Bosnia: A Short History*. (London: Macmillan London Limited, 1994), 47.
[153] Metin Kunt, *The Sultan's Servants: The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government, 1550-1650*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983); For an account of Bosnian "*beğ*s" and their special relation to the court in Istanbul, see for example: S. B. Bašagić. *Kratka uputa u prošlost Bosne i Hercegovine* [A Short Introduction into the Past of Bosnia and Herzegovina] (Sarajevo, 1900), 63.
[154] One of the most notorious examples in this sense is Sokollu Mehmed Paşa's clan, that established the Bosnian ascendancy in the court. For Muṣṭafā'Alī's comment on this case see C. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual*, 56.
[155] For the discussion of Ottoman ways of distinguishing between different religious, social, military and political groups in the seventeenth century, the questions of "millet" and "tā'ife," see: Daniel Goffman, "Ottoman Millets in the Early Seventeenth Century," *New Perspectives on Turkey* 11 (Fall 1994): 135-138;

tax called *terzo*by exploiting a general logic of linguistic difference as the basis for collective privileges typical of Venetian commercial sphere, "petitioned the Venetian Board of Trade to appoint additional commercial brokers who spoke 'our language'" because they thought that the existing ones, applying to Turkish-speaking Muslim merchants did not serve their interest in the best way. Although they did not specify which exactly was "their language," by doing this they distinguished themselves from other kind of Ottoman subjects dealing with trade in Venice. The reply from the Board is interesting in the sense that it shows the interplay between the political interests and self-identification practices, but also of the importance of the power configuration in the dialogue: the Venetian Board ruled out the merchants' claim of linguistic distinctiveness by claiming that they as Muslims from Bosnia must have been bilingual and thus could be accommodated by brokers knowing either of these two languages, and whose number was not small in Venice.[156] In order to show an early differentiation between Muslims of Bosnia and "Turks," Muhsin Rizvić provides and example of a document composed in Zadar (a historical center of Dalmatia) in 1568 in which "Haci Memi, Yusuf, Ali, Kara-Oruç, Hasan and Ferhat" were recorded as "Mossolmani di Bossina," but he does not provide more details about the relevant circumstances except for the fact that these men were merchants.[157]

Another example is Venetian *Fondaco dei Turchi* changing its regulations in 1621 to open up room for distinction amongOttoman subjects, thus introducing two sub-categories within that of *Turchi*: Bosnians and Albanians, on the one hand, and *asiatici,* on the other. Natalie Rothman infers, based on her detailed analysis of the context, that this categorization was informed by the good knowledge of the Ottoman circumstances of the two dragomans (interpreters) and mediators who prepared the relevant report: "in distinguishing Balkan from

Bruce Masters. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World: The Roots of Sectarianism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[156] Natalie Rothman, *Brokering the Empire* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011), 194.

Anatolian Ottoman Muslims, they seem to have built on a popular Ottoman distinction between "westerners" and "easterners," prevalent among provincial recruits to the imperial administration.[158] This example shows the conditions at the heart of the Ottoman state could reverberate in the political contexts around the early modern Mediterranean. Finally, in 1636, a group of thirty four Bosnians who delivered a joint petition to the Senate of Venice demanded that they be given the right to represent their own interests rather than having to use the services of commercial brokers and interpreters. The petition was, interestingly, submitted in (vernacular) Turkish, but it is not known to what effect. In Rhoads Murphey's interpretation this example can serve as an illustration for the link between "language use and assertion of individuality through personal statement."[159]

A significant link between trade and identity practices in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has also been shown by Aleksandar Fotic in his analysis of contemporary Belgrade, whereby he addresses both the instances of commercial cooperation and its standstills. He shows that the standstills were usually couched in terms of bans on trade with members of certain religious communities, although motivated by strictly commercial interests. Besides that, he points to the internal divisions withinparticular religious communities, illustrating it by the case of the Catholic community in Belgrade that was "rife with friction and intolerance between groups which were different from each other only in their territorial origins, along with adherence to particular monastic orders (Catholics from Dubrovnik versus Bosnian Catholics)."[160]

From all of the above examples one can infer that, while thinking about the period of the seventeenth century, "Bosnian" as a linguistic or identificatory label can in no way be

[157] Muhsin Rizvić, *Bosna i Bošnjaci, Jezik i Pismo* [Bosnia and Bosniaks, Language and Script] (Sarajevo: Preporod, 1996), 8.
[158] N. Rothman, *Brokering the Empire*, 203-206.
[159] Rhoads Murphey. "Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality In Ottoman Society," *Turcica*, 34 (2002), 151-152.

used without qualification and keeping in mind the circumstances of the context in question. This insistence on the context is, in my opinion, also important when thinking about the target audience Uskufi had in mind for his dictionary.

From the analysis of Uskūfī's dictionary as an example of the genre of Ottoman versified dictionaries undertaken in Chapter II, Uskūfī's "reasons for writing," and other circumstantial evidence it could be concluded that at least one part of the target audience of his dictionary may have been Bosnian peasants and those locally-bound Bosnians who had not had a chance to learn Turkish and who might improve their chances in the society by learning the *lingua franca* of the Empire. The logical question is whether an illiterate peasant would bother using it, or listening to excerpts from it recited to him by some literate person. The literate ones, who knew the Arabic script, were already expected to know some basic Arabic and Turkish from school, but irrespective of how much they could benefit from Uskūfī's dictionary in terms of linguistic knowledge, they might cherish this work for its poetic values, or maybe, those hidden allusions Uskūfī himself points at. In turn, those unfamiliar with "Bosnian language" are encouraged to learn it as one of the "scriptural"or divinely approved—languages. All of these are points that deserve further research and directly inform the larger question of the Bosnian "*aljamiado*" phenomenon and the relationship among literacy, regional and imperial identities. It is also important for the discussion of Uskūfī's poetic opus that will be analyzed in Chapter IV. However, before that, it is necessary to consider the afterlife of Uskūfī's dictionary, since it sheds significant light on the overall problematic outlined in this thesis about the emergence of the *aljamiado* literature.

B. *Maḳbūl-ʿĀrif* as "Potur Šahidija"

[160] Aleksandar Fotić," Belgrade: A Muslim and a non-Muslim cultural centre (sixteenth-seventeenth centuries)," in *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*, ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos (Rethymno: Crete University Press), 55-65.

Uskufi's dictionary, *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* was copied for centuries, sometimes with the prologue and epilogue, and sometimes without them. Therefore, it can be said that Uskūfī's dictionary served the purpose even when prologue and epilogue were amputated. The oldest complete copy that survives to this day dates to 1750[161]. The title in this copy, written by a skilled scribe, reads "this is the Book of *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif* ." The alternative title, *Potur Šahidija*. was provided later, by a shaky hand of a user unskilled in calligraphy. In this case as well there is no other option but to search for the circumstantial evidence about the ways Uskūfī's work was understood by those who used it for centuries.

The term "*Šahidija*" is a Slavicized form of *Tuḥfe-i Şāhidī*, one of many examples of how long titles of works written in Arabic, Turkish or Persian, especially those that were important, current, and used in schools and in learned circles, were shortened by their users. On the other hand, its attribute, *potur*, is a term that received a lot of attention in scholarly works, but no agreement about its meaning has been achieved. This is mainly because the word is usually ascribed religious connotations and the extant discussions revolve around the issues I will outline below.

In Noel Malcolm's words *potur* is "one other mysterious element in Bosnian religious history which, according to some writers, indicates a link between Islam and Bosnian Church."[162] Uskūfī's dictionary is commonly used as an illustration in these discussions, usually by pointing to Uskūfī's translation of this Slavic word as the equivalent of Turkish *köylü* (peasant). However, *potur* is obviously one of many identity labels whose content has changed during the course of time, and whose interpretation, typically based on sporadic excerpts from sources that themselves have not been critically analyzed, is yet to receive a proper treatment that does not suffer from anachronism. There are indications, for example,

[161] Manuscript catalogued under R-2865 in Gazi-Husrev Beg Library in Sarajevo. See Popara, Fajić, eds., *Katalog*, 491.
[162] Malcolm provides relatively broad review of the interpretation of this title in historiography. N. Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 51-69.

that it served for religious differentiation among Bosnians themselves, i.e., in determining who was a real Muslim, and who was only "half" Muslim (*po-tur*[163]).

Looking for the earliest mention of the word, Malcolm quotes Stanford Shaw and his account of the period of Mehmed II to show that in the period immediately after the conquest of Bosnia (1463) till the beginning of sixteenth century this word was used simply to designate Islamicized Bosnian Slavs.[164] Quoting Muhamed Hadžijahić, Malcolm mentions various imperial laws and decrees regulating the privilege of Bosnian Muslims (covering the period 1515-1589) in which this word retained the same meaning. Some other examples provided in this account are contexts in which *potur* meant "half-Turk" (from Hadžijahić) or "peasant," the latter being supported by an entry from Mehmed Uskūfī's dictionary (1631)[165]. Malcolm himself, somewhat contradictorily, in order to provide the most "obvious explanation," suggests that the word *potur* might not be of Slavic origin, but comes from the Turkish word *potur* (type of baggy pleated trousers), and that the Turkish word *poturlu* was used as a contemptuous term for "those Bosnian Slavs who despite having converted to Islam, remained evidently primitive and provincial when seen through Ottoman eyes." In light of the thus defined etymology/-ies of the word, and the evident mixture of Christian and

[163] A *mecmūʿa* that dates to the late 16th/early 17th century, written probably in 1595, contains an anecdote referring to the supposed superficial conversion of Bosnians and gives a detailed explanation of derivation of the word "*potur*" (*po*-from *pola* (half), and *–tur*, from the Slavic word *Turčin* (Turk)): "*po- demek Naṣārā dilince yārım demekdur yaʿnī niṣf-i Turçin lafẓından müraḫḫamdur ki Turçin demek Naṣārā dilince Müslimān demekdur*" (Copy of MS 4811/II, whose original from the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo burned in 1992). I thank my adviser Tijana Krstić for bringing this text to my attention and to Mr. Andras Riedlmayer for making the whole manuscript available to us.

[164] "The *devshirme* levy normally was not applied to children in Istanbul or the other major cities of the empire. Nor were children of rural craftsmen recruited because of the fear that this would harm industry and trade….. The only Muslims regularly included were those of Bosnia. Most of them had converted to Islam after the Ottoman conquest and had particularly requested inclusion of themselves and their descendants in the *devshirme* as part of their arrangement with Mehmet II. These were grouped together under the name *potor* and sent directly to the palace service rather than to the military," Stanford Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey. Volume I: Empire of the Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1976), 114.

[165] "*Köye selo, köylüye didi potur*." Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 12.

Islamic practices in "Bosnian religion,"[166] Malcolm quotes some of the references found in Catholic writers' reports to the Habsburg court, saying that borderland *potur*s would be easily converted to Christianity if liberated from the Turks, for they remained "Christians at heart" (1599). Another Catholic report from 1620 puts emphasis on language, saying that few of "the Turks who work on the land" can speak Turkish, and if they were not afraid of punishment they would all convert to Christianity. Yet, the intended effect is the same in both reports: a call for the liberation of Bosnia from the Turks. Jumping to 1668, Malcolm brings forth "the most puzzling" of all reports on *potur*s, namely that provided by Paul Rycaut who defines *poturs* as a sect, commenting on their linguistic and religious habits.[167] Malcolm however, discards this report as misleading, but his main conclusion goes back to the beginning of his discussion, namely the Bogomil background of Bosnian Muslims. The conclusion is that Rycaut's account has nothing to do with Bogomilism, and that *potur*s were simply, as Malcolm vaguely puts it, "the ordinary Slav Muslims of Bosnia"[168]

As I previously said, it is my contention that this identificatory label had various meaning in different periods of time and that it should not be dismissed simply as a "denigrating" term and a sign of some sort of cultural backwardness. In my opinion, the *potur*s will remain a puzzle as long as they are observed from strictly Bosnian perspective

[166] See also, Muhamed Hadžijahić, "Sinkretistički elementi u islamu u Bosni i Hercegovini" [Syncretic Elements in Islam in Bosnia and Herzegovina], *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 28-29 (Sarajevo, 1980): 301-329; Olga Zirojević, "Alahovi hrišćani" [Allah's Christians], *Republika* 14 (2002): 282-283.

[167] "But those of this Sect (i.e. Kadizadelis) who strangely mix Christianity and *Mahometanism* together, are many of the Soldiers that live on the confines of *Hungary* and *Bosna*; reading the Gospel in the *Sclavonian* Tongue, with which they are supplied out of *Moravia*, and the neighbouring city of *Ragusa*; besides which, they are curious to learn the Mysteries of the *Alchoran*, and the Law of the *Arabick* Tongue; and not to be accounted rude and illiterate, they affect the Courtly *Persian*. They drink Wine in the month of Fast called the *Ramazan*; but to take off the scandal they (?) Cinamon or other Spices in it and then call it *Hardali*, and passes currant for lawful Liquor. They have a Charity and Affection for Christians, and are ready to protect them from injuries and violences of the *Turks*: they believe yet that *Mahomet* was the Holy Ghost promised by Christ; and that the descending of the Holy Spirit on the day of *Pentecost*, was a Figure and Type of *Mahomet*, interpreting in all places the word (?) to signify the Prophet, in whose Ear the white Dove revealed the Infallible directions to happiness: The *Potures* of *Bosna* are all of this Sect, but pay taxes as Christians do; they abhor Images and the Sign of the Cross; they circumcise, bringing the Authority of Christ example for it, which also the *Copticks*, a Sect of the *Greek* Church imitated; but have now, as I am informed, lately disused that custom," Paul Rycaut, *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1668), 247-248.

[168] N. Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 51-69.

(Bosnia itself being treated now as a separate whole, now as an inseparable, "special" part of the Ottoman empire) and without enough sensitivity for diachronic and cultural dimensions of Islamization in Bosnia.[169] For example, if *potur*s were mentioned in imperial decrees and laws throughout the sixteenth century, this would mean that *potur* was a legal category that was granted certain privileges that were maintained or abolished during the course of time. This is particularly important in the period of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century that witnessed an increased consciousness about religious orthodoxy and orthopraxy,[170] as well as from the aspect of Bosnia's dynamics vis-à-vis the imperial center, (literary) patronage networks, and cultural atmosphere in general.

I would even push the argument further and speculate that at least some semantic components of the word *potur* and some features of people designated by this label (that originates from the end of fifteenth century) were, in the mid-seventeenth century attributed to groups of "Bosnian Ottomans" other than culturally and religiously "backward" Bosnian Muslim peasants, namely those people that were members of the highest echelons of Ottoman government but maintained some kind of relations, whether economic or political, with the region they originated from. Evliyā Çelebī, for example, mentions a certain Potur Hüseyin Paşa.[171] The word *potur* also appears in his description of Varvar Ali Paşa "incident" in the

[169] In his discussion of the complex issue of contents of Ottoman identity labels, Cemal Kafadar groups *potur*s with *iğdiş*, *turkopouloi*, *çitak, torbeş*, *gacal*, *manav* etc., with the comment that it is "hardly possible to follow the bewildering array of words that appear and disappear to designate minute differences of faith, ethnicity, language, locality and the like," see Kafadar, "A Rome of One's Own,"13. Kafadar's comment also reminds of the fact that the word *potur*, at least in the seventeenth century, was used in different parts of Ottoman Empire, including Serbia, Hungary, and Bosnia. Evliya Çelebi's *Seyahatname* can serve as a written evidence for this. He mentions this label in various, regional contexts on several occasions (the forms being: *Potur*, *Poturca* /language/, *Bosnak Poturları*, *Bosnak ve Potur*). Curiously enough, Evliya is not, to my best knowledge, mentioned as a source in discussions about Bosnian *potur*s. Another question that can be asked is to what extent these labels can be taken as religious and to what extent they are just cultural, and how these two aspects overlap in the context of changing socio-political conditions in the Ottoman empire. The intensification of the process of "*taife*-ization" of the Ottoman society in the seventeenth century in particular has already been pointed out and mentioned here, as well as an increased consciousness about religious orthodoxy and orthopraxy in the period of the late sixteenth and early seventeen centuries.

[170] Marc Baer, *Honored by the Glory of Islam*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); T. Krstić, "*Contested Conversions to Islam.*"

[171] In the company of other *mīrimīrānlar*, in the year 966 (1558/1559), namely "*Kapudan Alī Paşa ve Sofu Alī Paşa ve Potur Hüseyin Paşa ve Mahmūd Paşa ve Mehemmed Paşa ibn Lala Mustafā Paşa ve Abdurrahmān*

mid seventeenth century.[172] This than leads to a possible question of whether the so called *cins* solidarity or, alternatively, *cins*-based conflicts in the seventeenth-century Ottoman empire were structured not just along the lines of origin or common language, but also along the lines of perceptions of religious orthodoxy displayed by members of different factions in the court.

Ottoman identity issues were not discussed solely within the confines of its borders. Uskūfī's immediate contemporary, Juraj Križanić (born in 1618/19, perished in 1683, in the army of Jan Sobieski, during the Turkish siege of Vienna) travelled extensively and visited the old Rome of the Popes, the "New Rome of Constantinople," and the so-called Third Rome of Moscow. A lively debate about the ideas of this Catholic missionary sometimes held to be one of the earliest proponents of Pan-Slavism shows how hectic missionary activities intertwined with political and language ideology that is in this case particularly pronounced. [173] Križanić's thought was very much influenced by his thinking about the Ottoman empire of the time, or more precisely about the "Turks," who belonged in his treatise to the similar category like "Germans." In his ethnically-minded treatise on government, written around the middle of seventeenth century, in a chapter discussing the ways "people of other ethnicity can harm the *nation,*"[174] Križanić dedicates a paragraph to Christian renegades whom, as he says, "we call *poturice*," and who had been accepted by the Turks in the old times (and many of them still are) and granted the highest honors and estates; the janissaries, he continues, were drafting exclusively Christian children as recruits. All this, Križanić concludes, ultimately led to the contemporary situation in which the Turks themselves are ashamed of their own name,

Paşa ve Dāvūd Paşa ve Rūs Hasan Paşa ve Murād Paşa ve Hādım Cafer Paşa ve Dervīş Alī Paşa ve Arab Ahmed Paşa ve Mustafā Paşa," İ. Sezgin, et al., *Evliyā Çelebi Seyahatnāmesi*, vol 1, 96.

[172] "...Varvar'ın mektûbun okuyup âteş-pâre olup 'Görürsün melûn ahmak potur' deyüp İpşir Paşa'nın Varvar'a gönderdiği mektûbu kırâ'at edüp güle güle tamâm olup mektûbu hakîre atup 'Nazar eyle' dedi," İ. Sezgin, et al., "*Evliyā Çelebi Seyahatnāmesi*," vol 2, 226.

[173] Ivan Golub and Wendy Bracewell, "The Slavic Idea of Juraj Križanić," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. Theme: *Concepts of Nationhood in Early Modern Eastern Europe* 10, no. 3/4, (1986): 438-491.

[174] "Коими начинми инородники бывают народом шетны," 44, in *Russkoe gosudarstvo v polovinie XVII vieka, Published in* 1859, in Moscow http://archive.org/details/russkoegosudarst12kriz.

and if addressed by the use of that name, they would feel insulted as if someone identified them with a rudest peasant.[175]

Finally, coming back to Uskūfī himself and his work, in light of the above discussion, I would like to emphasize the fact that, according to his work, Uskūfī himself considered the word *potur* as the equivalent of peasant, which is a choice conditioned either by his own special understanding of the word, which is difficult to imagine, or by choosing one of the possible meanings or connotations of the word current during his life. A certain, albeit vague, indication of how Uskūfī identified himself can be discerned from the analysis of the poetic part of his work that will be discussed in Chapter IV.

[175] *Russkoe gosudarstvo v polovinie XVII vieka*, 47.

CHAPTER IV:
THE CHOICE OF GENRE AND LANGUAGE AS VEHICLES FOR USKŪFĪ'S POETIC MESSAGE

A. Poetic Works of Mehmed Hevā'ī Uskūfī

Several extant poems attributed to Mehmed Hevā'ī Uskūfī have been published in various scholarly works and articles, the primary subject of which was *aljamiado* literature in general. In these works, mainly written by Bosnian scholars, Uskūfī takes place as one of the first and most prolific of *aljamiado* authors. Just like in case of the dictionary, no autograph of Uskūfī's poems is preserved. Apparently, he did not pen a *divan* like his (somewhat younger) contemporary Ḥasan Ḳāimī (d.1691), a Sufi poet who isanother seventeenth-century *aljamiado*author known by name. Copies of Uskūfī 's poems were found in various *mecmūʿa*s, all of which are now lost. None of the editions in which the transcriptions of his poems were published was critical and none containedfacsimiles of the manuscripts in which the poems were found. To make the matter even more complicated, the versions of the published poems vary due to a number of reasons.[176]

Uskūfī's poems were first published in 1912 in the so-called Kemura-Ćorović anthology of Bosnian *aljamiado* poems from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries.[177] This edition contains five poems retrieved from codices then were kept in the Institute for Balkan Studies.[178] The poems are transcribed in Latin script next to a version printed in Arabic script but without an explanation about whether this version matches the original.[179]

[176] The most obvious difficulty scholars faced while reading these poems from manuscripts stems from the fact that Arabic script was applied to Slavic language in a non-standardized way. Second, much of the confusion comes from mistakes made by the copyists, and finally from the lack of attention or expertise on the side of the scholars themselves.

[177] Seifuddin Kemura and Vladimir Ćorović, *Serbokroatische Dichtüngen Bosnischer Moslims aus dem XVII, XVIII und XIX Jahrhundert* (Sarajevo, 1912).

[178] Better known as "Institut für Balkan-forschung." This institute worked from 1904 till 1918. The manuscripts from this Institute were later moved to the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo.

[179] This is the problem with all uncritical editions, because editors sometimes "fix" the original to adjust the meaning to their reading or to "correct the mistakes."

The title provided above the three poems designated as *ilāhī*s reads: *Ilāhī bi-Zebān-i Ṣırb* (*Ilāhīin Serbian Language*). In later publications these poems are distinguished by providing the first line of each of them, the first poem being *Molimo se tebi Bože* (*To You Lord We Pray*), the second *Bože jedini, ti nas ne kinji* (*Our Only God, Do not Torment Us*), and the third *Višnjem bogu koji sve sazda* (*To the Holy Lord Who Created Everything*). Text of the first poem contains the pen name Hūvo/Hevo, which is a variant of Hevāʾī that appears in the other two poems.[180] The fourth poem is titled *Beray-i Daʿvet-i Imān bi-zebān-i Ṣırb* rendered into Slavic as *Poziv na vjeru na srpskom jeziku* (*Call to Faith in Serbian Language*). The fifth poem attributed to Hevāʾī Uskūfī by Kemura and Ćorovićis titled *Savjet ženama* (*Advice to Women*).

Scarce but precious information about the type of manuscripts in which the poems were found can be recovered from Alija Nametak's work from 1968 in which he deals with Uskūfī's dictionary, several other dictionaries and lists containing Slavic words and, finally,Uskūfī's poems.[181] There one can read that Nametak himself used a manuscript from the Institute for Balkan Studies, numbered 1527. That was a *mecmūʿa* containing three different parts: 1) a work titled *Aḥsen'ul hadīs*, printed in Istanbul towards the end of the nineteenth century 2) a 1720 copy of *Luġat-i Ferişteoğlu*, and 3) undated "collected works" of Mehmed Hevāʾī Uskūfī in Turkish and "Bosnian" languages, without the poem *Savjet ženama*. Nametak held that the last part of the *mecmūʿa* was copied somewhat later than mid-seventeenth century, in spite of the fact that the analysis of the paper showed it originated from around mid-seventeenth century. Nametak based this argument on the factthat in his dictionary Uskūfī called his language Bosnian, sohe surmised that the titles mentioning Serbian language were added later by the copyists. Furthermore, he informs that Kemura and

[180] The first variant appears in Kemura-Ćorović, while the second is found in A. Kasumović; et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*. Both of these variants are Slavicised and have a diminutive overtone.
[181] Alija Nametak,"Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici, " 231-380.

Ćorović used another *mecmūʿa* from the Institute, and that it was there that they found the poem they designated as *Savjet ženama*. Nametak describes this codex (then numbered 1718, and dated 1757-8) as the largest collection of prose and poetry written in "Croatian-Serbian" language.[182] The overriding theme in the codex was morality, and the last mentioned poem was followed by a note of the copyist, certain Mustafa Kazaz, who claimed that he had copied the poem from Hevāʾī Uskūfī's notebook.[183]

Describing Hevāʾī's output, Nametak says that most of the poems he wrote were in Turkish, with several verses in Arabic and Persian.[184] Focused on the *aljamiado* aspect of Uskūfī's work, none of the scholars dealing with the subject described this part of his output in more detail, nor did they, to the best of my knowledge, publish the Turkish texts. This is why it is impossible at this point to make any judgment about Uskūfī's linguistic skills in Turkish, except based on his *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif*, or establish a relationship between his poems in Turkish and those in Slavic. Nametak, however, provides the translation of a poem written in Turkish, *Kasidei beray daveti iman*[185] (*"Kaside" [composed] as a call to faith*), to Croatian-Serbian, commenting that "this poem exists in our language as well but was titled by an unknown copyist as *Beray daveti iman bezbani srb.*"[186] It, appears, however, that these two poems, one in Turkish and one in Slavic, are indeed similar when it comes to the main theme, call to faith, but are different in terms of contents, motifs and target audience. Besides that, the Slavic rendition of *Call to Faith (Poziv na vjeru)* contains nine stanzas more than the Turkish version.

[182] Nametak does not specify in what script this codex was written, so one can only guess it was in Arabic script.
[183] Alija Nametak,"Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici, " 231-234.
[184] Some of the topics Hevāʾī Uskūfī addressed were, according to Nametak, "persecution, the greed that is the root of evil, the venality of the Turkish officialdom, (various) meals, etc.," but he does not substantiate this with any examples, Ibid.
[185] This transliteration is Nametak's.
[186] Alija Nametak,"Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici, " 234.

As far as Hevāʾī Uskūfī's work known under the title *Tabṣıret'ul-ʿĀrifīn*[187] is concerned, Nametak does not make any special comment about it. However, it can be concluded that this work was a part of the *mecmūʿa* used by Kemura and Ćorović (number 1718), since Nametak quotes biographical details about Uskūfī based on the information he separately gathered about this particular *mecmūʿa*. Besides that, Kemura and Ćorović provide in their book one facsimile page from the manuscript they used, with a note that the page contains the end of the *Tabṣıret'ul-ʿĀrifīn* and the beginning of the part titled *Ilāhī bi-Zebān-i Ṣırb*. It can be seen from the facsimile that "the end of the *Tabṣıret'ul-ʿĀrifīn"* is actually the Turkish version of *Call to Faith*.

It is exactly in *Tabṣıret'ul-ʿĀrifīn* that Uskūfī provides scarce biographical details related to his place of birth and family background. This is commonly-repeated information in secondary literature but the most detailed note about this work can be found in Mehmed Handžić's bookfrom 1933. There he remarks that this is the work where Hevāʾī Uskūfī speaks about himself as a son of a beg who is (in spite of that) willing to befriend all sincere people, and that he was left without parents at the early age and thus had to make his own way by seeking knowledge in Istanbul. Besides that, Handžić provides a copy of a note on *Tabṣıret'ul-ʿĀrifīn* made by Muhamed Enveri Kadić, a Bosnian chronicler (1855-1931). Kadić's note written in Ottoman Turkish states that this is a treatise (*risāle*) in verse on*tasṣavvuf* (*taṣavvufa dāʾir*), part of which was written in Turkish, part in Bosnian (*Türkçe ve Bosna Lisānınca*), during the reign of sultan Murat IV. Handžić himself remarks, based on this note, that this work, just like *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif*,was shown/presented to Sultan Murat IV (1623-40), but this is not something that can be concluded from Kadić's note, at least not

[187] *Tabṣıret (Ar.)* means "a making clearly seen and understood, demonstration; warning," but it is also used in titles of literary works dealing with various topics like *kelām* (theology), *usūl* (principles of the faith), *taṣavvuf*, astronomy *etc.* Therefore, the title could be rendered as *What Has Been Made Clear by the Learned Ones.*

from the part that Handžićquotes.[188] Regardless of whether it was dedicated to Sultan Murat IV or not, what is important is that the poem seems to have been written during his reign, which would mean that the Slavic version of Uskūfī's *Call to Faith*, dated to 1651 based on the *tarih* (date) provided by the poet himself, was composed much later than the Turkish one. The latter was probably part of the *Tabṣıret'ul-ʿĀrifīn* and should be read against the scarce but indicative information about this work. The question is, then, which Slavic verses *Tabṣıret'ul-ʿĀrifīn* contained.

A summary of scholarly works on Uskūfī and the texts of all Uskūfī's poems, even those the authorship of which has been disputed, were published in Latin script, in a monograph from 1990.[189] This edition as well is not critical. In addition to the above-mentioned ones, the authors of the monograph include several other works commonly attributed to Hevāʾī Uskūfī:the poem titled *Moje srce* (*My heart*), another one titled *Bosanski da vam besedim, bratani* (*Brothers, let me address you in Bosnian*), and a prose piece titled *Molitva* (*The Prayer*). As for the poem *Savjet ženama (Advice to Women*), it is noted in the monograph that it had sometimes been attributed to an Imam Edhem from Zenica, but that there it was treated as Hevāʾī Uskūfī's poem, following the opinion of a significant number of researchers dealing with *aljamiado* literature.[190] In this poem there is no mention of the pen name, Hevāʾī, which was the case in all poems attributed to Hevāʾī Uskūfī.[191] An alternative Turkish title of the poem *Moje srce* (*My heart*) is "*Türki Aşik*,"[192] which is probably the title

[188] Mehmed Handžić, *Književni rad bosansko-hercegovačkih Muslimana* [The Literary production of Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims] (1933), 84-86 (An offprint published in *Glasnik Islamske Vjerske Zajednice* 1 (1933), 1-12; 2 (1934): 1-6 as "Rad bosansko-hercegovačkih Muslimana na književnom polju").

[189] A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*. This monograph deals with the complete output of Mehmed Hevāī Uskūfī and relies on all scholarly works on this topic published before 1990. All secondary literature published after this date deals with Uskūfī 's dictionary.

[190] A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*, 55.

[191] The authors do not provide the manuscript number, nor do they comment on it in detail. They just note that in the manuscript from which the poem was taken for this particular edition the refrain of the poem was not rewritten but the repetition was marked by the Arabic word *aydan*, meaning "the same." This information is more a hint at the attitude of the copyist than it is telling about the "original author."

[192] It is not clear what is meant by this title. *Turkī* transliterated like this can mean Turkish (language) or a single Turk, but in that case it is not clear what would be the exact semantic relation of this adjective/noun to the noun

assigned to it by a Muhammad son of Ismail who copied it in 1733 together with a collection of hadiths. The speculation on Hevā'ī Uskūfī's authorship of the poem is based on the fact that it contains a line from Uskūfī's dictionary, half of it written in Turkish and half of it written in Bosnian.[193] *Bosanski da vam besedim, bratani* (*Brothers, let me address you in Bosnian*) is another poem that does not contain Hevā'ī Uskūfī'spen name, but is being attributed to him due to the overall tone, motifs and some expressions that are shared with other poems. The same goes for the prose piece titled *Molitva* (*The Prayer*) that was apparently found in a *mecmū'a*where it is copied after the *Call to Faith*.[194]

All in all, the arguments in support of attribution of these four poems to Hevā'ī Uskūfī are very weak and unclear. Unfortunately, it is now probably impossible for anyone to go back to the original manuscripts and conduct a proper critical analysis of these texts. In what follows, I will therefore attempt to make a general comment on common genre characteristics, contents and choice of language of these poems, focusing on those works attributed toUskūfī with considerable degree of certainty while treating others as related instances of *aljamiado* literacy.

B. Decoding the Message of Uskūfī's Poems I: The Significance of the *Ilāhī* Genre

Ilāhī is a type of devotional poem, composed in praise of God. In Ottoman context, these "world-rejecting poems" were written by the sheikh-poets to be sung and listened to at

'āşık that can mean a) lover; in love b) enraptured, enraptured saint, dervish. It is more probable that the first part was actually *türkü*, meaning a (folk) poem, in a Persian izafet with the noun *'āşık*, in which case the title would mean "the poem of/by the enraptured one."

[193] "*Ah efendum sana benzur, nije niko kao ti*. " A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*, 67.

[194] In all three compositions, *Bosanski da vam besedim*, *bratani*; *Call to Faith* and *Molitva*, there is a characteristic employment of the words *pamet* (Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian: intelligence, brains, cleverness) and *zamet* (Tr.) for the sake of the rhyme. *Zamet* (*zāmāt* in Ćorović-Kemura; *zāmet* in Kasumović's fototype) is a modified version of Turkish *zaḥmet* (trouble, difficulty, distress). In *Poziv na vjeru*: "Kogod ima čistu pamet/ on ne misli činit zamet/ nevirniku noge sapet/ hodte nami vi na viru;" In *Bosanski da vam besedim*: "Valja sabrati um i pamet/ne valja činiti rug i zamet," see A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*, 68; In *Molitva*: "Ti medju nami opačine ispravi/ da ne čine zamet, da uzmu viru i pamet, amin," Ibid.,70. This, and several other similar examples can serve aa an argument in support of the attrubution of these poems to the same author.

the *ẕikr*[195] ceremonies. Formally, the *ilāhī* is not considered a distinct poetic genre but rather a sub-genre within other formal contexts, since it was not defined by fixed principles of composition. A particular combination of themes, style and vocabulary, however, served as a criterion for treating *ilāhī* as a distinct poetic form. The *ilāhī* verse is socially embedded in, first of all, Sufi lodges and Sufi milieu. According to Walter Feldman, *ilāhī* should be distinguished from earlier forms of Sufi poetry since its development was tightly connected with the process of "consolidation of several Sunni *tarikats* in Anatolia and the Balkans between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries."[196] This process involved the evolution of the concept of the sheikh (*mürşid*), parallel elaboration of the *ẕikr* liturgy and consequent "formalization of the poetic expression of the sheikh."[197] *Ilāhī*s were/have been sung with music at Sufi rituals as well as less formal Sufi gatherings. Besides their formalized ritual function, various versions of these mystical poems, just like other forms of poetry and literature produced in Sufi environment, served the purpose of explanation and interpretation of the Sufi religious and ethic ideals, and thus had a didactic purpose, as well.[198]

In secondary literature *ilāhī* is recognized as one of the main genres of *aljamiado* literature of Bosnia. Except for *aljamiado ilāhī*s composed by anonymous authors, there are many examples where the authors are known, and Uskūfī is commonly treated as one of them, and furthermore, as the first one. The three poems attributed to Uskūfī with certainty are commonly designated as *ilāhī*s. Two of these poems are conceived as a collective address to God. *Molimo se tebi Bože* consists of five stanzas, each containing four octosyllabic

[195] *Ẕikr* means "a mentioning, mention," in this context mentioning the name(s) of God as a part of formulas accompanying the dervish ceremonies in praise of God.
[196] Walter Feldman, "Mysticism, Didacticism and Authority in the Liturgical Poetry of the Halveti Dervishes of Istanbul," *Edebiyat*, n.s 2, no. 1 (1993): 243-65.
[197] Ibid. Also on the question of Sunni *tarikat*s see D. Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the age of State building and confessionalization, 1300-1600."
[198] Walter Feldman, "The Celestial Sphere, the Wheel of Fortune, and Fate in the Gazels of Naili and Baki,"*International Journal of Middle East Studies* 282/2 (1996):193-215; Džemal Ćehajić, "Društveno-politički, religiozni i drugi aspekti derviških redova u jugoslavenskim zemljama" [Social, Political, Religious, Literary and other aspects of the dervish orders in Yugoslav Lands], *Prilozi za Orijentalnu filologiju* 34 (1985): 93-113.

verses. It invokes God's mercy on men, on those who are looking for an "image" for themselves, andit asks for a sign of that mercy.[199] *Bože jedini, ti nas ne kinji*, with seven stanzas each containing four decasyllabic verses, is a collective address to God the Creator who is invited to take care of the faithful who are addressing him.[200] These two poems could be said to have a prayer-like tone emphasizing pious fervor and human weakness. The third poem, *Višnjem bogu koji sve sazda*, is conceived as an individual reflectionof a believer preoccupied with the right path that leads to God that had created everything.[201]

Although the traces of mystic sensibility can be noticed, these three poems are not replete with Sufi terminology and do not contain complicated figures of speech. They also contain echoes of the "style and tone of the Christian prayer."[202] The last point is without doubt true of the prose piece *Molitva*.[203] The meter of the poems can be, tentatively speaking, characterized as that of a "popular kind."[204] The language of Uskūfī's religious poems is almost completely free of Turkish words.[205]

[199] The first stanza of the poem reads "*Molimo se tebi, Bože/ Ukaži, smili se nami/ Lik ištemo sebi, Bože/ Ukaži, smili se nami*. The last verse is the fourth verse in every stanza and it has the function of refrain. A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*, 52.

[200] Refrain: "*Sazdade ti nas, ti paz uvik nas!*," ibid., 52.

[201] Refrain:"*Višnjem bogu koji sve sazda/Kako ću poći, kako li doći?*," ibid, 53.

[202] The motif of the path can be seen, and the meeting with/separation from *one* God can be seen as Sufi elements of the poem, but there is no allegory typical for mystic poetry, see Muhsin Rizvić, *Književne studije* [Literary Studies] (Sarajevo: Preporod, 2005), 221.

[203]"*Bože jedini, ti nas grešno roblje oprosti, i vrli žitak, i na jedin navod i bili raj, i tvoje lipo milostivo lice. I svaki čas što je tvoja zapovida držimo. Ukaži da ne hodi među nami opačina, ni laž, ni nevira. Ti nas sačuvaj od omraze, i od muke, i od crna pakla, i od zla svakog čina, i neprilike, i osvim tebe drugoga robstva. I što se do sada po neviri robilo i od roda i od plemena po nemilosti vodilo, ti mir i prost učini svaku. Kano si od jednog kolina stvorio, onako na bratstvo utviruj, ne po viri od istoka i zapada sa svije strana svojoj milosti i rodu i prijateljem po putu sastav. Bože milostivi, tebi se molimo, teb se klanjamo, ti među nami opačine ispravi, da ne čine zamet, da uzmu viru i pamet, amin*," A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*, 69.

[204] The kind that can be found in Turkish poems called *türkü*, and in predominantly lyric poems typical of local oral literary production that all existed parallel to each other in Ottoman Bosnia and the surrounding, Slavic-speaking regions and that were recorded only in the nineteenth century. This is interesting in light of Boeschoten's suggestion related to a possibility of Uskūfī's intention to introduce the use of '*arūż* in Slavic poetic composition. Boeschoten does not deal with Uskūfī's poems and bases the suggestion on the dictionary. He also suggestes that, even if it existed at all, this idea had never been realised in *aljamiado* style poetic production in Bosnia and suggests a further research in that direction. The use of '*arūż*, therefore, in Uskūfī's case remained limited to his dictionary. See H. Boeschoten, "Bosnische Metrik."

[205] On Turkish word appears in the second poem*:* "*Za tobom ovdi* kan *otrovani*," one in the third: "*Da se ne nađeš sa zlom u* karu."

Therefore, designation of Uskūfī's poems as *ilāhī*s is informed by a very flexible understanding of this poetic form, which is probably conditioned by an awareness of the scholars of the particular development and function this genre has had among Muslims of Bosnia.[206] The question of language is central, however, if one would ask how much the development of the *ilāhī* genre in general differed in Bosnia in comparison to other regions of the Ottoman empire. In relation to Uskūfī's poems and the overall discussion, it is important to note that, based on what is known with certainty, the chronologically closest specimen of the "genre" of *aljamiado ilāhī* was composed by an anonymous author and found in a source dated around 1766.[207] The first *aljamiado* poet known by name who lived at the same time and after Uskūfī was Ḥasan Ḳāimī (born between 1625 and 1635-d.1691/92), and he did not compose *ilāhī*s in Slavic.[208] The two poets singled out in the secondary literature as the most prominent authors of *aljamiado* poems of the *ilāhī* type lived more than a hundred years later. The first was ʿAbdulvehab Ilhāmī (ca. 1773-1821)[209] and the second his close contemporary

[206] *Ilāhī*s have not lost their popularity among Bosnian Muslims to our day but, in this context, *ilāhī* is a very broad term the core meaning of which is simply a "religious poem." Particular specimens of these poems can have various (sub) functions depending on the context in which they are sang or recited. Some forms of *ilāhī* perform the function of a lullaby. The differentiation should be made between those that are limited to the closed Sufi environment, on one end, and the so called *narodne ilahije* (popular) whose authors are usually anonymous. Today, *ilāhī*s are sang on the occasion of regular *zikr*s in *dervish* lodges, but also on the occasion of celebrating Mevlid, or on ceremonies related to Islamic holy (mübarek) nights. *Ilāhīs* circulating in Bosnia were composed in Arabic, Turkish and Slavic languages or, most commonly, by mixing the three. The understanding was not always a precondition. What mattered among the other was the strenghth of the word, i.e., the belief in its mystical/magic power. The last point is particularly related to *ilāhīs* in Arabic and Turkish. See Jasmina Talam, "Ilahije i Salavati derviša nakšibendijskog reda u Vukeljićima kod Fojnice" [*Ilāhī*s and *Ṣalavāt*s of the Dervishes of the Naqshibandi Order in Vukeljici near Fojnica], *Muzika* 2, no. 22 (2003): 43-58; Maja Baralić-Materne, "Narodne ilahije: ilahije uspavanke" [Popular *Ilāhī*s, *Ilāhī*s Sang as Lullabies], *Muzika* 1, no. 21 (2003): 9-15.

[207] The title of this *ilāhī* is *Ovi svit cvit*, Abdurahman Nametak, *Hrestomatija*, 86. The poem wass found in the *mecmūʿa* recorded in Turkish and containing a popular religious work *Kırk Sual*, and a second text that also deal with spiritual topics. The *mecmūʿa* is dated 1756-66. In his comment, Nametak provides an interesting detail, namely that the Turkish text contains vowel marks, while Slavic does not: this would mean that the copyist expected the reader to recognize the Slavic text without the diacritics. The poem is in Slavic language, dispersed with Turkish words, and a refrain in Arabic, repeating after each line (lā illāhe illallāh). This poem is what can be call "typical" *ilāhī*, for the period after Uskūfī.

[208] See Jasna Šamić, "Ḳāi'mī," *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, Second Edition. Supplement (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 506-507; and J. Šamić, *Dîvan de Ḳaimî*.

[209] M. Huković, *Alhamijado književnost*, 117-127.

ʿAbdurrahmān Sirrī (1785-1847).[210] Besides the *aljamiado ilāhī*s, these two influential sheikhs composed *ilāhī*s in Ottoman Turkish in the social, religious and literary setting similar to that described at the very beginning of this discussion.[211] Indicative is the fact, however, that these later *ilāhī*s composed in Slavic had a strongly pronounced didactic and moralizing function whereby the intended audience belonged to the broader circle of Sufi adherents and believers. In terms of language, "they were interspersed with words and expressions borrowed from Arabic, Turkish and Persian, the meaning of which is explained in Bosnian."[212]

The issue of intended audience and function in case of these later *aljamiado ilāhī*s is therefore somewhat easier to discern than in the case of Uskūfī's poems that stand alone and isolated in time when it comes to known authorship. It should also be noted that *ilāhī*s composed by "non-Bosnian" Sufis were popular parallel to the "indigenous" ones, and that all of these poems were widely copied together in the same *mecmūʿa*s.[213]

What can, then, be concluded about Uskūfī's poems imbued with religious message but in many ways different from later examples of this genre? Just like in case of his dictionary, his intended audience were either literate Muslims who knew how to read Arabic script, or those who would care to learn the poems by oral transmission. There is not much indication that Uskūfī's *ilāhī*s were copied frequently. It seems that they were copied much less frequently than other *aljamiado ilāhī*s composed by both anonymous and known authors that, linguistically speaking contained more Turkish words related to religious concepts. If that is true, it would stand in sharp opposition to the popularity of his *Maḳbūl-i ʿĀrif*. The

[210] Alexandre Popović, "'Abd al-Raḥmān Sirrī," *Encyclopaedia of Islam.* Third Edition, vol. 2 (Leiden:Brill, 2009): 10-11; Hamid Algar, "Some Notes on the Naqshbandī Tarīqat in Bosnīa," *Studies in Comparative Religion* 9, no. 2 (1975): 2-26.
[211] These poems were retrieved from the collections of manuscripts from Sufi lodges.
[212] Popović briefly describes Sirrī 's *ilāhī*s: "he drew attention to the commandments and prohibitions codified in the Quran and the Sharia, while insisting on the models and virtues of religious life," Ibid., 11.

answers to some of these questions are certainly related to the question of various (sub)networks within the literary production in Arabic script in Ottoman Bosnia, as well as the change in the social, political and religious circumstances during Uskūfī's life and afterwards, when his works were copied.

The motifs in Uskūfī's *ilāhī*s in Slavic are centered around the subject of piety, but not in an imperative tone characteristic of later Slavic examples of this genre that often contain direct instructions of what should and should not be done. Two of them betray a strong sense of community sharing the same challenges and temptations and united in the collective prayer to one God, the Creator; one is concerned with an individual path to salvation. These poems can also be seen as a peculiar expression of a particular amalgam of beliefs characteristic of, for example, *poturs*, discussed in the previous chapter.[214] From what is said until now, it can be concluded that Uskūfī indeed had some sort of affiliation with a Sufi order, although it is not entirely clear which one.[215] The comparison of his Slavic poems with the Turkish ones, namely those that were dedicated to Sultan Murat IV, if it were possible, would indeed shed additional light on Uskūfī's poetic work.

Therefore, it seems that there are at least several indications that Uskūfī's poems might be written with some sort of a social program in mind, a program that is more subtle in comparison to come of the contemporary examples of *aljamiado* literature that bear a decidedly moralizing or didactic tone.[216] The fact that Uskūfī had chosen the genre of *ilāhī*

[213] One such example are the *ilāhī*s of Niyāzī-i Mısrī. On Niyāzī Mısrī, see Derin Terzioğlu, "Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi Self-Narratives and the Diary of *Niyāzī-i Mısrī* (1618-94)," *Studia Islamica* 94 (2002): 139-165.

[214] This evokes another "possibility," namely, that of the Christian origin of Uskūfī's family. The last point has only been suggested in secondary literature, probably, again, based on the nature of his poems, but what would matter more is to know how many generations Uskūfī was removed from his convert ancestors. See Aziz Kadribegović, "Neke opaske o nasem aljamiado pjesništvu" [Some Remarks on our *Aljamiado* Poetry], *Anali Gazi-Husrev Begove Biblioteke* 4 (1976), 150.

[215] Helveti mentioned in dictionary. Kasumović, Mønnesland, eds., *Bosansko-Turski Rječnik*, 75.

[216] *Savjet ženama* atributted to Uskūfī is usually taken as an example of a didactic poem. Another *aljamiado* genre is that of petition (*arzuhal*) that also has a moralizing character but in a sense of address to "corrupt" officials. Earliest examples of this "genre" are two fragments attributed without much certainty to Haci Yusuf son of Muhammed, from Livno. Haci Yusuf is taken to have composed two such petitions (1618/19 and 1621)

for poems that are stylistically and linguistically different from typical Sufi *ilāhīs* might signal his intention of using the "authority" of the Ottoman genre to boost the effect of his message that was expressed in "pure" Slavic, devoid of typically Sufi metaphors, and not pronouncedly Sufi in its sensibility. Writing them down in Arabic script and giving them place next to the poems [217] that are, in terms of both style and genre, more typical of Ottoman/Sufi literary tradition can be seen as argument complementary to this. Moreover, the fact that Uskūfī chose to compose poems centered on piety in Slavic language can hardly be seen as, solely, a matter of artistic preference, in light of the more-than-evident contemporary concerns about the linguistic issues related to communicating the creed and postulates of the (true) faith, as well as the overall religious and political atmosphere.

An example that illustrates the existence of concerns of this kind in Ottoman Bosnia is that of ʿAbdullāh Bošnjak (d.1644) born in the vicinity of Livno. To his commentary to *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikām* of Ibn ʿArabī, ʿAbdullāh Bošnjak adds a short appendix (*teẕyīl*) in which he argues that there is a need for writing and transferring of (spiritual) knowledge in a vernacular (*narodni jezik*) and justifies it by the fact that *evliyā* were interpreting the Qur'an in vernaculars (*na narodnim jezicima*). Moreover, he claims, Prophet Muhammad was transferring the words of the previous prophets in his own (Arabic) language and ordered Şeyḫ Ekber to write the *Fuṣūṣ* and present it in a way that is understandable to common people.[218] This example, can further lead to thinking about the question of accessibility of the words of the holy, which is prominently a Christian Protestant idea, and yet also consistent

addressing a judge (*kadi*) in Imotski (Dalmatian Hinterland, today's Croatia), and complaining about *kadi* deputy's evil-doing and his incompetence, with the idea that the behavior of the deputy can hurt the reputation of the judge himself. Abdurahman Nametak, *Hrestomatija*, 13. Haci Yusuf's background is interesting for considering social embeddedness of *aljamiado* literature: he was a *muezzin* who made a collection of *fetva*s, and moreover left a diary written in Turkish (1615) describing his travel to *haj*. H. Šabanović, *Književni rad*, 205.

[217] Like the above mentioned Turkish ḳ*asīde* centered around the motif of a "call to faith."

[218] Fejzulah Hadžibajrić, "Tasvvufsko- tarikatska poema Abdulaha Bošnjaka," [Taṣavvuf Tarīkat poem of ʿAbdullāh Bosniak], *Anali Gazi-Husrev Begove Biblioteke* 2-3 (1974), 21.

with the prefaces to Ottoman *ʿilm-i hāl*[219] literature that is insisting on making the religious rules accessible to common people by writing in Turkish or the language of the people.[220]

At the same time, language issues were subject to serious concern in the Catholic setting neighboring Ottoman Bosnia. The official liturgical language in Bosnian Catholic context was Latin. However, the liturgical status of Slavic languages in the region was changing during the course of time, from eleventh-century Roman Catholic Church interventions against services in Slavic language, until the seventeenth century, when, due to practical reasons and in line with post-Reformation developments in translation of the scriptures, there appeared more sympathy for this practice. During the first period of the Council of Trent (1545-1549) many of the Council fathers had spoken in favor of banning vernacular translations of the Bible. One of the key factors in the Council's decision to allow it (brought in 1546) was "the existence of the Slavo-Latin (Glagolitic) rite in Istria, Carniola and Dalmatia."[221] Bartol Kašić (1575 -1650), a Jesuit, author of a grammar, and translator of the Bible and Roman Rite into Slavic/Croatian dialect, conducted several missions to the Ottoman provinces of Bosnia, Serbia and Eastern Slavonia. His mission mainly targeted the Protestants whom he called *Christian* heretics. Although these people seem to have embraced the Reformation around 1550, this conversion was not so deep-rooted, and they were considered "semi-Catholics" by the Jesuits. These "half-converted" Slavs, in Nenad Moačanin's words, "probably…could not manage to get instruction and books in their native tongue in Protestant centers far north, while German and Hungarian were not understood, which is what Kašić as a missionary was well aware of."[222] Besides hectic activities of the

[219] *ʿIlm-i hāl* is a term used to designate the basic knowledge of Islamic faith, as well as the genre developed to impart it.
[220] T. Krstić, *Contested Conversions*, 26-50; Derin Terzioğlu, "Where *ʿIlm-i Hāl* meets Cathechism: Islamic Manuals of Religious Instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the Age of Confessionalization," *Past & Present* (forthcoming, 2013).
[221] Francis J. Thomson, "When did Bartol Kašić Commence and Complete his Translation of the Bible into Croatian?," *Slovo* 56-57 (2008): 559-570.
[222] Nenad Moačanin, *Town And Country on the Middle Danube, 1526-1690* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 158-180. On His visit to the Middle Danube area around 1620, Kašić expressed positive view of the Ottoman administrative

Jesuits, Bosnian Franciscans were also active both in terms of missionary and literary work.[223]

The fact that Uskūfī's "initiative" comes from "less mainstream" setting with more or less pronounced Sufi coloring becomes more clear against the background of broader Ottoman debates characteristic of the period in which he lived. Uskūfī was part of the Ottoman literacy base that was significantly expanded during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries through the elite patronage of religious and educational institutions. According to Tijana Krstić, the religious, reform-minded initiatives in seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire were more and more coming "from below." The sixteenth century imperial project of "Sunnitization" led by the highest political and scholarly circles of the Ottoman Empire produced significant number of new preachers who wanted their word to be heard in the debates about religious reform and the definition of "orthodoxy" and "orthopraxy."[224] This discussion did not circumvent the question of converts, disapproval of the wide-spread practices like saint worship and alike. Sufis were one of the social groups that had an active role in this debate, as a party directly opposed to "purist" Kadizadeli movement which, in several waves of activity, marked the whole seventeenth century. Kadizadelis "took issue with various practices they perceived as 'innovation,' particularly in the Sufi rituals and beliefs, but also increasingly targeted non-Muslims.[225] One of the most active Sufi tarikats in the debate against Kadizadelis were Halvetis who had their own ideas of proper religious practice and belief, and were active in Ottoman Rumeli, and therefore in Bosnia, as well.[226] As one of the effects of these debates one can point that with, approximately, the beginning

system and was impressed by the friendly approach he experienced in contacts with representatives of the state and other Muslims, Turks and non-Turks alike, Ibid, 173; See also, Nenad Moačanin "The Historical Fate of Croatia and Turco-Croatian Relations in the Past," *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 16, no. 27 (1992): 243-254.

[223] For Croatia, and, partly, Bosnia see John V. A. Fine, *When Ethnicity did not matter in the Balkans* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2006). For Bosnia in particular see I. Lovrenović, *Bosnia*, 128-145.

[224] D. Terzioğlu, "Sufis in the Age of State-building."

[225] T. Krstić, *Contested Conversions*, 14.

of seventeenth century *ʿilm-i ḥāl* literature overflowed local *mekteb*s and *medrese*s, and there are certain indications that *medrese* curriculum was narrowed by ejecting the "inappropriate" sciences.[227] The various Sufi tarikats in Bosnia are relatively well studied, and it is known that members of Sufi orders were very active in literary sense. The earliest, more detailed proof of the ways Kadizadelis in particular were encountered in Bosnia, comes down from the eighteenth century.[228]

The "Uskūfī initiative," targeting his co-religionists should thus be observed against this background, but also having in mind more locally determined social, political, military and linguistic conditions, and, of course, the fact it was informed by his own understanding of "orthodoxy" and "orthopraxy."

C. Decoding the Message of Uskūfī's Poems II: The Language of the Slavic Rendition of Uskūfī's *Call to Faith*

Hevāʾī Uskūfī's poem *Poziv na vjeru* is formulated as a collective epistle, a message addressing people of different faith that speak the same language to join the collective designated in the poem as the "Turks." In secondary literature, this poem attracted enormous attention and received different interpretations, most of the time loaded with anachronism. This poem was, on the one hand interpreted as voicing Uskūfī's (intolerant) invitation to Christians to come to Islam, i.e., to convert to "the true faith," whereby, according to the title attached to it by later copyists and motifs that pass in the text,[229] the Christians in question were identified as Orthodox Serbs. On the other hand, the poem was interpreted by ignoring its religious aspects, as a universal call to tolerance and concordance in times of trouble and turmoil, an expression of a "supranational" sense of "Bosnian" identity that is based on

[226] Madeline C. Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in the Seventeenth-Century Istanbul," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45, no. 4 (1986): 251-269.
[227] Ismet Kasumović, *Školstvo i obrazovanje u bosanskom ejaletu za vrijeme osmanske uprave* [School and Education in the Province of Bosnia during the Ottoman Reign] (Mostar: Islamski kulturni centar, 1999), 17-20.
[228] See, for example, Kerima Filan, "Sufije i Kadizadelije u osmanskom Sarajevu" [Sufis and Kadizadelis in OttomanSarajevo], *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke* 29-30 (2009): 163-186.

common ancestry[230] and that goes beyond the confessional boundaries within Ottoman Bosnia.[231] Indeed, one can find verses in the poem to support each of the interpretations posed in the secondary literature.

The "puzzling" title containing the phrase "in Serbian language" has also been a subject of scholarly attention, since it was taken to be in opposition to Hevāʾī Uskūfī's "consistent labeling of his language" as Bosnian. This title should be seen in light of the practicalities of the copying practice and depended on the copyists' way of labeling various Slavic dialects spoken at the time. In his three-volume work on Bosnian copyists Muhamed Ždralović says that the titles of *aljamiado* texts were commonly written in Turkish, and provides two titles of Ḥasan Ḳāimī's poem on the conquest of Candia that reflect a variety in the use of linguistic labels, as well as in understanding of the genre of a particular piece.[232]

As for the interpretation, I will hereby accept the middle way as an option that has also been proposed but mainly remained beyond the "mainstream" discussion.[233] In his *Poziv na vjeru* Hevāʾī Uskūfī emphasizes that all people were created by one god, the importance of "pure" faith,[234] the foolishness of constant struggles and fights among people[235] that cause nothing but destruction and harm to everyone involved. The recurrent motif is the "common origin" forgotten due to divisions and people's having gone astray.[236] The proposal aimed to alleviate the effects of long suffering (on all sides) is repeated in a refrain calling to (the right,

[229] There is a mention in the poem of St. Sava (Rastko Nemanjić, d. 1236), the first Archbishop of the autocephalous Serbian Church.
[230] The commonly quoted verse in favor of this interpretation is "*Otac jedan, jedna mati/ Prvo bi nam valja znati/Jer ćemo se paski klati/ Hodte nami na viru*," A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*, 65.
[231] This interpretation centers on the supposition of a Bosnian identity that had its continuity from the medieval Bosnian state, and cuts across confessional boundaries. This identity is, depending on a position, characterized as either ethnic or national.
[232] In one title Kāʾimī's poem is described as *Fethname* (poem about conquest) composed within the science of augury (*ʿilm-i cefir*) in Serbian language, in the other as an epistle in Bosnian language "sent" to the Venetian Republic in the year 1078; Muhamed Ždralović, *Prepisivači dela u arabičkim rukopisima, I-II* [Copyists of the works written in Arabic script] (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1988), 214.
[233] A. Kadribegović, "Neke opaske o nasem aljamiado pjesnistvu," 150.
[234] "*Nedajtese hali lučit/ Zaboraviv jedin mučit/ Čistu viru valja učit/ Hodte nami vi na viru*," A. Kasumović, et al., *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*, 65.
[235] "*Boj ne bije koj pametan/ Bude veće prepravetan/ Išta viri on zametan/ Hodte nami vi na viru*," Ibid.
[236] See above, footnote 230.

"our") faith. The "us [Turks]" should not be perceived by the infidels as adversaries[237] but as friends who are making a call to faith with the aim of avoiding conflict, battles, struggles and all kinds of trouble. The (pure) faith is necessary as it shows the "way" and no person can live without knowing the proper way.[238]

Besides the previously mentioned debate on what constitutes Muslim orthodoxy, one of the hallmarks of Uskūfī's times was the Ottoman empire's ongoing military rivalry with the Habsburgs, Safavids and Venetians. As for Ottoman Bosnia, the war against Austrian Habsburgs (1593-1606) fought right after the Islamic millennium (1591/2) was the first major Ottoman-Habsburg war after Suleyman I's campaign in 1566. This war was actually sparked in 1592 on Bosnia's north-eastern border by local forces who faced a heavy defeat in 1593, while besieging the stronghold of Sisak.[239] During the war, certain Serbian church dignitaries, most notably from Banat, showed allegiance to the Christian side, which in turn effected heretofore-good relations between the Ottomans and the Serbian Patriarchate based in Peć.[240]

The war that was ongoing at the time Uskūfī composed his epistle (in 1651), was the previously mentioned Ottoman war with Venetians over Crete (1644-69). In secondary literature, Uskūfī's poem is not connected with this event in particular, nor any other historical event for that matter, but it is impossible to imagine that it was not thought of by Uskūfī as one of those foolish battles mentioned in *Poziv na vjeru*.

The Ottoman-Venetian war was fought all over the Mediterranean, but the fiercest battles were fought in Crete, and Bosnia's closest neighborhood, Dalmatia.[241] This twenty-five years long war is the central theme of Ḥasan Ḳāimī 's long, threatening epistle directed at Venice and titled *Kad vam ode Kandija* (1669) that "foresees" the fall of Candia, but is dotted

[237] "*Ko god ima čistu pamet/ Ne misli on činit zamet/ Nevirniku noge sapet/ Hodte nami vi na viru!*," Ibid.
[238] "*Mi Turčini virno žiti/ I sa svetim oboviti/ Bez puta se nije biti/ Hodte nami vi na viru*," Ibid., 64
[239] See N. Malcolm, *Bosnia*, 45.
[240] The retribution of the Ottoman authorities manifested itself with the burning of the relics of Saint Sava, Tatjana Katić, "Serbia under the Ottoman Rule," *Österreichische Osthefte* 1-4 (2005), 153).
[241] Srđan Katić, *Jegen Osman Paša* [Yeğen Osman Pasha] (Beograd: Colografx, 2001), 27-33.

with Dalmatian toponyms and addresses the strife in that region in many details.[242] Both of these epistles in verse, Uskūfī's and Ḳāimī's, are very similar in terms of form, and could be transmitted orally.

Finally, the question is, what can be concluded based on similarities and differences between these two poems? Both of the poems can be seen as reactions to contemporary events, although they elaborate on two different topics and have different tone. Both are penned by authors who, at the same time with composing this poems, knew Turkish and exploited Ottoman Turkish genres. Unlike Ḳāimī, Uskūfī seems to be offering a solution for the social and political turmoil he witnessed, a solution in the form of return/coming to faith, and moreover, return/coming to faith officially professed by the state of which he was a subject.

I will finish this chapter by a conclusion that may or may not be applied to all authors of *aljamiado* literature: Mehmed Hevāʾī Uskūfī's work is a manifestation of the inward-looking reflections of a Slavic-speaking Ottoman subject coping with local conditions, if not directly participating in, then, at least aware of configuration of power in the seventeenth-century Ottoman empire and its surrounding. As such, Uskūfī did not seem to see himself as an adherent of the "peripheral Islam," whatever the meaning of the phrase.

[242] One of the two similar versions is: "Nemojte se kladiti a Hrvate mlatiti/zlatom ćete platiti/kad vam ode Kandija;" i.e., "Do not bet on thrashing (mlatiti) the Croatians, you will pay with gold [lose a fortune] when Candia departs/is taken from you." (Translated in J. Fine, *When Ethnicity did not matter*," 369.)

CONCLUSION

As I was starting this discussion, I posited that the literary practice that involves writing a Slavic dialect in Arabic script was a conscious and, thus, ideologically motivated choice. One of my goals was to test the benefits of expanding the framework for analysis of Bosnian *aljamiado* literature, until now treated from literary and linguistic aspects, by introducing historical and sociolinguistic perspectives, and thus point to the desiderata for future research. By focusing on the literary output of Mehmed Hevāʾī Uskūfī, I suggested different factors and information that should be taken into account in approaching this case as well as the subject of Bosnian *aljamiado* literature as a whole. Aware that there are many limiting factors for drawing definite conclusions, and of the fact that my previous discussion poses more questions than it provides answers, I will try to summarize possible ideological implications of the linguistic complexity of Mehmed Hevāʾī Uskūfī 's work.

The complete *ouevre* of Hevāʾī Uskūfī maintains, at least symbolic, presence of the three Ottoman languages. This can be inferred from the fact that he wrote some of his poems in (Ottoman) Turkish, but still felt the need to embellish his work with several verses in Arabic and Persian. His act of composing a dictionary of Bosnian/Turkish language and his idea of presenting it to the sultan himself can be interpreted as a statement in favor of utility and legitimacy of joining the Bosnian language to the group of (literary) Ottoman languages. Uskūfī was a person who seemed to be well-acquainted with the social, political and cultural trends in the Ottoman Empire, and this can be taken as a symbolic act not in opposition to the Ottoman ideal of diversity that found its expression in near-contemporary literary works glorifying the Ottoman dynasty. Yet, the question that emerges in light of the early composition date of this work in comparison to other examples of the dictionaries that involved non-Ottoman languages, the way Uskūfī explained his choice of language (by

emphasizing the similarity of Bosnian to the scriptural Latin), as well as the fact that *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* literacy was well established in Ottoman Bosnia by the beginning of seventeenth century is what kind of practical purpose Uskūfī had in mind while composing the dictionary, what the relation between his audience and the audience of the solely *elsine-i s̲elās̲e* literary works was and in what social space these two groups overlapped?

The conclusion that imposes itself in observing Uskūfī's dictionary together with his poems is that his program was religiously-minded, i.e., that he aimed at showing the benefits of using the Slavic/Bosnian language in communicating the need for religiously and morally correct behavior and religious unity in a concise and understandable way to those Slavic-speaking (non) Muslims who were not versed in any of the three Ottoman Languages. Writing poems targeting his Muslim co-religionists in Arabic script and positioning them side by side with more pronouncedly Ottoman forms might be interpreted as Uskūfī's way of putting his Slavic compositions on equal footing with the Turkish ones. Another audience he obviously had in mind were non-Muslim Slavic speakers who might be encouraged into voluntary conversion after they are explained the necessity of the "right path" in a comprehensible manner and reminded of the common background, language, space and experiences they shared with their Muslim neighbors.

However, none of these conclusions can be taken as straightforward. Equally puzzling as his promotion of Slavic/Bosnian language as a language of religion is the brand of Islam that manifests itself in, first of all, Uskūfī's *ilāhī*s. Uskūfī's mixed linguistic background seems to be interacting with his familiarity with multiple religious traditions, resulting in what might be labeled "borderland Islam," whereby borderland is to be understood (symbolically) as both an internal personal and actual geographical space in which religious or linguistic traditions intermingle. The question is then how broad was the social base of this

"borderland Islam" and how it overlapped and interacted with the social base of the forms commonly taken as more "mainstream."

In retrospect, Uskūfī's lexicographical project achieved significant success due to its functional features, but did not serve as an impetus of a lexicographical tradition and ended up with a "nickname" that has a connotation of not only cultural but also a religious "backwardness" and "unorthodoxy." Besides that, his *ilāhī*s (unlike *Poziv na vjeru*) do not have a later *aljamiado* counterpart that would be similar in form, style and tone, although this genre became a hallmark of Bosnian *aljamiado*.

Irrespective of the fact that Uskūfī might be seen as a person occupying a marginal political and economic position, he was definitely a man of his time who partook in at least two different milieus: the imperial and the regional/local. Uskūfī's work seems to be bearing a particular stamp of introspection in the context of competing identificatory practices that were characteristic of his time and conditioned by a conjunction of social, political, cultural and economic factors the influence of which cuts across the geographical and state borders. In light of the contemporary debate about the proper ways of "Sunnitization" between purist Kadizadelis and more moderate Sufi orders that raged in the capital and reverberated throughout the whole Ottoman Empire, Uskūfī's "inclusive" social and linguistic initiative could be seen as a third, distinctly "Slavic" voice of the border. One of the possible tasks for research is studying how this particular voice reverberated, if at all, and was there any group of Ottoman subjects that might be seen as its adherents, and if so, what would be the manifestations of their position.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Algar, Hamid. "Some Notes on the Naqshbandī Tarīqat in Bosnia." *Studies in Comparative Religion* 9, no. 2 (1975): 2-26.

Ammon, Ulrich, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier, Peter Trudgill, eds. *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Andrews, Walter G. *Poetry's Voice, Society's Song*. Seattle, London: University of Washington Press, 1984.

Andrews, Walter and Irene Markoff. "Poetry, the Arts, and Group Ethos in the Ideology of the Ottoman Empire." *Edebiyat* NSI: 1 (1987): 28-70.

Babinger, Franz et al, eds. *Literaturdenkmaler aus Ungarns Turkenzeit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1927.

Babinger, Franz. *Mehmed the Conqueror and His Time*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Baer, Marc. *Honored by the Glory of Islam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Bajraktarević, Fehim. "O našim mevludima i mevludu uopšte" [Of Our Mevlids and Mevlid in General]. *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor* 17 (1937): 83-87.

Baralić-Materne, Maja. "Narodne ilahije: ilahije uspavanke" [Popular Ilāhīs, Ilāhīs Sang as Lullabies]. *Muzika* 1, no. 21 (2003): 9-15.

Bašagić, Savfet Beg. *Kratka uputa u prošlost Bosne i Hercegovine* [A Short Introduction into the Past of Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Sarajevo, 1900.

Blau, Otto. *Bosnischturkische Sprachdenkmaler, Abhandlungen fur die Kunde des Morganlandes*. Vol. 5, no 2. Leipzig, 1868.

Boeschoten, Hendrik. "Bosnische Metrik." *Beläk Bitig-Sprachstudien für Gerhard Doerfer zum 75. Geburtstag*. Ed. Marcel Erdal, 33-49. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 1995.

Bogićević, Vojislav. *Pismenost u Bosni i Hercegovini* [Literacy in Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1975.

Bombaci, Alessio. "The Turkic Literatures. Introductory Notes on the History and Style." In *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Vol. 2. Ed. Louis Bazin et al, 11-71. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1964,

Börekçi, Günhan. "Factions and Favorites at the Courts of Sultan Ahmed I (r. 1603-17) and his Immediate Predecessors." PhD dissertation, Ohio State University, 2010.

Caferoğlu, A. ”Note sur un manuscrit en langue serbe de la bibliothèque d’Ayasofya.” *Revue International des Etudes Balkanique* 1, no. 3 (1936): 185-190.

Çınar,Bekir. “Niğdeli Visālī ve Hamdullah Hamdī’nin kıyāfetnāmeleri üzerine bir inceleme”[An Examination on physiognomies of Niğdeli Visālī and Hamdullah Hamdī]. I. In *Uluslararası Niğde Dil, Kültür ve Tarih Sempozyumu*, 3-6 (May, 2012), available at: www.diewelt-dertuerken.de

Ćehajić, Džemal. “Društveno-politički, religiozni i drugi aspekti derviških redova u jugoslavenskim zemljama” [Social, Political, Religious, Literary and other aspects of the dervish orders in Yugoslav Lands]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 34 (1985): 93-113.

_____. *Derviški redovi u jugoslovenskim zemljama sa posebnim osvrtom na Bosnu i Hercegovinu* [Orders of Dervishes in Yugoslav Countries Pointing out Bosnia and Herzegovina]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni Institut Sarajevo, 1986.

Dankoff, Robert. “The Languages of the World According to Evliya Çelebi.” *Journal of Turkish Studies* 13 (1989): 23-32.

_____. *An Ottoman Mentality. The World of Evliya Çelebi*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Dankoff, Robert and Sooyong Kim, eds. *An Ottoman Traveler: Selections from the Book of Travels of Evliya Chelebi*. London: Eland, 2011.

Dimitrov, Strashimir. “Fetvi za izkorenyavane na bulgarskata mirogledna sistema sred pomohamedanchenite bulgari.” *Vekove* 2 (1987): 27-39.

_____. “Some Aspects of Ethnic Development, Islamisation and Assimilation in Bulgarian Lands in the 15th-17th Centuries.” In *Aspects of the Development of the Bulgarian Nation*. Ed. Georgi Yanakov, 36-59. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1989.

Dedes, Yorgos. “Luġat-i Rūmiye: A Turkish Greek Dictionary from the Late Ottoman Period.” *Journal of Turkish Studies* 31/1 (2007): 238-280.

Delice, Ibrahim. “Luġat-i Ferişteoğlu ve Luġat-i Kânūn-i İlâhi’nin neşri üzerine” [Comment following publication of Luġat-i Ferişteoğlu ve Luġat-i Kânūn-i İlāhi]. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları* 3 (1996): 195-232.

Dressler, Marcus. “Inventing Orthodoxy: Competing Claims for Authority and Legitimacy in the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict.” In *Legitimizing the Order*. Ed. Hakan T. Karateke and Maurus Reinkowski, 151-173. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Duranti, Alessandro. *Linguistic Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

_____, ed. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2004.

Eckmann, Janos. "Turkish Lexicography." *Encyclopedia of Islam*. 2d Ed. Vol. 4. Leiden: Brill, 527:528.

Elsie, Robert. "Albanian Literature in the Moslem Tradition: Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Century Albanian Writing in Arabic Script." *Oriens* 33 (1992): 287-306.

_____. *History of Albanian Literature.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.

Erdem, Mehmed Dursun."Manzum Sözlükler ve Tuhfe-i Âsım" [Versified Dictionaries and Tuḥfe-i Āsım]. *International Journal of Central Asian Studies* 10, no. 1 (2005): 197-215 (199).

Fazlıoğlu, Ihsan. "Osmanlı döneminde 'bilim' alanındaki Türkçe telif ve tercüme eserlerin Türkçe oluş nedenleri ve bu eserlerin dil bilincinin oluşmasındaki yeri ve önemi" [The Place and Importance of the Scientific Works Written in or Translated into Turkish in the Formation of Language Consciousness in the Ottoman Period] (2003), available at: http://www.ihsanfazlioglu.net/yayinlar/makaleler/1.php?id=40

Feldman, Walter. "Mysticism, Didacticism and Authority in the Liturgical Poetry of the Halveti Dervishes of Istanbul." *Edebiyat*, ns. 2, no. 1 (1993): 243-65.

_____. "The Celestial Sphere, the Wheel of Fortune, and Fate in the Gazels of Naili and Baki," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 28, no. 2 (1996): 193-215

Filan, Kerima. "Sufije i Kadizadelije u osmanskom Sarajevu" [Sufis and Kadizadelis in Ottoman Sarajevo]. *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke* 29-30 (2009): 163-186.

Fine, John V. A. *When Ethnicity Did Not Matter in the Balkans*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2006.

Finkel, Caroline. *Osman's Dream, The Story of the Ottoman Empire 1300–1923*. London: John Murray, 2005.

Fleischer, Cornell H. *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Âli (1541-1600).* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Fotić, Aleksandar."Belgrade: A Muslim and a Non-Muslim Cultural Centre (Sixteenth-Seventeenth Centuries). In *Provincial Elites in the Ottoman Empire*. Ed. Antonis Anastasopoulos, 51-75. Rethymno: Crete University Press.

Gallego, Maria Angeles. "The Languages of Medieval Iberia and Their Religious Dimension." *Medieval Encounters* 9/1 (2003): 108-139.

Gibb, Elias John Wilkinson. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. Vol. 4. London: Luzac, 1905.

Goffman, Daniel." Ottoman Millets in the Early Seventeenth Century." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 11 Fall (1994): 135-138.

Golub, Ivan and Wendy Bracewell. "The Slavic Idea of Juraj Križanić." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* Theme: *Concepts of Nationhood in Early Modern Eastern Europe* 10, no. 3/4 (1986): 438-491

.

Gümüş, Zehra."Klâsik türk edebiyatında manzum sözlük şerhleri"[Commentaries on Versified Dictionaries in the Classic Turkish literature]. *Turkish Studies* 2, no. 4 (2007): 297-312.

Hadžibajrić, Fejzulah. "Tesavufsko-tarikatska poema Abdulaha Bošnjaka" [Taṣavvuf Tarīkat poem of 'Abdullāh Bosniak]. *Anali Gazi-Husrev Begove Biblioteke* 2-3 (1974): 21.

Hadžijahić, Muhamed. "Sinkretistički elementi u islamu u Bosni i Hercegovini." *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 28-29 (Sarajevo, 1980): 301-329.

Hagen, Gottfried. "Translations and Translators in a Multilingual Society: A Case Study of Persian-Ottoman Translations, Late 15th to Early 17th Century." *Eurasian Studies* 2, no. 1 (2003): 95-134.

_____. "Afterword: Ottoman Understandings of the World in the Seventeenth Century. In *An Ottoman Mentality.* Ed. Robert Dankoff amd Evliya Çelebi, 207-248. Brill, Leiden, 2004.

_____. "Arabic in the Ottoman Empire." In: *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*. Ed. Kees Verstegh. Leiden, Boston: Brill. Forthcoming.

Handžić, Mehmed. *Književni rad bosansko-hercegovačkih Muslimana* [The Literary production of Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims], 1933. An offprint published in *Glasnik Islamske Vjerske Zajednice*, 1/(1933): 1-12; 2 (1934): 1-6 as "Rad bosansko-hercegovačkih Muslimana na književnom polju," 84-86.

Hegyi, Ottmar. "Minority and Restricted Uses of the Arabic Alphabet: The Aljamiado Phenomenon." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 99, no. 2 (1979): 262-269.

Huković, Muhamed. *Alhamijado književnost i njeni stvaraoci* [Aljamiado literature and its creators]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1986.

İhsanoğlu, Ekmeleddin, ed. *History of the Ottoman State and Civilization*. Istanbul: IRCICA, 2002.

Imber, Colin. *Ebu's-su'ud: The Islamic Legal Tradition*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Kadribegović, Aziz. "Neke opaske o nasem aljamiado pjesništvu" [Some Remarks on our Aljamiado Poetry]. *Anali Gazi - Husrev Begove Biblioteke* 4 (1976): 143-154 (150).

Kadrić, Adnan. "Originalnost izvan ili/i unutar leksikografske tradicije: komparacija Uskufijinoga rječnika i rječnika Ibrahima Šahidije" [Originality outside or/and within a lexicographic tradition: Comparison between Uskūfī's and İbrahim Ṣāhidī's dictionaries]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 52-53 (2002-2003): 73-90.

_____. "The Phenomenon of Conceptual Lexicography in Ottoman Bosnia." In *Perspectives on Ottoman Studies: Papers from the 18th Symposium of the International Committee of Pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Studies*. Ed. Ekrem Čaušević, Nenad Moačanin, Vjeran Kursar, 317-329. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2010.

Kafadar, Cemal. "Self and Others: The Diary of a Dervish in Seventeenth Century Istanbul and First-Person Narratives in Ottoman Literature." *Studia Islamica* 69 (1989): 121-151.

_____. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

_____. "A Rome of One's Own: Reflections on Cultural Geography and Identity in the Lands of Rum." *Muqarnas* 24 (2007): 7-25.

Kappler, Matthias. "Ottoman Versified Dictionaries for Balkan Languages: a Comparative Analysis." *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 37 (2001): 10-20

Kasumović, Ahmed and Svein Mønnesland, eds. *Bosansko Turski Rječnik. Muhamed Hevai Uskufi, 1631*, Tuzla, 2011.

Kasumović, Ahmed, Muhamed Huković and Ismet Smailović. *Muhamed Hevai Uskufi*.Tuzla: Univerzal, 1990.

Kasumović, Ismet. *Školstvo i obrazovanje u bosanskom ejaletu za vrijeme osmanske uprave.* [School and Education in the Province of Bosnia during the Ottoman Reign]. Mostar: Islamski kulturni centar, 1999.

Katić, Tatjana. "Serbia under the Ottoman Rule." *Österreichische Osthefte* 1-4 (2005):145-158.

Kemura, Seifuddin and Vladimir Ćorović. *Serbokroatische Dichtüngen Bosnischer Moslims aus dem XVII, XVIII und XIX Jahrhundert*. Sarajevo, 1912.

Kerslake, Celia. "Ottoman Turkish." In *Turkic languages*. Ed. Lars Johanson, Eva A. Csato, 179-203. London, New York: Routledge, 1998.

Kılıç, Atabey. "Klâsik Türk edebiyatında manzum sözlük yazma geleneği ve Türkçe-Arapça sözlüklerimizden Sübha-i Sibyán"[The Tradition of Versified Dictionary Writing in the Classic Turkish Literature and Sübha-i Sibyán, one of our Turkish-Arabic Dictionaries]. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 20 (2006): 67.

Kim, Sooyong. "Minding the Shop. Zati and the Making of Ottoman Poetry in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century." PhD dissertation. University of Chicago, 2005.

Korkut, Derviš M. "Makbūl-i Âryf: Potur Šahidija, Uskufi Bosnevija." In *Glasnik hrvatskih zemaljskih muzeja u Sarajevu* 54 (1942), (reprint, Sarajevo 1943): 371–408.

Kroskrity, Paul V. “Language Ideologies.” In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Ed. Alessandro Duranti, pages. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2004.

Krstić, Tijana. “Illuminated by the Light of Islam and the Glory of the Ottoman Sultanate: Self-Narratives of Conversion to Islam in the Age of Confessionalization.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 51, no. 1 (2009): 35-63

_____. *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

_____. “Of Translation and Empire—Ottoman Imperial Interpreters as Renaissance Go-Betweens.” In *The Ottoman World*. Ed. Christine Woodhead. pages. London and New York: Routledge, 2011.

Kunt, Metin. *The Sultan’s Servants: The Transformation of Ottoman Provincial Government, 1550-1650.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

_____. “Regional (Cins) Solidarity in the Seventeenth Century Ottoman Establishment.” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 5, no. 3 (1974): 233-239.

Lazard, Gilbert. “The Rise of the New Persian Language.” In *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 4. Ed. Peter Jackson, 595-632. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Lehfeldt, Werner. *Der Serbokroatische Aljamiado-Schrifttum der Bosnisch-Hercegovinischen Muslime: Transkriptionsprobleme*. Munich: Dr. Rudolf Trofenik, 1969.

_____. *Ein arabisch-persisch-griechisch-serbokroatisches Sprachlehrbuch in arabischer Schrift aus dem 15./16. Jahrhundert – Untersuchungen zur Graphematik*. Bochum: Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Veröffenlichungen des Seminars für Slavistik, 1970.

Ljubović, Amir. *Prozna književnost Bosne i Hercegovine na orijentalnim jezicima* [Prose literature of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Oriental Languages]. Sarajevo: Orijentalni Institut Sarajevo, 1995.

Lopašić, Alexander, “Islam in the Balkans: the Bosnian Case.” In *Religious Quest and National Identity in the Balkans.* Ed. Celia Hawkesworth, Muriel Heppell, and Harry Norris, 141-157. Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.

López-Morillas, Consuelo. “Language and Identity in Late Spanish Islam.” *Hispanic Review* 63, no. 2 (1995): 193-210.

Lovrenović, Ivo. *Bosnia: A Cultural History*. London: Saqi Books, 2001.

Lowry, Heath. *The Nature of the Early Ottoman State*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.

Malcolm, Noel. *Bosnia: A Short History*. London: Macmillan London Limited, 1994.

Marinković, Mirjana.“Srpski jezik u osmanskom carstvu/primer četvorojezičnog udžbenika za učenje stranih jezika iz biblioteke sulatana Mahmuda I” [Serbian Language in the

Ottoman Empire, an example of four-language textbook for learning foreign languages, from the library of Sultan Mahmud I]. *Slavistika* 14 (2010): 280-298.

Masters, Bruce. *Christians and Jews in the Ottoman Arab World: The Roots of Sectarianism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Memija, Minka. "Dosadašnja istraživanja alhamijado prakse i šta dalje" [Previous Investigations of Aljamiado Practice and Future Research Directions]. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 39 (1990): 211-217.

Miklosich, Franc. *Monumenta serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*. Viennae, apud Guilelmum Braumüller, 1858.

Minkov, Anton. *Conversion to Islam in the Balkans. Kisve Bahasi Petitions and Ottoman Social Life, 1670–1730*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Moačanin, Nenad. "The Historical Fate of Croatia and Turco-Croatian Relations in the Past." *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Tarih Bölümü Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 16, no. 27 (1992): 243-254.

Moačanin, Nenad. *Town And Country on the Middle Danube, 1526-1690*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Muftić, Teufik. "Arapsko pismo kod nas" [Our Arabic Script]. *Treći Program Radio Sarajeva* 24 (1979): 547-560.

Mušić, Omer. "Mostar u turskoj pjesmi iz XVII vijeka" [Mostar in Turkish Poetry of XVII Century]. *Prilozi za Orijentalnu Filologiju* 14-15 (1964-65): 73-100.

Murphey, Rhoads. "Forms of Differentiation and Expression of Individuality in Ottoman Society." *Turcica* 34 (2002): 135-170.

Nakaš, Lejla. *Jezik i grafija krajišničkih pisama* [Language and Orthography of the Frontier-Lords' Letters]. Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet, 2010.

Nametak, Abdurahman. *Hrestomatija bosanske alhamijado književnosti* [Anthology of Bosnian Aljamiado Literature]. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1981.

Nametak, Alija. "Rukopisni tursko-hrvatskosrpski rječnici" [Handwritten Turkish-Croatian/Serbian Dictionaries]. In *Građa za povijest književnosti Hrvatske*, 231-380. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, 1968.

Nezirović, Muhamed, ed. *Krajišnička pisma* [The Frontier Lords' Letters]. Sarajevo: Preporod, 2004.

Necipoğlu, Gülru. *Architecture, Ceremonial, and Power: The Topkapı Palace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1991.

_____. *The Age of Sinan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Paker, Saliha. ”Translation, the Pursuit of Inventiveness and Ottoman Poetics: A Systematic Approach.” In *Culture Contacts and the Making of Cultures: Papers in Hommage to Itamar Even-Zohar*. Ed. Sela-Sheffy Rakefet and Gideon Toury, 459-474. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University, Unit of Culture Research, 2011.

Peirce, Leslie. *The Imperial Harem: Women and Sovereignty in the Ottoman Empire*. New York: Oxford University Press: 1993.

Pollock, Sheldon I. *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture, and Power in Premodern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.

Popara, Haso and Zejnil Fajić, ed. *Katalog arapskih, turskih, perzijskih i bosanskih rukopisa: Gazi Husrev-Begova biblioteka u Sarajevu. Svezak sedmi* [Catalogue of the Arabic, Turkish, Persian and Bosnian Manuscripts: Gazi Husrev-Beg Library in Sarajevo], vol. 7. Sarajevo: Rijaset Islamske zajednice u Bosni i Hercegovini, 2000.

Popović, Alexandre “‘Abd al-Raḥmān Sirrī.” *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. 3d ed. Vol. 2: 10-11. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Radushev, Evgeni. “The Spread of Islam in the Ottoman Balkans: Revisiting Bulliet’s Method on Religious Conversion.” *Oriental Archive* 78 (2010): 363-384.

Ricci, Ronit. *Islam Translated: Literature, Conversion, and the Arabic Cosmopolis of South and Southeast Asia.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Rizvić, Muhsin. *Bosna i Bošnjaci, Jezik i Pismo* [Bosnia and Bosniaks, Language and Script]. Sarajevo: Preporod, 1996.

_____. *Književne studije* [Literary Studies]. Sarajevo: Preporod, 2005.

Rothman, Natalie. *Brokering the Empire*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Rycaut, Paul. *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire* (London, 1668).

Šabanović, Hazim. *Književnost Muslimana BiH na Orijentalnim Jezicima* [The Literature of Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Oriental languages]. Svjetlost: Sarajevo, 1973.

Šamić, Jasna. “Dîvan de Ḳaimî: Vie et œuvre d'un poéte bosniaque du XVIIe siècle.” *Synthèse*, no. 24. Paris: Institut Français d'Etudes Anatoliennes, 1986.

Seyyid, Loḳmān. *Kıyāfetü’l-İnsānıyye fī Şemāıli’l-Osmānıyye* [Physiognomy in the Ottoman Lands]. Ankara: Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Turkish Republic, 1987.

Shaw, Stanford. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey.* Volume 1*: Empire of the Gazis: The Rise and Decline of the Ottoman Empire, 1280-1808*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Shefer-Mossensohn, Miri. *Ottoman Medicine: Healing and Medical Institutions, 1500-170.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.

Sezgin, Ibrahim, Seyit Ali Kahraman and Yücel Dağlı. *Evliyā Çelebi Seyahatnāmesi* [The Travelogue of *Evliyā Çelebi*]. Vol.5. Istanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001.

Sokolović, Osman Asaf. "Pjesnik Aga-Dede iz Dobor-grada o svome zavičaju i pogibiji Osmana II" [A Poet, Aga-dede from Dobor-grad, on his homeland and the death of Osman II]. *Anali Gazi - Husrev Begove Biblioteke* 1 (1972): 16.

Stavrides, Theoharis. *The Sultan of Viziers: The Life and Times of the Ottoman Grand Vizier Mahmud Pasha Angelović (1453-1474).* Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Talam, Jasmina. "Ilahije i Salavati derviša nakšibendijskog reda u Vukeljićima kod Fojnice." [Ilahis and "Salavats" of the Dervishes of the Naqshibandi Order in Vukeljici near Fojnica]. *Muzika* 22, no. 2 (2003): 43-58

Terzioğlu, Derin."Autobiography in Fragments: Reading Ottoman Personal Miscellanies in the Early Modern Era," In *Autobiographical Themes in Turkish Literature: Theoretical and Comparative Perspectives*. Ed. D. O. Akyıldız, H. Kara, B. Sagaster. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag. 2007.

_____. "Sufis in the Age of State-Building and Confessionalization." In *The Ottoman World.* Ed. Christine Woodhead, 86-102. London and New York: Routledge, 2011.

_____."Where 'Ilm-i Hāl meets Cathechism: Islamic Manuals of Religious Instruction in the Ottoman Empire in the Age of Confessionalization." *Past & Present* (forthcoming, 2013).

_____."Man in the Image of God in the Image of the Times: Sufi Self-Narratives and the Diary of Niyāzī-i Mısrī (1618-94)." *Studia Islamica* 94 (2002): 139-165.

Tezcan, Baki. *The Second Ottoman Empire: Political and Social Transformation in the Early Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Thomson, Francis J. "When did Bartol Kašić Commence and Complete his Translation of the Bible into Croatian?" *Slovo* 56-57 (2008): 559-570.

Yakar, Halil I., "Manzum Sözlüklerimizden Tuhfe-i Fedāī" [Tuhfe-i Fedāī, One of Our Versified Dictionaries]. *Turkish Studies* 2, no. 4 (2007): 1016-1025.

Yıldız, Sara Nur. "Ottoman Historica Writing in Persian, 1400-1600." In *Persian Historiography*. Ed. Charles Melville, 209-257. London; New York: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

Verburg, Antoinette, C. "The Tuḥfe-i Ṣāhidī: A Sixteenth-Century Persian-Ottoman Dictionary in Rhyme." *Archivum Ottomanicum* 15 (1997): 1-87 (6).

Windfuhr, Gernot L. "Persian." In *The World's Major Languages*. Ed. Bernard Comrie, 445-460. London, New York: Routledge, 2009.

Woodhead, Christine. "Ottoman Languages," In: *The Ottoman World*. Ed. Christine Woodhead, 143-159. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

Woolard, Kathryn A. "Bernardo de Aldrete and the Morisco Problem: A Study in Early Modern Spanish Language Ideology." *Society for Comparative Study of Society and History* 44 (2002): 446-480.

Woolard, Kathryn A., Bambi Schieffelin, Paul Kroskrity, eds. *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Woolard, Kathryn A., Bambi Schieffelin. "Language Ideology." *Annual Reviews in Anthropology* 23 (1994): 55-82.

Ždralović, Muhamed. *Prepisivači dela u arabickim rukopisima*, I-II. Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1988.

Zilfi, Madeline C. "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in the Seventeenth-Century Istanbul." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 45, no. 4 (1986): 251-26.

Zirojević, Olga. "Alahovi hrišćani" [Allah's Christians]. *Republika* 14 (2002): 282-283.