

i članci o srednjovjekovnom pravu, vjerskoj historiji, historiji umjetnosti, demografiji te historiji vlasteoskih porodica. Članci publicirani u okviru ovog zbornika predstavljaju još jedan iskorak ka boljem razmijevanju procesa i zakonitosti srednjovjekovnog doba kod južnoslavenskih naroda.

ENES DEDIĆ

HASAN ŠKAPUR. *Odnos osmanskih vlasti prema Bosanskom ustanku (1875-1878.)* [*The Attitude of the Ottoman Authorities towards the Bosnian Uprising, 1875-1878*]. Sarajevo: Centar za osmanističke studije. 2017. Pp. 470.

This book attempts to illuminate the political attitude and military reaction of the Ottoman authorities towards the uprising that deeply shook the Ottoman borderland province of Bosnia between 1875 and 1878, serving as the *raison d'être* for the major meddling of the international powers that came to be known as the Great Eastern Crisis. Founded on a rich basis of primary archival material, mostly of Ottoman origin, assembled and analysed by a scholar who had mastered Ottoman language and palaeography, the book also uses these documents to add new chapters to the history of the Bosnian uprising. All this comes in a form which is a classic example of the "history of events" (*histoire événementielle*), a traditional narrative style of history writing, focused on telling the story about "what happened", in an objectivistic way, by "reconstructing" the image of unique events of the past and by connecting them chronologically into the

meaningful stream of events. Škapur's book is posthumously published. Knowing that it was written in the 1970s, a time when trends in historiography looked much different than today, his approach comes hardly as a surprise. Nevertheless, a contemporary reader, particularly one with a background in theoretical debates on the nature of knowledge and scholarship, would probably have several critiques on methodological practices employed in the study.

Hasan Škapur did not set out to take a broad view of the Bosnian uprising which implies presenting multiple perspectives connected with this violent episode in the history of the Balkans. The one who seeks to get a deeper insight into the perspectives of the rebels or their supporters should probably look elsewhere for that kind of analysis. On the other hand, a student of the Ottoman view of the Balkan crisis could easily find this book helpful, similarly as a reader who would want to know more about the information on the insurrection that was included into the official correspondence of the Ottoman political and military structures.

Odnos osmanskih vlasti prema Bosanskom ustanku (1875-1878.) covers a wide range of topics connected with the Bosnian uprising, which reflects the author's conceptualisation and the way he used the available archive material. The book pays considerable attention to presenting Ottoman [Škapur's manuscript originally uses the term Turkish] political and military strategies in breaking the rebellion and restoring the peace and order. Škapur's main thesis in this part of the book is that the Ottoman government's plan of action primarily prescribed solutions for the peaceful shut down of the rebellion, through negotiations, concessions and promises, by using measures

that could win the population over. According to his findings, the use of armed force and amnesty were only considered after the previously mentioned options had already been explored (p. 249).

The author also invests efforts in explaining ways the Ottoman central, provincial and local authorities dealt with harsh challenges produced by various internal and external factors. For example, he investigates Ottoman attitude towards domestic and foreign propaganda, espionage, security problems, desertion, devastation, reorganisation of the police and armed forces, financial troubles, hunger, sanctions for the rebels, repatriation and reintegration of the emigrants.

Additionally, Škapur gives a full-blown narrative history of the Ottoman military operations in Bosnia, in chronological order, woven together with the information on riot and mayhem caused by the rebels. Furthermore, the story about the Bosnian uprising he laboriously presented in this book is enhanced by the author's views on the intercommunal relations during the revolt, particularly on the contacts and communication between Muslims and Christians.

Even though Škapur's study goes over the well-trodden territory of the Bosnian uprising that has been attracting the attention of historians from the 19th century onwards, he still manages to add new information and interpretations to the field of historiography. What separates his work from previous studies is his decision to put the attitude of the Ottoman authorities towards the revolt in the centre of his research, as well as to primarily rely on the Ottoman official correspondence. In fact, most of the data Škapur presents could not be found in previous accounts of the Bosnian uprising, perhaps because all major students of that historical

episode did not possess the necessary language and palaeography skills to independently approach the Ottoman sources. As historians are often the "prisoners" of their sources, it may have also contributed to the emergence of some major differences between Škapur and other historians who wrote about the Bosnian uprising, in terms of questions raised and structural divergences.

To fill in this long-standing, glaring gap, an issue already discussed about by the time the idea of this book was conceived, the author strived to assemble as much Ottoman material as he could, starting from official reports, telegrams, decrees, and instructions, to field records and other insightful documents that could serve the mentioned purpose. Arguably, a major strength of this study lies in a thorough use of the remarkable array of primary sources. Finding them, selecting, deriving and interpreting the information suitable for the research aims represented a time-consuming and demanding undertaking in its own right. Among the strengths of the book, one should also mention that it brings adequate examples for theses and assertions put forward by the author. For at least a part of such cases, we can say that they have been well supported by the evidence obtained from primary sources. Additionally, these strengths are a characteristic feature of the historiographic course F. Braudel called "traditional history", whereas P. Lacombe and F. Simiand used the label "history of events": historians who prefer such an approach in writing about the past, including Škapur, often meticulously conduct their archival research; in the eyes of many, this has traditionally been seen as the cornerstone of the "historian's craft".

Nevertheless, the book also has weaknesses that are typical for a traditional

narrative historian driven by the objective of distilling the kernel of “historical truth and facts” from the primary sources. Škapur’s narrative is descriptive and extensive, loaded with details that are ultimately unimportant for the author’s argumentation line or for the main theses of the book. He seems to be occupied so much with presenting the content of sources that most of the time he neglects to offer us interpretation or comments which would connect these texts more strongly with the key problems of the study. In fact, source-related parts of the book dominate so heavily that one could rightfully raise the question of the serious lack of theses and conclusions that could, if present, facilitate a better understanding of the purpose of introducing all these examples. Two more things that are lacking are the analysis and polemical approach, ingredients that certainly make an important part of a scholarly work. When all this is taken into the account, one concludes that the book’s narration style reminds of the works of those historians who persistently refrained from analysis, inaccurately assuming that presenting the content of a source is enough, as primary sources, metaphorically speaking, talk.

As any other historian, Škapur was caught in a network of discourses of his time and space that constrained his individual perspective. Discourse on scholarship that serves as an interpretative framework for this book is objectivism: he openly refers to his work as an objective endeavour (p. 30), which effectively speaks of his ideas of a good piece of scholarship, shared with many other historians. However, today, after witnessing many theoretical debates on this question, we should take such claims with a reserve, and his words as a mere rhetorical

strategy designed to make his representation of the past more convincing.

Other dominant discourses of 1970s Yugoslavia also left their trail in this book, most notably the nationalistic and patriotic set of ideas and representations of the Serbian national historiography that had a key role in building the dominant and legitimate narrative of the Bosnian uprising. That is why Škapur occasionally evaluates the revolt as the fight for liberation (p. 36) while calling its participants patriots (p. 162). Of course, these issues are in general culturally situated, context-bound, relative and depending on the position of a historian who is making the judgment. Today, such a statement would probably face disapproval by a cohort of critical academics, but, on the other hand, it is very likely that others would wholeheartedly defend mentioned views, particularly those who consider them to be a part of their own national imaginary.

Moreover, the academic community would have considerably less reason for criticism if several structural and technical shortcomings of the book had been remedied before the manuscript was sent to the printers. The issue which might probably raise a few eyebrows is the absence of a general conclusion and bibliography, elements that are widely considered as a standard part of the scholarly study. The author, unfortunately, did not prepare the manuscript for publication himself, and some of these flaws are perhaps the result of that fact. The editor of the book (Sedad Bešlija), and the editorial board (Edin Radušić, Hana Younis, Kemal Bašić) were aware of its weaknesses and even critically identified some of them in the preface. Nevertheless, they still decided to publish the manuscript with some “small interventions” (this is how they described

them themselves), justifying it with the need to fill the obvious gap in historiography.

In addition to the edited version of the manuscript left behind by Škapur, this book also includes a preface, signed by the editorial board, as well as the short biography and bibliography of the author, put together by K. Bašić. Especially insightful and refreshing part of the book is its preface: it brings some valuable academic reconsiderations of previous historiographic representations of the Bosnian uprising, as well as remarks which are crucial for better understanding of the Škapur's take on the subject-matter.

Odnos osmanskih vlasti prema Bosanskom ustanku (1875-1878.) offers a representation of the Ottoman politics and selected events during the time of the Bosnian uprising of 1875-1878 from which scholars can benefit immensely. As the book is strongly rooted into the Ottoman archival material and provides an insight into the hitherto neglected point of view of the Ottoman political actors and administrative officials, it adds fresh new colours to the historical image of one of the biggest crises in the late history of the Ottoman Empire. This makes a fine case to consider it as a welcomed addition to scholarship. However, it is also a book that harbours a problematically traditional approach of the "history of events", with all of the disadvantages that such an approach implies. Moreover, it may even be considered as an unfinished product, for it is a posthumous publication of a manuscript from the 1970s, whereas the author did not have a chance to prepare it for the publication himself. Thus, I hope that this book will serve as a catalyst that would encourage future researchers to find some "new" primary sources and readdress this important issue. But this time it should be done

with a stronger comparative and polemical perspective, and by considering recent theoretical frameworks and debates.

FAHD KASUMOVIĆ

Hana Younis, *Od dućana do pozorišta. Sarajevska trgovačka elita 1851-1878., Historijske monografije, knj. 15, Dobra knjiga, Sarajevo, 2017, 353 str.*

U bosanskohercegovačkoj i stranoj historiografiji do sada nije bilo djela u kojem se u cjelini razmatra trgovačka elita u Sarajevu u periodu od 1856. do 1878. godine. Ta problematika je bila zastupljena samo fragmentarno, u okviru izučavanja pojedinih aspekata društvene i ekonomske historije Bosne i Hercegovine u navedenom periodu. Knjiga dr. Hane Younis, koja predstavlja djelomično prerađenu doktorsku disertaciju odbranjenu na Filozofskom fakultetu u Sarajevu 8. novembra 2012. godine, postojeću prazninu popunjava u znatnoj mjeri. Obima je 353 strane, od kojih se na glavni tekst odnosi 243 (11-254), na zaključak na bosanskom, engleskom i arapskom jeziku 13 strana (339-356), popis korištenih izvora i literature 17 (255-272), priloge 11 (273-284) i na registar ličnih i geografskih imena 40 (285-325). te na sadržaj četiri strane (349-352). U nizu dat je prateći kritički aparat sa 1246 napomena u ujednačenoj formi. Pored uvodnih razmatranja knjiga je koncipirana iz tri glave sa po više kraćih poglavlja. U uvodnim razmatranjima autorica je ukazala na značaj teme i njenu istraženost u historiografiji, definirajući problemski okvir za njeno kompleksnije sagledavanje.

U prvoj glavi knjige pod naslovom *Društveno-ekonomske promjene u Osmanskom*