

Ahmed, imprimée à Venise et *le Tarih-i Hind-i Garbi*. Elle reconnaît cependant que malgré ces informations, recueillies auprès de sources européennes à jour, ces régions sont restées à la périphérie des intérêts politiques et stratégiques ottomans de l'époque.

Il nous semble ainsi que l'ouvrage de P. Emiralioglu est avant tout une bonne synthèse de la production géographique ottomane du 16^{ème} siècle. Si l'exhaustivité de la présentation de l'auteur est indéniable, plusieurs questions viennent contrecarrer son interprétation générale, notamment si on initie une comparaison avec la géographie arabe. En effet, on constate qu'exception faite du Nouveau monde, l'intérêt géographique des Ottomans apparaît semblable à celui de leurs prédécesseurs musulmans en Méditerranée, voire plus réduit si on prend en compte les informations données par les Arabes sur l'Afrique et l'Europe. Or, les géographes ottomans sont ici plus discrets. Beaucoup plus étonnant, alors que P. Emiralioglu suppose que cette production géographique soutenait des prétentions hégémoniques, pourquoi n'y a-t-il aucun ouvrage descriptif sur la Roumélie ou les Balkans, régions où les Ottomans avançaient alors inexorablement ?

Jean-Charles Ducène

EPHE, Paris

Ines Aščerić-Todd,

***Dervishes and Islam in Bosnia: Sufi Dimensions to the Formation of
Bosnian Muslim Society,***

Leiden and Boston: E. J. Brill, 2015, 198 p., ISBN 978-900-4278-21-9.

The relative scarcity of books about the history of Sufism and Sufi culture in the Western Balkans, and especially the scarcity of books written in the languages of Western Europe,¹ has led to an oversimplification of the subject and

1 The available publications are mostly dealing with the post-Ottoman and the contemporary period or limited to a particular dervish order, as Rifā'iyya in Alexandre Popovic, *Un ordre de derviches en terre d'Europe* (Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme, 1993) or Khalwatiyya in Nathalie Clayer,

an attempt to force it into the conventional patterns and frameworks employed by mainstream scholarship. There has often been a failure to recognize the peculiarities of Ottoman Bosnia, which contained a large number of autochthonous Muslims who had been Islamized but not Turkicized. This deficiency, in my view, has been more than adequately addressed by Ines Aščerić-Todd in *Dervishes and Islam in Bosnia*, the fifty-eighth volume of the series 'The Ottoman Empire and its Heritage', published by E. J. Brill. Were the book simply a chronological survey of Sufi activities and the foundation of various dervish orders in Ottoman Bosnia during the classical period, it would still be a valuable contribution to the field. However, the author has undertaken the far more ambitious task of exploring the involvement of Sufi orders in the formation of Muslim society during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the first two centuries of Ottoman rule in Bosnia.

The first part of the book discusses the role of dervishes in the Ottoman conquest of Bosnia, their eventual contribution to the foundation of certain settlements, and more generally the part that they played in establishing the basis of an emerging Muslim society in Bosnia. The author rightly concludes that Ö. L. Barkan's 'kolonizatör Türk dervişleri' in the Western Balkans of 1463 did not play the same crucial role either in the conquest or the spread of Islam as they had done in Greek and Serbian territory during the two previous centuries. The relationship between the spread of dervish orders and the process of Islamization was indirect and the colonizing and missionary roles of dervishes in Bosnia were at least equally fulfilled by orthodox dervish orders, if not more so. The conquest coincided with the period in which the Ottoman Empire was already proclaiming an orthodox identity and the Ottoman court was beginning to patronize more orthodox Sufi orders, particularly the Khalwatī, and to a much lesser extent the Mawlawī. Later, the patronage of the court would be directed almost entirely toward the Naqshbandī. In contrast with South Serbia, Macedonia, Greece, and Albania, the role of Bektashi in Bosnia was negligible.

The second part of the book examines life in existing Ottoman urban areas in Bosnia, especially the development of trade guilds, their relationship with

Mystiques, état et société: les Halvetis dans l'aire balkanique de la fin du XVe siècle à nos jours (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994). The notable exceptions are a very good general work of Metin İzeti, *Balkanlar'da Tasavvuf* (İstanbul: Gelenek, 2004), and completely unknown study in the western academia of Džemal Čehajić, *Derviški redovi u jugoslovenskim zemljama* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1973).

Akhī corporations, the presence of Sufi traditions and activities within the guilds, and the relationship of the guilds with particular Sufi orders. Here the author relies extensively on unpublished and generally unknown documents related to the city trade guilds. Of particular importance are documents that prove important links between the development of guilds and the Islamization of Bosnia. The development of crafts and guilds in Bosnia evidently ran parallel to the formation of a new Muslim society, and the pace of this development more or less mirrored the progression of Islamization.

The third and final part of the book considers the notorious mass persecution of the Bosnian followers of the Malāmī-Bayrāmī quṭb Ḥamza Bālī, who was executed at Istanbul in 1561. The author offers a meticulous survey of the history of the order and the tragic chain of events, relying upon primary sources as well as secondary literature. While I am impressed by it, I might have preferred more caution when following classical Bosnian scholarship on the Ḥamzawī, in particular the work of M. Hadžijahić. In other words, I am not be sure that Ḥamza Bālī was related in any way to Ḥamza Dede or to his unaffiliated convent in Orlovići/Tuzla. The author rightly concludes that there is nothing in the available documents written by prominent members of the order that could provide a satisfactory reason for its grim fate, but she also fails to place it in the wider context of the Ottoman religious disputes of the end of fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, as well as in the broad framework of the history of the Malāmī-Bayrāmī community. Contemporary sources indicate that the Malāmī-Sikkīnī, a heterodox branch of the Bayrāmī order that was often known in the derogatory terms of the time as ‘Ḥamzawī’ or ‘Idrīsī’, retreated into seclusion after the execution of their quṭb Ḥusāmuddīn Anqarawī in 1557. They survived in two lines. An underground and extremely heterodox group was represented by Ḥamza Bālī and Idrīs-i Mukhtafī (d. 1615), while a more orthodox group represented by ‘Abd Allāh al-Bosnawī (d. 1643) and Ḥusayn Lāmakānī (d. 1625) displayed a greater interest in observing the Sharia. The key role in connecting the two groups was played by Ḥasan Qabaduz of Bursa (d. 1601), the murīd and successor of Ḥamza Bālī as Malāmī quṭb. His murīds included not only ‘Abd Allāh al-Bosnawī and Lāmakānī but also the “infamous” Idrīs-i Mukhtafī.

If I were to look for shortcomings in an impressive book, they would mainly concern the author’s apparent ignorance or lack of interest in a number of publications that are closely related to her topic, including a very important article on

the Mawlawī tekke at Sarajevo written by Hatice Oruç and Yılmaz Kurt¹ as well as the edition prepared by İsmail Erünsal of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-‘Askarī’s *Mir’āt al-‘Ashq*, an indispensable source for the history of the Malāmī-Ḥamzawī movement during the fifteenth and sixteenth century.² I might also be tempted to mention some of my own contributions to the subject.³ Nevertheless, I heartily recommend this valuable book to students and scholars working on early modern Ottoman history, on Sufism, and on Islamization, as well as to anyone interested in the history of the Ottoman Balkans and of Bosnia in particular.

Slobodan Ilić

Near East University

Selim Deringil,

Conversion and Apostasy in the Late Ottoman Empire,

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, 294 p., 978-110-7546-01-1

In this highly analytical writing with abundant archival sources, Selim Deringil, one of the leading academics and historians of Turkey, examines the politics of conversion and apostasy of the “Tanzimat State” and “Abdulhamit’s State”, from 1839 to 1908, at a time when the Empire was ‘converting’.

Five thematic chapters compose the book. The first chapter shows how through the Tanzimat reforms (1839 and 1856 edicts) the Ottoman state converted from its classical sultanic bureaucracy to the legal, rational bureaucratic state. The author convincingly demonstrates that the conversion issue became a

1 Hatice Oruç and Yılmaz Kurt “İsa-begova tekija/mevlevihana u Sarajevu,” *Znakovi vremena* 39/40 (2008), pp. 107-124.

2 İsmail E. Erünsal, *XV-VI. Asır Bayrâmî-Melâmîliği’nin Kaynaklarından Abdurrahman el-Askerî’nin Mir’âtü’l-İşk’i* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2003).

3 Slobodan Ilić, *Ḥüseyn Lâmekânî. Ein osmanischer Dichter und Mystiker und sein literarisches Werk* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999). Slobodan Ilić, “Lamekani Hüseyin Efendi,” *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi (DİA)*, 2003, XXVII, 94-95.