

AMIR LJUBOVIĆ

WORKS BY BOSNIAKS IN THE FIELD OF LOGIC*
IN THE ARABIC LANGUAGE¹

In the history of the Arabic logic, the so-called "Arabic period" is a relatively well-known one. In the course of its main flow, since the appearance of the first translations of Aristotle's works into Arabic, until the end of the XIII century, until the meeting of the European logicians and philosophers with the works of Ibn Sina (Avicenna), al-Farabi and Ibn Rushd (Averroes) with thus far unknown works of Aristotle and the "new logic", it can be followed well. In the logic history books, the late XIII and early XIV centuries are most often denoted as the "final stage of evolution" and the "phase of the fall" of the Arabic logic.²

Such evaluations primarily came as a consequence of the insufficient research performed on this subject, and the researchers of the history of European logic were not even particularly interested in this period. For them, it was of prime importance how to reconstruct the path it used to reach the universities in Europe and how to "revive Aristotle" while using the works of Ibn Sina, al-Farabi and Ibn Rushd, who – among other things – also wrote detailed commentaries to accompany Aristotle's documents. On the other hand, the Oriental research dating back to as early as the beginning of the 19th century, presented in the catalogues of Oriental manuscripts by H.O. Fleischer (Leipzig, 1838, and Dresden, 1831), Kraft (Wien, 1842), Ahlwardt (Berlin, 1889), Rieu (London, 1888) and others, as well as in Brockelmann's *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur* (Wimer-Berlin, 1898-1902), offer data, though not sufficiently organized and evaluated, on the continuous presence of the works in the field of logic in the Arabic language until the 19th century, even after.

* See: "Djela Bošnjaka iz logike na arapskom jeziku". In: *POF* 42-43/1992-93, Sarajevo, 1995, pp. 69-102.

¹ This work constitutes a partially revised 2nd chapter of the PhD dissertation *Radovi naših ljudi iz oblasti logike na arapskom jeziku* [Works of Our People in the Field of Logic in the Arabic Language], defended at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo. The work cites a number of manuscripts found at some time at the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo, which was put to fire by Serbs and Montenegrins on 16-17th May, 1992. The copies of the manuscripts cited are found in *Dodatak* [the Annex] to the PhD dissertation.

² See, for instance: *Historija logike* [History of Logic], edited by A. N. Prior, "Naprijed", Zagreb, 1970, 55.

Within a broader range of interest, our cultural heritage researchers too recorded a number of authors in the field of logic and their works. The largest number of data, both related to the heritage overall and to the field which is the subject of our interest, were offered by H. Šabanović in his book *Književnost Muslimana BiH na orijentalnim jezicima – Biobibliografija* [The Literature of Muslims of BH in Oriental Languages – Bibliography] (Sarajevo, 1973), summarizing in it the previous knowledge and results of his own research. These are the basic biography data for individual authors, the titles of the works and, if he was able to access such data, where the manuscript was found and what its number was. As the work is not quite completed (it was published posthumously) a number of the gathered bibliographical data were left without the necessary references and unverified. Understandably, due to the abundance of the materials to be presented and due to their versatile nature, a thus devised bibliographical work, just like those of similar character preceding it, omitted any attempts to evaluate these works, and even a rough denotation of their basic contents. Nevertheless, this work has been of good use to us as the basic information provider and a starting point in our study.

The data we could find in the aforementioned works, both in the above listed monumental Orientalist catalogues and in the works of our researchers, and in the catalogues of Oriental manuscripts of more recent dates, inventory books, as well as the data we found during the study, clearly told us that the aforementioned evaluations of the history of the Arabic logic from the 14th century onwards can not stand. It was evident that even in the upcoming period, the logic continued on, even on a new territory too. In the Balkans, that is, exactly in our region, in the 16th century it met the Aristotelian logic in its Latin variant, through the Croat Latinists, and there continued its life in these two variants, until the appearance of works wrote in the mother language.

The goal of this work was to use the authentic manuscript materials in the field of logic written in the Arabic language (over 1,000 manuscript pages provided in the *Dodatak* [Annex] to the Dissertation), which thus far has not been a subject of any particular research, and other sources in order to provide a chronological list of those Bosniak authors who wrote logic works in the Arabic language, from the appearance of the first texts (16th century) until the end of the 19th century, and a breakdown of the basic logic issues they addressed. The data presented in this work themselves and the data on numerous transcripts of these and other works in the field of logic we meet in the anthologies of Oriental manuscripts clearly tell us that this is by no means a discipline which has since long ago been in “the phase of falling and dying down”, not even a discipline with a marginal role, but that this is a discipline with a special significance and place in the educational and scientific systems,³ that it is recognized as a discipline offering the technique of thinking

³ On the position of logic within the educational and scientific systems, please see: A. Ljubović, “Neke karakteristike proznog stvaralaštva na orijentalnim jezicima kod nas” [Some Characteristics of the Prose in Oriental Languages in our Re-

in other areas too, that is – following a recognizable trace – a tool for any scientific work and scientific thought in general. Thus, the Bosniaks gave a modest contribution towards expansion and development of the Arabic logic, but also a large contribution towards expansion of the Arabic-Islamic sciences in our region. It is understandable that due to the limited space in this work we have not been able to provide a more in-depth analysis of the positions, opinions and perceptions of individual authors on some more significant logic or philosophy issues nor, which would be particularly interesting, have we been able to approach these topics from the historical comparative standpoint. This will remain our commitment on another occasion.

*

In chronological aspect, the surveys and histories of literature and art in the Oriental languages in our region begin with the first Bosniaks who accepted the Islam. Some of them gained opportunities for higher education, thus also the possibility to join into this process themselves, either directly as teachers or in some other ways, and to give contribution to the elaboration and development of the Arabic-Islamic classic inherited by the Ottoman epoch.

One of the first persons recorded in the ancient Ottoman chronicles and other sources, and based on then in Joseph von Hammer's *History of the Ottoman Empire*, is Mula (Mawla) Abdulkерim (died in 1493),⁴ originates from the South Slavic territory, that is, the territory of ex-Yugoslavia. According to these sources, among other things, he also wrote a gloss to the work very well known in the East, *Sources of Light in the Logic*, by Sirağuddin al-Urmawī (died in 1283).⁵ The research we have made: verification of the aforementioned sources and literature, consulting of new ones, and surveys of the major Oriental manuscript anthologies in our country and abroad (by direct inspection or by way of catalogues), offered us no new information based on which we could state something about this gloss. Therefore we begin this survey of the authors and their works with one of the most prominent writers coming from the Oriental-Islamic component of our culture, whose works in logic (in manuscript forms) have been preserved until to-date, with the Bosniak named Hasan Pruščak.

gion], *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* [Contributions for the Oriental Philology] (hereinafter referred to as: *POF*), 40/1990, Sarajevo, 1991, 63-78.

⁴ Hağgi Halifa (Kātib Čelebī), *Fezleke-i Tarih*, İstanbul, 1286/87 (1869/70, I, 497; C. Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur* (hereafter referred to as: *GAL*), vol. I-II, Weimer-Berlin, 1898-1902, Suppl. I-III, Leyden, 1937-1942, Vol. I, 467; Hammer – Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches* (hereafter referred to as: *GOR*), I-X, Pesth, 1834-36, vol. II, 586; S. Bašagić, *Bošnjaci i Hercegovci u islamskoj književnosti* [Bosniaks and Herzegovinians in the Islamic Literature], Sarajevo, 1912, 19; H. Šabanović, *Književnost Muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine na orijentalnim jezicima* [The Literature of the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Oriental Languages], Sarajevo, 1973, pp. 44-46.

⁵ Sirāğ ad-dīn al-Urmawī, *Maṭāli' al-anwār fī al-manṭiq*, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, I, p. 467 (614).

A. HASAN KĀFĪ PRUŠČAK

Since there are a lot of sources and a very rich literature on Hasan Pruščak, his life and work,⁶ we will here only briefly present just the most important elements of his biography.

His full name, as he used to sign himself, is: Ḥasan Kāfī b. Turḥān b. Dāwūd b. Ya‘qūb az-Zībī al-Aqḥiṣārī al-Bōsnawī. *Kāfī* is his artistic name (the so-called *maḥlaṣ*) that he used for the first time in 1850 in his work *Kāfī’s Compendium on Logic*, and the denotations *az-Zībī* (Zib – a locality that was found in the vicinity of today’s Bugojno), *al-Aqḥiṣārī* (Aq-ḥiṣār = Biograd = Prusac) and *al-Bōsnawī* represent the denotations of the regional origin, place of birth and ethnic affiliation by which he was recognized. We also meet similar denotations with other authors of ours. He was born in 1544 in Prusac, a small town near Donji Vakuf. As he says in his biography himself, he obtained the initial education in his birth town, and then he went to Istanbul where he studied for nine years. Among his teachers from this period, he mentions a Kara Yılan and a Mula Ahmad Ansari, and “the teachers of his teachers”, which helps us to find trace and models he was relying upon in his work even in the domain we are interested in here.

The period from his return from Istanbul until he was first appointed judge of the Prusac district (1583) he mostly spent in Prusac, where, as he says, “he gathered around himself pupils and started giving lessons”. Except in Prusac, he also performed the judicial duty in the “Srem county”, and then “in some place near to my Prusac”, and, finally, he was re-appointed the judge of Prusac. For the last twenty years, he remained at this position which he received as a life-time pension.⁷

In his birth town he built some endowments, but the data on this is incomplete. In addition to performing the duty of judge (according to some information, he became a supreme judge in his later years), Hasan Kāfī also held lessons at the school he founded himself. He died on October 9, 1615, in his birth town of Prusac, and was buried there.

As far as known up to now, Hasan Kāfī Pruščak wrote seventeen works in various scientific areas and religious disciplines, and the object of his particular interest was in politics, philology, law, speculative theology and logic.⁸

In the field of logic, Hasan Kāfī Pruščak wrote two works. The first work is *Muḥtaṣar al-Kāfī min al-manṭiq* [Kāfī’s Compendium on Logic], and the second one is the commentary of his own work titled *Šarḥ Muḥtaṣar al-Kāfī min al-manṭiq* [The Commentary of Kāfī’s Compendium on Logic].

⁶ An extensive list of sources and literature has been provided in the book titled Hasan Kāfī Pruščak, *Izabrani spisi*, “Veselin Masleša”. Introduction, translation and notes by Amir Ljubović and Fehim Nametak. Sarajevo, 1983, p. 189.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 151-153.

⁸ The bibliography of works by Hasan Kāfī Pruščak with the data on the manuscripts, printed editions and translations is provided in the book titled Hasan Kāfija Pruščak, *Izabrani spisi ...*, 159-179.

1. Kafi's Compendium on Logic

One of the first works wrote by Hasan Kafi Pruščak was exactly *Muhtaşar al-Kāfi min al-manṭiq* [Kafi's Compendium on Logic], created in 1580. He wrote it primarily for practical reasons. "Since I noted" says Pruščak "that nowadays pupils are making efforts in logic, and they do not receive from it what they are seeking, due to the abundance of unclear issues in logic and because it is hard to provide exact interpretations in sciences, I have selected a clear compendium based on the books of old authorities and those following them, and thus analyzed for those who want to know and made it easier for those who study, by providing explanations based on my modest skills and recognizing my low capabilities..."⁹

Today, we know of three preserved manuscript copies of this work found in public libraries, that is, in anthologies of Oriental manuscripts,¹⁰ and in this paper we will use the copy kept at the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo and quote according to it and the edition of this text in translation into our language in the book *Izabrani spisi*.¹¹

As one could see from the cited segment, this work collects and assembles the debates on logic and the commentaries of Pruščak's predecessors in the basic elements in the form of a textbook, and as such and by its form too it represents a model textbook in this field, typical of the Oriental-Islamic world, which very concisely provides definitions and answers to the major questions in logic. Of course, Hasan Kafi Pruščak used literature to select the issues he would deal with, and he himself decided on the layout and distribution of the material, which is rather original. This is based on, as he sees them, the two fundamental logic issues: *perceptions* (taşawwurāt) and *claims* (taşdīqāt), either of these with its origins and its goals.

Based on this division, and after the introductory segment (fol. 1a-3b), all the logic issues were classified into the following chapters:

⁹ Hasan Kafija Pruščak, *Izabrani spisi ...*, 61.

¹⁰ A manuscript copy of this work is kept in the Oriental Anthology of the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Zagreb (hereinafter referred to as: OZ HAZU), no. 173, fol. 1b-20b, sized 12.5 × 17.5. This copy is not complete because the transcriber did not insert into text the largest number of logic terms, titles of chapters and some other elements, but he left gaps instead so he could later insert them in red ink, which he did not do.

The second copy is kept at the Husrev-Bey's Library in Sarajevo (hereinafter referred to as: GHB), R 3407; fol., sized 19.5 × 13 cm.

The third copy is kept at the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo (hereinafter referred to as: OIS), R 591 (Old no. MT 878). The description of this manuscript is provided in the book *Izabrani spisi ...* 27, and the copies of the manuscript in *Dodatak* [the Addendum].

¹¹ Pp. 61-85.

The same translation is published in the magazine *Dijalog* (A. Ljubović), nos. 1-2, Sarajevo, 1985, pp. 134-168.

1. *On words* (fī al-alfāz), fol. 4a-7b,
2. *On sources of perceptions – five universal principles* (fī mabādi' at-taṣawwūrāt – al-kulliyāt), fol. 7a-12a,
3. *On goals of perceptions – interpretative speech* (fī maqāṣid at-taṣawwūrāt – al-qawl aš-šāriḥ), fol. 12a-13a,
4. *On sources of claims – judgment* (fī mabādi' at-taṣdīqāt – al-qaḍiyya), fol. 13a-19a,
5. *On goals of claims – syllogism* (fī maqāṣid at-taṣdīqāt – al-qiyās), fol. 19a-25a,
 - a) *Apodyctics* (al-burhān), fol. 25a-25b and 26b-28b,
 - b) *Dialectics* (al-ḡadal), fol. 25b,
 - c) *Rhetorics* (al-ḥitāba), fol. 25b,
 - d) *Poetics* (aš-ši'r), fol. 25b-26a,
 - e) *Sophistics* (al-muḡālata), fol. 26a-26b.

In connection to the above presented layout and distribution of materials in this work by Prušćak, one needs to say that it has a very solid but natural and logical composition within there are exceptionally many various qualifications. They run consistently and derive one from the other, and have their functional values.

2. The Commentary of Kafi's Compendium on Logic

Prušćak's work *Šarḥ Muḥtaṣar al-Kāfi min al-manṭiq* [The Commentary of Kafi's Compendium on Logic] was known in literature only by its title, and the data was used from Prušćak's biography where he lists it among his first works. Starting from this source, the manuscript of this work by Prušćak we managed to find at the Cambridge University Library.¹²

The work was written in 1583, and represents the commentary of the previous work "until", as Prušćak himself says, "the end of the chapter with perceptions",¹³ and this means until the end of the third chapter of the work *Muḥtaṣar al-Kāfi min al-manṭiq* [Kafi's Compendium on Logic]. The motives for writing this piece of work were the same like with the previous one, that is, as assistance to pupils in mastering of the logic issues. After an extensive *Introduction* (fol. 1b-9a), according to the basic text, the commentary is divided into three chapters:

1. *On words* (fī al-alfāz), fol. 9a-18a,
2. *On sources of perceptions – five universal principles* (fī mabādi' at-taṣawwūrāt – al-kulliyāt), fol. 7a-12a, and
3. *On goals of perceptions – interpretative speech* (fī maqāṣid at-taṣawwūrāt – al-qawl aš-šāriḥ), fol. 30b-33b.

Therefore, the basic layout of the commentary was conditioned by the text of the basic work which was incorporated into the commentary word for

¹² Mr. Or. 541 (8). The microfilm of this manuscript is found with the author.

¹³ Kasan Kafiya Prušćak, *Izabrani spisi...*, 151.

word. However, unlike the basic texts, in the commentary Hasan Kafi Pruščak is frequently let free from the compositional restraint by accompanying certain terms of issues on logic with not only some deep analysis of the problem but even beyond. In this way, he anticipates some problems exceeding the framework of the subject problem, those to be addressed only later, or not to be addressed in this work at all, such as some issues in theory on courts, syllogistics, forms of direct conclusion, and the like. However, in spite of this, the work constitutes a coherent and harmonic entity in which digressions are always in the explanatory function. A separate value lies with those in which Pruščak refers to texts and authors he used as substantiation of his own positions, thereby also indicating upon his own sources. Here we particularly need to mention the texts by Ibn Sina *Kitāb aš-šifā'* [The Book of Healing] and *Kitāb al-išārāt wa at-tanbīhāt* [The Book of Indications and Thinking Stimuli],¹⁴ and authors al-Fanari¹⁵ and al-Urmawi.¹⁶

B. MUHAMMED, SON OF MUSA, ALLAMEK (MUSIĆ)

Among the most significant authors of our origin writing in the Arabic language is Mumammad, son of Musa, more known as Allamek (The All-Knowing) in the sources and in older reference materials. In the more recent literature, he can be found under the patronyme of Musić, and in the sources and literature his name is met accompanied with denotations of "al-Bōsnawī" and "as-Sarāyī". Husain Abdel Latif as-Sayid dedicated his doctor's dissertation to this author, defended at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo University in 1965,¹⁷ and its basic subject was Musić's language work. However, as

¹⁴ See, for instance, fol. 21b-22a, 26a, 30b and the like.

¹⁵ Šams ad-dīn b. Ḥamza al-Fanārī, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G. I, 303-304 (233-234), S I, 647 and S II, 328-329.

¹⁶ For this, see footnote 5. Hasan Kafi Pruščak often mentions him under name Šāhib al-Maṭāli', on the basis of his work *al-Maṭāli'*..., see fol. 17a.

¹⁷ Husein Abdel Latif as-Sayyid, *Muhamed Musa "Allamek" – Bosanac, arapski jezikoslovac iz prve polovine XVII stoljeća* [Muhammad Musa "Allamak" – the Bosniak, Arabic Linguist from the first half of the 17th century], doctoral dissertation defended at the Faculty of Philosophy of Sarajevo University in 1965, p. 382.

In addition to this work, the significant sources and literature for studying the life and work of Muhamed Musić are: Muḥibbī, *Ḥulāṣat al-aṭar*, Misr (Kairo), 1284 (1867/68), vol. IV, 302; Ḍahābī, *A'lām an-nubalā'*... vol. VI, 246, al-Baḡdādī, *Hadiyya al-'arifīn. 'Asmā' al-mu'allifīn wa āṭār al-muṣannifīn*, vol. II, 278; C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 417 and 466, S I 516, 534 and 740; S. Bašagić, *Bošnjaci...*, 72-73; same author, *Znameniti Hrvati, Bošnjaci i Hercegovci u Turskoj carevini* [Prominent Croats, Bosniaks and Herzegovinians in the Turkish Empire], Zagreb, 1913, 12; M. Handžić, *Književni rad bosansko-hercegovačkih muslimana* [Literature work of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims], Sarajevo, 1934, 6, 14, and 69-70; J. Blaškovič et al., *Arabische, türkische und persische Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek in Bratislava*, Bratislava, 1961, 15, 41-42, and 242; H. Šabanović,

since this year research has made some considerable shifts, and the dissertation was never published either, here we will be providing a somewhat more extensive biography of Allamek based on the more recent research and authentic documents.

Muhamed, son of Musa, Allamek, was born in 1595 in Sarajevo, where he completed his elementary and secondary education (Gazi Husref-Bey's Madrasa). From 1611/12, he continued his education in Istanbul, at one of the highest educational institutions in the Empire, *Sahn-i Seman*,¹⁸ and he completes it as at the latest in 1616.

Since then, the life and work of Muhammed Musić can be followed on three grounds: as a professor at several schools, as a judge and as a writer. There were no more specific data on his life and work until the beginning of 1626, when he wrote the commentary to the work *ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya*, and soon after that, in the summer of the same year, he also wrote grammar glosses. From the work of his pupil Ibrahim, son of Ramadan, who will be addressed later in the text, we learn that even before that time Muhamed Musić held logic lectures at some of the schools based on his own work. In September 1627, after a certain period in which he was jobless and in a difficult financial situation, he started writing a gloss with a commentary to one chapter of the *Qur'an* which in the same year he used as a habilitation for the professor post at the Hasanbey-zade's madrasa in Istanbul. From May 1626, he lectured at two schools, and in March 1633, he was appointed professor at one of the schools from the circle of the already mentioned *Sahn-i seman*. The works he wrote over this period were mainly in the field of the Arabic language (syntax, stylistics and rhetoric), which indicates that Arabic was the main subject that Musić was teaching. In 1634/35, he was appointed supreme judge (qāḍī quḍāt) in Aleppo (Syria) where, in addition to this duty, he also continued holding lectures in the Arabic syntax. He spent the last days of his life in isolation, in Rumeli Hissar (a fortress in the near vicinity of Istanbul), upon the order of Mustafa-pasha Silahdar, who was afraid that Allamek would report to the Port about his crimes and violence committed in Aleppo and its surroundings. Here, in 1636, he learned of his appointment as the Istanbul judge, which was a sign of exceptional recognition. Several days

Književnost..., 131-151; S. Grozdanić, "Neke opaske o književnosti Muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine na arapskom jeziku" [Some Remarks on the Literature of Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Arabic Language], in: *Književnost Bosne i Hercegovine u svjetlu dosadašnjih istraživanja* [The Literature of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Light of the Past Researches], ANUBiH Posebna izdanja, vol. XXXV/5, Sarajevo, 1977, 71; same author, "O književnosti Muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine na arapskom jeziku" [On the Literature of Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Arabic Language], *Radio Sarajevo – treći program*, no. 19, yearbook VII, 1978, 537-538.

¹⁸ For organization of the schooling system in the Ottoman Empire, and particularly on the role and place of "Sahn-i Seman", see: H. Inaldžik, *Osmansko Carstvo* [The Ottoman Empire], Part I, 238-239 and further on.

following, exhausted with heavy rheumatism and arthritis, Muhamed, son of Musa, Allamek died, most probably in Rumeli Hissar where he was also buried.

All of his works were written in the Arabic language. One of his works, *The Gloss to Mulla Ğami's Commentary of the Arabic Grammar "al-Kafiya"*, was printed in Istanbul in 1890, whereas the rest was preserved only in manuscripts.¹⁹ Except in the aforementioned fields, he also wrote works in logic, law, exegesis of the *Qur'an* and the dogma. All of his works, except one translation from Arabic into Turkish, are commentaries or supracommentaries. They are characterized by an independent approach to the issues which they address and by an exceptionally bold criticism, either of the author of the basic work or of other commentators, regardless of their authority or reputation they may have had at the time. His basic standpoint in reviewing any scientific problem, even in dogma, that some solution must not be accepted as indisputably correct only because some authority has already given the answer, whoever he may be.²⁰ This very explicit methodical skepticism of Muhamed Musić and his critical approach towards heritage and the basic values of his works which due to their characteristics stand in opposition to the major segment of creative activities in the Ottoman Empire, activities often encumbered with traditionalism and authority.

As for the work of Muhamed Musić in the field of logic, in the sources and literature there are various data existing. The famous Ottoman historians Muhibbi²¹ and Ismail-pasha Baghdadi²² in their works say that Allamek wrote an extensive *Gloss to Kutbudin's "Commentary aš-šamsiyya"*,²³ and Ušaki adds to all of this that this work "was known and in use".²⁴ One of the first Ottoman encyclopedists and the contemporary of Muhamed Musić, Katib Čelebi (Haji Khalifa), says that Muhamed Allamek wrote *Commentary aš-šamsiyya*, in reference to the famous work *ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya* by Nağmuddīn al-Qazwīnī al-Kātībī, and that it is "combined" (mamzūğ).²⁵

In our survey, we managed to record four manuscript copies of Musić's work, always under the title *Šarḥ ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya* [Commentary of The Sun Treatise], one in the manuscript collection of the Topkapı Museum in

¹⁹ See: H. Šabanović, *Književnost ...*, 131-151.

²⁰ See the cited fragment from Musić's work *Ḥāšiya 'alā Šarḥ al-Mawāqif* in: H. Šabanović, *Književnost ...*, 149-150.

²¹ Muhibbī, the aforementioned work, vol. IV, 302.

²² Bağdādī, the aforementioned work, vol. II, 278.

²³ The author of the main text of *ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya* is Nağm ad-din 'Alī b. 'Umar al-Qazwīnī al-Kātībī (died in 1293 or 1295, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 466 and S I, 845).

The Arabic title of the work allegedly written by Allamek should be *Ḥāšiya 'alā Šarḥ al-Quṭb 'alā aš-šamsiyya*, that is, the gloss accompanying the work *Šarḥ ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya*, by Quṭb ad-dīn Muḥammad ar-Rāzī at-Taḥṭānī (died in 1365, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 466, and S I, 845).

²⁴ See: H. Šabanović, *Književnost ...*, 148.

²⁵ Ḥağgi Ḥalīfa, II, 1064.

Istanbul, of the National Museum Library in Algiers, in the Manuscript Collection of the HAZU in Zagreb and the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo each.²⁶

Having carefully read through this work and having compared it to the basic text by al-Qazwini and to the aforementioned commentary by Kutbudin ar-Razi, we found out that this was not a gloss, but a commentary of the original text. In this text of his too, as we have already emphasized in the text above, Muhamed Musić was very skilful in using the commentaries by Sadudin at-Taftazani,²⁷ Nasirudin at-Tusi,²⁸ al-Ġurġani,²⁹ and in particular by Kutbudin ar-Razi, whose names are regularly mentioned on the margins (thence Katib Ćelebi says that this commentary is "combined"). Probably the fact that Kutbudin ar-Razi is cited very frequently gave way to those biographers, when discussing this work, to say that this is not a gloss to Kutbudin's commentary which, unless some other work by Allamek is found, can not be accepted.

1. Commentary of "The Sun Treatise"

As stated above, we have recorded four manuscript copies of this work by Musić. The copy kept at the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo is not complete. Therefore, in our work we used the copy from Algiers, the copies of which

²⁶ The Istanbul manuscript is found in the Emanet Hazinesi Kitaplığı fund, No. 1970. It contains 223 sheets, sized 18.5 × 11.5 cm. It was transcribed in 1035 (1620). See: Karatay, TSMK-AYK, C III, No. 6845.

Xerox copies of the manuscript from Bibliothèque d'Alger (N 522) are found in the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo (copies no. 1). The manuscript has 80 sheets (fol. 1b-80b), sized 13 × 19.5 cm, with 25 lines each. The work was transcribed from the autograph on May 27, 1626, by a certain Muṣṭafā b. Ĥidr al-Adirnawī (from Edirna).

The manuscript of the Oriental collection of HAZU in Zagreb carries number 1511, has 124 sheets (fol. 4b-127a), sized 13.5 × 21 cm.

The manuscript in the Oriental institute in Sarajevo, R 698, is not complete, it only has the first ten sheets (fol. 1b-10a), sized 13.5 × 21 cm.

The collection of oriental manuscripts of the National and University Library "Kliment Ohridski" in Skoplje, under no. MSA II 209/2 contains a manuscript titled *Šarḥ dibāġa ar-Risāla aġ-šamsiyya al-manqūl min Šarḥ Muḥammad Mūsā al-Bōsnawī*. The manuscript has 7 sheets (fol. 86-146), and is sized 13.5 × 20 cm. After the inspection of this manuscript (the microfilm was obtained for the needs of the Oriental Institute), and its comparison with the manuscript from Algiers, we found out that this was the transcription of the commentary for the introductory part, separately entitled by the transcriber himself.

According to some commentaries that we unfortunately were not able to verify, several copies of this work by Musić are found at the Library of Sulaymaniyya in Istanbul (Fatih 3355, Hamidiye 819, Laleli 2658 and 2661, and Šehid Ali Paša 1791).

²⁷ Sa'd ad-dīn Mas'ūd at-Taftāzāni, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G II, 278-280 (215-216), S I, 514-516, 531, 683 and S II, 301-304.

²⁸ Abū Ġa'far Našir ad-dīn at-Ṭūsī, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 670-676 (508-512), and S I, 924-933.

²⁹ Al-Ġurġānī as-Sayyid aš-Šarīf, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, in several places, and in particular G II, 280-281 (216-217) and S II, 305-306.

are found at the Oriental Institute,³⁰ and which, in spite that in the major part of the text it does not contain diacritics, is very correct in terms of spelling and grammar, and very importantly, the transcriber did not omit (as much as we could establish by comparing it with the other copies) a single word. It was transcribed from the autograph, right after the work was completed, on May 27, 1626.³¹

The work was completed, as told us in the note at the end of this manuscript,³² on February 2, 1626, and it contains 160 densely written manuscript pages. As conditioned by the main text being commented on, after the general introduction (fol. 1b-5a), the work was divided in the following manner:

1. *Introduction (al-muqaddima)*, fol. 6a-13a, consisting of two debates (baḥṭān): 1. *On the essence of logic* and, 2. *On the subject of logic*,
2. *Article One (māqala)*: *On individual terms*, fol. 13a-35a, with four sections (faṣl): 1. *On words*, 2. *On meanings*, 3. *On universal principles and particular principles* and, 4. *On definitions*,
3. *Article Two*, fol. 35a-63b, with *Introduction* (On the definition of judgments and its segments) and three sections: 1. *On categorical judgment*, 2. *On conditional judgments* and 3. *On the rules of judiciary* (direct forms of conclusion making),
4. *Article Three, On syllogism*, fol. 63b-77a, with five sections: 1. *Definition, its parts and figures*, 2. *On mixed syllogism (modal)*, 3. *On connected syllogism*, 4. *On divided syllogism* and 5. *Supplements on syllogism*.
5. *Conclusion (ḥātima)*, fol. 77a-80a, with two debates: 1. *On the contents of syllogism* and 2. *On the segments of science*.³³

This work by Musić falls in the class of medium-extensive commentaries of the *Sun Treatise*, one of the most significant works in the domain of logic in the Arabic language from the later period, the author of which, al-Qazwini al-Katibi, is the pupil of the great Arabic philosopher Nasirudin Tusi. From the aforementioned note by Musić's pupil Ibrahim son of Ramadan, and from other manuscript copies of this work, a relatively large number of them having been preserved given the time of its creation (interestingly, two of the preserved manuscripts were transcribed only several months after the work was completed), as well as from the very manner of presenting the matter, it is quite noticeable that this work was used as a logic textbook. Unfortunately, we have no data based on which we could at which level Musić was using this work as the basis for his lectures, but by the scope of the work and the encompass of the logic issues we could assume that these involved some kind of high-level religious schools. In addition to the already stated qualities of

³⁰ The copies of this manuscript are given in *Dodatak* [the Addendum].

³¹ *Šarḥ ar-Risāla aš-Šamsiyya*, fol. 80b.

³² *Ibidem*.

³³ For Arabic names for individual chapters and sections, see in the abridged *New Commentary of the "Sun Treatise"* by Mustafa Ejubović.

this commentary, we need to say that its presentation is particularly characterized by clarity, extraordinary language³⁴ and a feeling “for sufficient measure” in interpretations.

C. MUSTAFA EJUBOVIĆ – ŠEJH JUJO

One of the most prominent writers in the Arabic language from our territory is Mustafa Ejubović – Šejh Jujo /Shayh Yuyo/. Thanks primarily to the carefully written biographies assembled by his pupil Ibrahim Opijač³⁵ and Mustafa Huremija, a poet from Mostar,³⁶ it was possible to reconstruct the basic life path and work of Mustafa Ejubović. The researchers were largely also helped by Mustafa Ejubović himself, who, in the majority of his works and even in some manuscripts he transcribed, entered very precise data on the dates of completion of the works and because in several places he left a recorded bibliography of his works.³⁷

The full name of Mustafa Ejubović, as he signed himself or how he is recorded in the sources of the Arabic graphic (given in transcription), is: Muṣṭafā Yūyō (Yūyī) b. Yūsuf b. Murād Ayyūbi-zāde al-Mōstārī al-Bōsnavī. He was born in 1651 in Mostar, where his father Yousuf the son of Murat, worked as a lecturer at one of the Mostar schools. He obtained his primary education in his birth town, and in 1677 he left for Istanbul where after four years he finished education, probably at *Sahn-i Seman*. After the completed studies and apprenticeship, he worked for a period of time at one of the schools in Istanbul. It is interesting to mention from this period that his biographers recorded that

³⁴ Musić's work all over is characterized by extraordinarily good language and style, which is particularly underlined by Kamel el-Buhi (*Arapski radovi jugoslovenskih pisaca*, the unpublished doctoral dissertation defended at Belgrade University in 1963, 104) and Husein Abdel Latif as-Sayyid (the aforementioned work, 176).

³⁵ Ibrahim Opijač, *Risāla fī manāqib aš-Šayḥ Yūyō ibn Yūsuf al-Mōstārī*, autograph: GHB, no. 3585. Edition by: O. Mušić, “Ibrahim Opijač Mostarac”, *POF*, X-XI/1960-61, Sarajevo, 1961, 31-35. Translation by: M. Mujić, “Biografije Mustafa Ejubovića (Šejh Juje)”, *GVIS*, VII/1-3 (Sarajevo), 1956, 1-22.

³⁶ Huremi (Muṣṭafā ibn al-ḥāḡḡ Aḥmad ibn Ḥurram al-Mōstārī), *Nizām al-'ulamā'*, manuscript: OZ HAZU, No 86.

³⁷ In addition to the two cited sources, of the literature pertaining to the life and work of Mustafa Ejubović, we primarily need to state: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, S I, 842 and S II, 317; S. Bašagić, *Bošnjaci ...*, 118-123; the same author, *Znameniti...*, 55; M. Handžić, *Književni rad ...*, 9, 22-24, 71, 74, and 105; M. Mujić, “Šejh Jujo (1650-1707) u svjetlu književno-istorijskog materijala”, *Zora* (honorary issue), Mostar, 1968/69, 291-301; H. Šabanović, *Književnost ...*, 390-410; S. Grozdanić, “O književnosti ...”, 541-542; M. Ždralović, “Prilog poznavanju djela Šejh Juje” [A Contribution towards Knowing About the Works of Shayh Yuyo], *Hercegovina*, I, Mostar, 1981, 119-137, and A. Ljubović, “Na marginama rukopisnih djela Mustafe Ejubovića (1651-1707)” [On the margins of manuscript works by Mustafa Ejubović (1651-1707)], *Hercegovina*, IV, Mostar, 1985, 225-238.

“Shayh Yuyo was good in perceiving the weakness, sleepiness and weight of the old scholastic method of lecturing at the religious schools, and with his method of lecturing and with his textbooks he tried to blaze new trails in the methodics of lecturing”.³⁸ During his stay in Istanbul, some ten of his works were created, and in order to create his own library he transcribed a large number of documents from almost all the fields of spirituality of the time. According to the number of manuscripts preserved today (the majority is found in the Oriental Anthology of the University Library in Bratislava), one can assume that he has transcribed over 60 works. Since 1692, Shayh Yuyo was performing the duty of the supreme judge in Mostar. The last fifteen years of his life spent in Mostar were primarily characterized by his full engagement in educational work (lecturing and writing textbooks) and in some fields of science he was particularly drawn to. He died in Mostar, on July 16, 1707.

Mustafa Ejubović wrote 27 shorter and longer debates. His most numerous works are in logic and disputation (13), law (6) and then in the Arabic language, syntax and stylistics. In addition to this, he also wrote a work on Persian lexicography and metrics, two works in dogma and he made an anthology of sermons. A certain number of these works are textbooks which, as we have said in the text above, in relation to his work of a teacher, and some are the result of his personal preoccupations such as the works in logic and dialectics. So, in the Preamble to the work *Šarḥ Tahriḥ al-mantiq wa al-kalām* [Commentary of “Training in Logic and Apologetics”], which is his last work, Mustafa Ejubović says:

“I have been long involved in these two disciplines, and in these fields I have written a number of useful, larger or smaller, works. My heart would often miss a beat at the thought that I should clarify what the writer meant in certain places of this work and should comment on both the segment pertaining to logic and that pertaining to disputation.”³⁹

This means that Mustafa Ejubović was particularly occupied with the issues on logic that were necessarily linked to dialectics, that is, the science of notions, then to syntax, stylistics, and rhetorics.

1. The Commentary of “Esiri’s Treatise on Logic”

The first work on logic by Mustafa Ejubović was *Šarḥ ar-Risāla al-Afirīyya fi al-mantiq* [The Commentary of “Esiri’s Treatise on Logic”] or, it can also be found under another title of *Šarḥ Isāgūḡī* [The Commentary of “Isagogue”]. The work was completed in August 1682. Along with the autograph and several manuscript copies of this work preserved until to-date⁴⁰, this is the

³⁸ See: H. Šabanović, *Književnost ...*, 394.

³⁹ Autograph: OIS, R 4668, fol. 1b. Also see: M. Mujić, “Šejh Jujo (1650-1707) u svjetlu ...”, 298.

⁴⁰ An exceptionally large number of manuscript copies of this work have been preserved, and the autograph is found at the Oriental institute in Sarajevo, R 2379. It has a leather binding and 27 sheets (fol. 1b-27b) of unusual format, 9 × 25 cm.

only work by Šejh Jujo that was printed.⁴¹ It is a commentary of the work very well-known in the East on logic, titled *Īsāgūgī* [Isagogue] by Esirudin al-Ebheri (died in 1256).⁴² Right away, we have to say that this is not just an adaptation of the famous Porphyry's *Isagogue* or its commentary, as this can be met in the literature when addressing this compendium by al-Ebheri, but it is a piece of work for which Porphyry's title was taken, and the basic elements of his work only constitute an introductory part in reviewing the logic issues.⁴³

After the Preamble (pp. 2-6),⁴⁴ the work of Mustafa Ejubović was divided into nine chapters (bāb):

1. *Isagogue*, pp. 6-24, encompassing brief debates on words, meanings of words, relations between words and ideas, then on notions, and particularly on the *five universal principles* (type, gender, difference, quality and incidence),
2. *On interpretative speech* (al-qawl aš-šāriḥ), pp. 24-27, that is, rules of forming definitions and descriptions,
3. *On judgments* (al-qaḍāyā), pp. 27-49,
4. *On syllogism* (al-qiyās), pp. 49-73,
5. *Apodyctics* (al-burhān), pp. 73-75,
6. *Dialectics* (al-ḡadal), p. 75,
7. *Rhetorics* (al-ḥiṭāba), pp. 75-76,
8. *Poetics* (aš-ši'r), p. 76,
9. *Sophistics* (al-muḡālaṭa), pp. 76-77.

Therefore, the work has the basic layout of the material just like the one given in the *Isagogue* by Esirudin al-Ebheri. As the aforementioned structure can show, and this will be addressed more in detail in the text below, this document by Mustafa Ejubović which falls into the category of medium extensive commentaries, contains a summary of the most significant issues in the domain of logic addressed in the standard textbooks. Finally, let us not that in his commentary Mustafa Ejubović very often uses the works by ar-Razi and al-Ġurḡani, and the already mentioned work *Sources of Light on Logic*⁴⁵ and the commentaries to this work.

⁴¹ Istanbul, 1316 (1898/99), 78 pp.

⁴² Aṭīr ad-dīn Mufaḍḍal b. 'Umar al-Abharī, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 608-611 (464-465) and S I, 839-844.

⁴³ The basic content of Porphyry's work *Isagogue* (*Eisagoge* or *Introduction into Aristotle's categories*) is a debate on the five basic notions (quinque voces): gender, type, difference, quality and incidence. As the text below will show, in the *Isagogue* by al-Abhari these topics will be subject of attention only in the first chapter which will retain this title. See for more: A. Ljubović, "Da li je al-Abharijevo djelo *Īsāgūgī* adaptacija Porfirijevog djela *Eisagoge*?" [Is al'Abhari's work *Īsāgūgī* an adaptation of Porphyry's work *Eisagoge*], *POF*, 38/1988, Sarajevo, 1989, 217-223.

⁴⁴ In this paper we will quote based on the printed edition.

⁴⁵ See footnote no. 5.

2. The Useful Gloss to "Al-Fanari's Notes" for Asirudin's Treatise on Logic

Mustafa Ejubović made another referral to the *Isagogue* by Esirudin al-Ebheri ten years later (1692), when, as he says himself in the Introduction, noticed that the commentary to *Isagogue* titled *al-Fawā'id al-Fanāriyya* [Al-Fanari's Notes] written by al-Fanari (1350-1431)⁴⁶ was very adequate for clarifying a number of issues on logic, and logic is used for "... a man's mind to enjoy and for souls to connect in order to differentiate the correct from the incorrect and in order for them to be able to measure the truth and to select the undoubted facts."⁴⁷ This work carries the full title of *Ḥāšiyā mufīda li al-Fawā'id al-Fanāriyya 'alā ar-Risāla fi al-manṭiq* [The Useful Gloss to "Al-Fanari's Notes" for Asirudin's Treatise on Logic],⁴⁸ and it contains 80 pages of manuscript. It was completed on May 17, 1692.

Since this is a *ḥāšiyā*,⁴⁹ that is, a gloss which in its first variant was written in the form of margin notes, later on edited by the author and represented in the form of an integral text, given that this is a group of individual notes, explanations, interpretations or commentaries of individual words or opinions, it has no perceivable internal structure of a piece of work and no layout of material, because it is assumed that at the same time the reader is also following the text which is commented on in such a way. Nevertheless, Mustafa Ejubović tried to interconnect the margin notes and to discreetly draw the attention of the reader to where the issues from chapters of the basic text end and where they begin.⁵⁰ So, the layout of the materials is according to the text to which the notes pertain, according to *Al-Fanari's notes*, and this, again, according to the basic text, al-Ebhari's *Isagogue* whose basic structure may be seen from the above addressed work by Mustafa Ejubović *The Commentary to Isagogue*. The volume of commentary within individual chapters depends on how many "vague or unclear places" the commentator found.

3. The New Commentary of "the Sun Treatise"

One of the most renowned and most frequently commented works on logic in the Arabic language from the later period, in addition to the *Isagogue*, as we have said so in the text above, is the work titled *ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya*

⁴⁶ Šams ad-dīn b. Ḥamza al-Fanārī, see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 303-304 (233-234), S I, 647 and S II, 328-329.

⁴⁷ See: M. Ždralović, "Prilog poznavanju...", 128. Manuscript: OZ HAZU No. 198, fol. 2b.

⁴⁸ As far as we know, the only copy of this work is found as a manuscript at OZ HAZU in Zagreb, no. 198, fol. 2b-42a, sized 14.5 × 19.5 cm with 21 lines on pages each. The manuscript is bound in cardboard with a leather ridge, and it was subsequently bound into fabric too. That this is the autograph endowed in Karadžoz-bey's Library in Mostar in 1117 (1705), is testified by the note made on the manuscript (fol. 2a). See also: M. Ždralović, "Prilog poznavanju ...", 128.

⁴⁹ The word *ḥāšiyā* comes from the verb *ḥašā – yaḥšī*, and means a seam, a lining; the notes on the margin of the book; post scriptum and the like. See: T. Muftić, *Arapsko-srpskohrvatski rječnik*, Sarajevo, 1973.

⁵⁰ See, for instance: fol. 22a, 26b, 37b.

[The Sun Treatise] by Nağmudin al-Qazwini al-Katibi (died in 1295).⁵¹ As the work was written in quite summarized terms, and as it contains a number of incomplete and unclear places, and it has been commented really often, therefore the commentaries may feature quite opposing interpretations of the basic text. In order to remove the unclear and opposing places, in contesting the wrong interpretations of the then already famous authorities, in 1690, Mustafa Ejubović wrote *aš-Šarḥ al-ğadīd ‘alā aš-Šamsiyya fī al-manṭiq* [The New Commentary of “the Sun Treatise”].⁵² Ejubović comments on this in a typically oriental style:

“*The Sun Treatise* by the scientist and great sage, the sun of the nation and the faith, al-Katibi..., is the most exalted and most magnificent work written in this field (logic, note by A. Lj.), and it contains even the most enlightened expressions and encompasses some pearl meanings. Although it is small by volume it is very useful, and although it has a short necklace it contains the beads of some very precious rules. Since the secrets of his truths are veiled by briefness, and the innocence of its fineness are shielded behind the curtain of brief presentation, many scientists have tried to explain the unclear positions in the *Sun Treatise* and wrote commentaries and glosses in order to make its benefits accessible. However, disputes arose among them, and oppositions between their words. Therefore I have decided to write *The New Commentary of the Sun Treatise* and to unveil it, reveal its secrets, and remove the curtains.”⁵³

This work by Mustafa Ejubović has 286 pages, and the basic layout was made in accordance with the basic text, divided into the *Introduction*, three articles and the *Conclusion*. Ejubović aimed towards this work to address not only the issues mentioned in the basic text but to include as many issues as possible, we would say, to encompass almost all the logic topics known in the existing literature written in the Arabic language thus far, although the modestly said that he wishes to supplement this “short necklace”. The vast material he gathered very skillfully and logically he includes into the basic layout, opening new chapters, sub-sections and making new distributions. His extreme neatness and systematism characterizing his work in general come to the full expression here. Surely, the very nature of logic itself allowed for this to a large extent. The work begins with the *Preamble* (fol. 1b-5a), which is followed by:

⁵¹ See footnote no. 23.

⁵² We know about two manuscript copies of this work.

The autograph is kept at the Gazi-Husrev-bey’s Library, no. 793, fol. 1a-142b, sized 13 × 20 cm, with 23 lines on each page. We also used the autograph in our work and cited based on it.

The other manuscript copy is found today at the Oriental Anthology of HAZU under no. 1407/II, fol. 7b-146a, sized 13 × 20 cm. This is a transcript from 1781, made by Ahmad, son of Husain, from Ljubuški.

⁵³ Autograph: GHB, no. 793, fol. 1b-2a.

Introduction (al-muqaddima), fol. 5a-13a,

- (1) *Debate on the essence of logic* (baḥṭ fi bayān māhiyya al-mantiq), fol. 5a-10b,
- (2) *Debate on the subject of logic* (fi mawḍū' li al-mantiq), fol. 10b-13a,

Article One – On individual notions (al-maqāla al-'ūlā – fi al-mufradāt), fol. 13b-54b.

1. *Section on words* (al-faṣl fi al-alfāz), fol. 14a-25b,
2. *Section on simple ideas* (fi al-ma'ānī al-mufrada), fol. 25a-38b,
3. *Section on researching the general and the individual* (Fī mabāḥiṭ al-kullī wa al-ḡuz'ī), fol. 38b-50b,
 - a. *Researching the general notion* (mabḥaṭ fi al-kullī), fol. 38b-39a,
 - b. *Research on the nature of the general notion*, fol. 39a-40a,
 - c. *Research on the opposition of notions*, fol. 40a-45a,
 - d. *Research on the individual notion*, fol. 45a-46b,
 - e. *Research on the universal notions*, fol. 46b-50b,
 - f. *Section on definitions* (al-faṣl fi at-ta'rīfāt), fol. 50b-54b,

Article Two – On Judgments (fi al-qaḍāyā), fol. 54b-106b,

Introduction, fol. 54b-57b,

1. *Section on categorical judgment* (fi al-ḥamliyya), fol. 57b-80a,
 - a. *Research on its parts and divisions* (fi aḡzā'ihā wa aqsāmihā), fol. 57b-62b,
 - b. *Research on Establishing the quantity of judgments* (fi taḥqīq al-maḥṣūrāt), fol. 62b-65a,
 - c. *Research on determination and scope of judgments* (fi al-'udūl wa at-taḥṣīl), fol. 65a-69a,
 - d. *Research on modal judgments* (fi al-qaḍāyā al-muwaḡḡaha), fol. 69b-80a,
2. *Section on the division of conditional judgments* (fi aqsām aš-šarṭiyya), fol. 80a-87b,
3. *Section on direct conclusion making* (fi aḥkām al-qaḍāyā), fol. 87b-106b,
 - a. *Research on opposition of judgments* (contradictoriness and contrariness) (fi at-tanāquḍ), fol. 87b-93a,
 - b. *Research on conversion – equipollence* (fi al-'aks al-mustawā), fol. 93a-101a,
 - c. *Research of contraposition* (fi 'aks an-naqīḍ), fol. 101a-106a,
 - d. *Research on conditional judgments* (fi lawāzim aš-šarṭiyyāt), fol. 106a-106b,

Article Three – On Syllogism (fi al-qiyās), fol. 106b-137b,

1. *Section on definition of the syllogism and its parts* (fi ta'rīf al-qiyās wa aqsāmihī), fol. 106b-120a,

- a. *Figure One* (aš-šakl al-awwal), fol. 109a-111a,
 - b. *Figure Two*, fol. 111a-113a,
 - c. *Figure Three*, fol. 113a-115b,
 - d. *Figure Four*, fol. 115b-120a,
2. *Section on the conditions of conclusions given the modality in mixed syllogism* (fī šarā'it li al-intāg bi ḥasb al-ḡiha fī al-muḥtaliḡāt), fol. 120a-127b.
 - a. *Figure One*, fol. 120a-122a,
 - b. *Figure Two*, fol. 122a-124b,
 - c. *Figure Three*, fol. 124b-125b,
 - d. *Figure Four*, fol. 125b-127b,
 3. *Section on the connected syllogism with conditional judgments* (fī al-iqtirāniyyāt al-kā'ināt min aš-šarṭiyyāt), fol. 127b-131b,
 - a. *Conjunctive judgments* (al-muttašilāt), fol. 128a-129a,
 - b. *Disjunctive judgments* (al-munfašilāt), fol. 129a-129b,
 - c. *Categorical and conjunctive* (al-ḥamliyya wa al-muttašila), fol. 129b-130a,
 - d. *Categorical and disjunctive*, fol. 130a-131a,
 - e. *Conjunctive and disjunctive*, fol. 131a-131b,
 4. *Section on divided syllogism* (fī al-qiyās al-istiḡnā'ī, fol. 131b-134b,
 5. *Section on supplements to syllogism* (fī lawāḥiq al-qiyās), fol. 134b-137b,
 - a. *Complex syllogism* (al-qiyās al-murakkab), fol. 134b-135a,
 - b. *Syllogism of absurd* (al-qiyās al-ḥulf), fol. 135a-136b,
 - c. *Induction* (al-istiqrā'), fol. 136b-137a,
 - d. *Analogy* (at-tamṡil), fol. 137a- b,
- Conclusion*, fol. 137b-142b,
1. *Research on integral parts of syllogism* (fī mawādd al-aqyisa), fol. 137b-142a,
 - a. *undoubtedly sure knowledge* (yaqīniyyāt), fol. 137b-139a,
 - *initial knowledge or axioms*, fol. 138a,
 - *knowledge obtained from experience*, fol. 138b,
 - *knowledge obtained from experiment*, fol. 138b,
 - *intuitive knowledge*, fol. 138b-139a,
 - *conveyed knowledge*, fol. 139a,
 - *propositions in the basis of which syllogism lies*, fol. 139a-139b,
 - *apodyctics* (burhān), fol. 139b-140b,
 - b. *unsure knowledge* (ḡayr yaqīniyyāt), fol. 140b-142a,
 - *dialectics* (ḡadal), fol. 140b,
 - *rhetorics* (ḥiṡāba), fol. 140b-141a,
 - *poetics* (šī'r), fol. 141a-141b,
 - *sophistics* (safsāṡa), fol. 141b-142a,

2. *Research on segments of science* (fī aǧzā' al-'ulūm), fol. 142a-143b,
 1. *subjects of science* (mawḍū'āt al-'ulūm), fol. 142a-142b,
 2. *principles of science* (al-mabādi'), fol. 142b,
 - *axioms* (al-bayyina bi nafsihā),
 - *postulates* (ǧayr al-bayyina bi nafsihā),
 - *hypotheses* (al-waḍ').
 3. *issue of science- theses* (al-masā'il), fol. 142b-143a.

Although we did not go through to the end in representing the structure of this work by Ejubović (we did not show the divisions within the sub-sections, research and the like), this already shows that the author had a very good mastery of the logic and that he succeeded, as for all those logic issues he wanted to address, to perceive those features by which they could be classified. Thus he also made an extraordinary key to their nature itself. In the Preamble to this work of his (fol. 4b-5a), he speaks about its division and about the significance of the good composition, and with his work itself he shows how an extraordinarily extensive matter can be put into a logical and harmonic whole, and apply the logical method of classification that he is actually addressing. In the Preamble, just as we have already stressed it in the text above, Mustafa Ejubović underlines that in completing this work he used the texts of a large number of famous Arabic logicians, primarily stressing Ibn Sina and al-Farabi, and some dozen other authors and their works. Thanks to the fact that the autograph of this work has been preserved, including its many margin and interlinear notes, one can say that Ejubović had in mind almost all the major works on logic in the Arabic language. Here he mentions there works by Ibn Sina,⁵⁴ and the commentaries of his work *The Book of Instructions...* by Fahrudin ar-Razi,⁵⁵ Nasirudin at-Tusi,⁵⁶ al-Isfahani,⁵⁷ and others, independent works (except the aforementioned ones) by Abdulmalik al-Hunaǧi (1194-1249), Kamaludin ibn Yunus (1156-1242), Naǧmudin al-Katibi (died

⁵⁴ In addition to the two already mentioned works by Ibn Sina, *Kitāb al-iṣārāt wa at-tanbihāt* and *Kitāb aš-šifā'*, Mustafa Ejubović also mentioned the work *An-Naǧāt*.

⁵⁵ Fahr ad-dīn ar-Rāzī (died in 606/1209), wrote two works – commentaries on this work. These are: *Lubāb al-iṣārāt*, the work which had several subsequent editions (Cairo, 1882, 1907, 1916, and 1936), and *Šarḥ al-iṣārāt fī at-tabī'iyāt*. See: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 454 and S I, 816.

⁵⁶ Našīr ad-dīn aṭ-Ṭūsī (died in 672/1273) wrote the work which in fact is a critic of ar-Rāzī's commentary (see footnote no. 55) under the title of *Ḥall muškilāt al-Iṣārāt*. See: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 454, and S I, 816.

⁵⁷ Maḥmūd ibn 'Abd ar-Raḥmān al-Iṣfahānī (14th century), see: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G I, 418; G II, 47; S I, 537, 628, 742, 926, and S II, 137.

The text by M. Ejubović does not clearly indicate what work by al-Iṣfahānī the referral was to. Probably this was the work under the title *al-Muḥākama bayna Našīr ad-dīn wa ar-Rāzī*, see: Introduction A. M. Goichon with: Ibn Sina (Avicenne), *Livre des directives et remarques*, Beyrouth-Paris, 1951, 73.

in 1246), al-Urmawi, Shamsuddin as-Samarkandi, al-Taftazani, al-Ġurġani, al-Fanari, and others.⁵⁸

Finally, in connection with the literature used and the manner of presentation and structure of work, one needs to say that Mustafa Ejubović is very skillful in integrating the basic text, the literature used and his own thoughts and views so that it all fits in together into the above presented mosaic of notions, logical issues and knowledge. In our estimation, this work by Ejubović is not only his most significant work on logic, but also one of the major, if not the most valuable, work in this domain in our heritage. However, judging by the number of the preserved copies, the *Commentary of "Isagogue"* seemed to have been more popular.

4. The Commentary on "Training in Logic and Apologetics"

Even the last work written by Mustafa Ejubović, completed on September 13, 1706, is partially dedicated to logic. This is the work *Šarḥ 'alā Tahdīb al-mantiq wa al-kalām* [The Commentary on "Training in Logic and Apologetics"].⁵⁹ This is the commentary on the work written by Sadudin at-Taftazani (died in 1389).⁶⁰ The first part of the commentary (until page 85 of the autograph) is dedicated to logic, and the second part (from page 85 through page 285) to apologetics or, more exactly, to application of the dialectal method in theology.⁶¹ In the *Introduction*, explaining what prompted him to write the commentary to this work, Mustafa Ejubović says:

⁵⁸ For data on individual authors, see C. Brockelmann, *GAL*.

⁵⁹ To date, we have recorded two manuscript copies of this work.

The autograph is kept at the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo, no. 4668 (fol. 1b-242b), sized 13.5 × 20.3 cm, with 23 lines on each page. It is bound in cardboard with leather ridge and lining. In addition to the author's notes about endowment and conditions for use of the book, the protective sheet also contains the original seal of Mustafa Ejubović. We used this autograph for this work and we cited according to it.

The second copy is kept at the Oriental Anthology of HAZU under no. 412 (fol. 4b-253b), sized 13 × 21.2 cm, with 23 lines per page. It was transcribed by Ahmad, son of Husain, from Mostar, on Zulkadde 19, 1151 (April 1, 1739). See: M. Ždralović, "Prilog poznavanju djela Šejha Juje", *Hercegovina*, no. I, 128-129.

⁶⁰ Sa'd ad-dīn Mas'ūd b. 'Umar at-Taftazānī, died in 791/1389. See: C. Brockelmann, *GAL*, G II, 278-280, (215-216), S I, 514-516, 531, 683 and S II, 301-304.

⁶¹ The Arabic expression *kalām* means speech, word, discussion, but also, often in the construction *kalām Allah*, it means *Godly speech*. Thence '*ilm al-kalām* becomes a denotation of the discipline that will deal with thinking about the "word" communicated to the man in the Qur'an. In his *Muqaddima*, Ibn Haldun defines *kalām* with the following words: "This is a science containing arguments based on rational evidence in defense of religious dogma against the novelty-mongers who vary from the principle of faith in comparison to their predecessors and traditionalists (followers of the tradition)". (*Muqaddima*, Kairo, s.a., 458). In the western literature, the most frequent names found for this discipline are dialectal or speculative theology, or scholastic philosophy. Its relation to logic will be addressed on another occasion.

“On logic and apologetics, the significance of which is known by those who have a grip of the things, many works have been written, some of them more concise and some more extensive. However, the work *Tahḏīb al-manṭiq wa al-kalām*, which was written by top scientists and great names, models of respected and learned men, a contemporary scientist and big capacity Sadudin Taftazani ..., is a highly valued work, liking to a pearl necklace, and its text is brilliantly written. With his greatness he has exceeded all of the great. If I spent all of my life praising and commending, my tongue would then be incapable of describing all the good sides of this work. Due to its excessive conciseness it is hard to understand it, and not everyone shooting can have a straight shot of it; only those strong can come to its water, and what he wants to say is only graspable to the talented. I have never seen a single complete commentary to this work. All that I have seen is what has been given as commentaries by some prominent scientists in relation to that part pertaining to logic. I have never even heard that there is a complete commentary at all...”⁶²

In the text *Training in Logic and Apologetics* commented by Mustafa Ejubović, the logic topics are not presented so systematically or neatly like in the previously stated works. The author of the basic text, Saddudin Taftazani, classifies the materials based on the two fundamental issues: *perceptions* (taṣawwūrāt) and *claims* (taṣdīqāt), which constitute two chapters, and into *Introduction* (muqaddima) and *Conclusion* (ḥātima). A similar standpoint in the classification of materials was also assumed by Hasan Kafi Pruščak in his work *Kafi's Compendium on Logic*, whereas Pruščak develops this standpoint in a very natural and logical fashion. Mustafa Ejubović develops Taftazani's classification trying to make it as neat as possible, and to this goal, on the first two sheets of the autograph he provides the work's table of contents with the titles of chapters and pagination,⁶³ which is a rare phenomenon at those times. After the general introduction (fol. 1b-5a), the section dedicated to logic is divided in the following manner:

Introduction (muqaddima), fol. 5a,

1. *On the meaning of words* (dalāla al-lafz), fol. 6b,

2. *Understanding* (al-mafhūm), fol. 8b.

Perceptions (taṣawwūrāt), fol. 10b,

(1) *Five universal principles* (al-kulliyyāt al-ḥams), fol. 10b,

(2) *On genders* (al-aḡnās), fol. 12a,

⁶² See: Autograph, OIS, no. 4668, fol. 1b-2a. Translation by: M. Mujić, “Šejh Jujo u svjetlu ...”, 297-298.

⁶³ These two sheets were inserted into the code subsequently (by the handwriting one can see that they were written by M. Ejubović) so that they do not fit into the original numerical order of fol., and they are found between the protective sheet and the first folio which was also subsequently transcribed and inserted into the code. This is also indicated upon by the different type of paper used for the first four folios.

- (3) *Statement on something* (al-maqūl ‘alā aš-šay’), fol. 13a,
- (4) *Factor for the “higher” is a factor for the “lower”* (al-muqawwim li al-‘ālī muqawwim li as-sāfil), fol. 13b,
- (5) *Conclusion on research of the universal principles* (ḥātima li mabāḥiṭ al-kulliyāt), fol. 14b,
- (6) *Section on that which defines something* (mu‘arrif aš-šay’), fol. 15a,

Claims – categorical judgments (taṣdīqāt), fol. 16b,

- (1) *Conditional judgments* (aš-šarṭiyyāt), fol. 16b,
- (2) *On opposition* (at-tanāquḍ), fol., 26a,
- (3) *On conversion* (al-‘aks al-mustawā), fol. 28b,
- (4) *On contraposition* (al-‘aks al-munqid), fol. 30b,
- (5) *On syllogism* (al-qiyās), fol. 31b,
- (6) *On conditional integrated syllogism* (aš-šarṭī al-iqtirānī), fol. 36b,
- (7) *On disintegrated syllogism* (al-qiyās al-istiṭnā’ī), fol. 37b,
- (8) *On induction* (al-istiqrā’), fol. 39a,
- (9) *Syllogism is either apodyctical...* (al-qiyās immā burhānī ...), fol. 39b,

Conclusion – segments of science (ḥātima ‘ağzā’ al-‘ulūm), fol. 40b-42a.

Although to a relatively small extent, Mustafa Ejubović made efforts to include as many logical issues as possible in this work as well. The fact remains that it is no so neat and systematical like his previous works, which is, quite certainly, conditioned by the text commented on. As though this was felt by Shayh Yuyo himself, who in several places in this text referred the reader to his *New Commentary on the “Sun Treatise”*.⁶⁴ As could be seen from the above quoted segment, his goal was to provide commentary and to associate logic and application of its methods in apologetics, which will be addressed more in detail somewhat later. For this commentary too, Mustafa Ejubović used the numerous works on logic (mentioning mainly those same works that he used in the *New Commentary* too), and we need to add that some notes show that he had knowledge of the works by Aristotle too (fol. 42a), understandably indirectly, through the works of the Arabic classic.

D. MUHAMED ČAJNIČANIN

On Muhamed, son of Mustafa, Čajničanin sources and literature provides very little data.⁶⁵ All of them can be summarized in a couple of sentences. He was

⁶⁴ See, for instance, fol. 12a-13b.

⁶⁵ The data from these sources are used in the following works: Bašeskija, *Ljetopis*, Sarajevo, 1968, 247 and 391. S. Kemura, *Sarajevske muftije* [Sarajevo’s Muftis], Sarajevo, 1916, 17-19; M. Handžić, *Književni rad...*, 105; Kamel el-Buhi, *Arapski radovi ...*, 398-399; H. Hasandedić, “Djela i kraći sastavi ...” [Works and shorter

born in the town of Čajniče in 1731. In his texts, and he was also mentioned as such in the sources, he signed as Muḥammad b. Muṣṭafā al-Čaynawī. He finished his primary school in Sarajevo, and his higher education in Istanbul. From 1781 through 1783 he taught at the Djumišića madrasa in Sarajevo, and twice, in 1783 and 1785, he was appointed the Sarajevo supreme judge. He died in Sarajevo, on March 20, 1792. From the period he taught at the religious school comes the only of his works known so far, in the field of logic, under the title of *Fatḥ al-asrār fī šarḥ al-Īsāgūṭī* [Revealing Secrets in Commenting the "Isagogue"] preserved in several manuscript copies.⁶⁶ So this constitutes a medium extensive commentary of al-Ebheri's *Isagogue* written on some 120 pages. After the extensive Preamble (fol. 1b-11a), in accordance with the basic text, the text itself is divided into nine chapters as follows:

1. *Isagogue*, fol. 11a-37a,
2. *On interpretative speech* (fī al-qawl aš-šāriḥ), fol. 37a-40b,
3. *On judgments* (fī al-qaḍāyā), fol. 40b-62a,
4. *On syllogism* (fī al-qiyās), fol. 62a-82a,
5. *Apodyctics* (al-burhān), fol. 82a-84b,
6. *Dialectics* (al-ḡadal), fol. 84b-85a,
7. *Rhetoric* (al-ḥiṭāba), fol. 85a-85b,
8. *Poetics* (aš-ši'r), fol. 85b,
9. *Sophistic* (al-muḡālaṭa), fol. 85b-86a.

When comparing this work with the *Commentary of "Isagogue"* by Mustafa Ejubović addressed above, we established that some three fourths of

essays...], *Anali GHB*, vol. IV, Sarajevo, 1976, 117-118; A. Bejtić, "Jedno viđenje sarajevskih evlija i njihovih grobova kao kulturnih mjesta" [A View of the Sarajevo Prominent Persons and their Graves as Cult Places], *POF*, XXXI/1981, Sarajevo, 1982, 116.

⁶⁶ Here we indicate of the five manuscript copies of this work we have reviewed and collated for this occasion. These are: OIS, R 933; GHB, no. 219 and 2429; OZ HAZU, N 1243 (here some ten manuscript sheets are missing), and the manuscript from the Archives of Herzegovina in Mostar, no. 138.

Since we have estimated that the manuscript copy from the Archives of Herzegovina is a very correct one (with an exceptionally small number of spelling and other mistakes), and legible in addition to this, we have decided to use this copy in our work and to cite from it.

The manuscript has 80 sheets (fol. 1b-86b), sized 17 × 11 cm, with 15 lines on each page. It is bound in fabric, and it was transcribed by a certain Yusuf, a pupil of the religious school at Bentbaša in Sarajevo (see fol. 86). See: H. Hasanefendić, *Katalog arapskih, turskih i perzijskih rukopisa* [A Catalogue of Arabic, Turkish and Persian manuscripts], Mostar, 1977, 21.

At the time of completion of this paper, we received a piece of information from our colleague Salih Trako that there is another manuscript copy of this work at the National and University Library "Petar Kočić" in Banjaluka (code III-548-1), which is most probably the autograph. (See: S. Trako, "Tragovi minulih stoljeća" [The Traces of the Past Centuries], *Nedeljni Glas*, Banjaluka, 20th and 21st September 1986, 8).

the commentary by Muhammad Čajničanin are completely identical with the work by Mustafa Ejubović, that is, that a significant number of fragments was taken from this work. Our attention to this was drawn by a sentence in which Ejubović, speaking about one method of conversion, says: "Verification of this place are lines in our commentary next to the glosses pertaining to the work *Disputation* by Mesud (Rumi) and we have explained this to him to a sufficient extent."⁶⁷ And indeed, Mustafa Ejubović commented this work twice,⁶⁸ and five years before the creation of *The Commentary to "Isagogue"*, at the time when he was heavily involved in disputation and dialectic, he completed an extremely extensive anthology of, in his opinion, twelve major texts in this domain, which is found today at the University Library in Bratislava.⁶⁹

The same aforementioned sentence was taken by Muhammad Čajničanin.⁷⁰ As we do not have the autograph of M. Čajničanin at our disposal today, we can not be sure if he himself has left any trace of how he used Ejubović's *Commentary to "Isagogue"*, but the text itself proves this without doubt. The first section of the title itself, *Revealing Secrets...*, frequent in the Orient in other domains too, is in a way indicative of these being supplements or supercommentary.

Although the Arabic language work in the domain of logic from the later period overall can be estimated as though being in the spirit of idea and form of their great predecessors, as for Muhammad Čajničanin, or rather for "his work", one can say that it is of a typically epigonic character.

D. OTHER AUTHORS

In addition to these four authors for whose biographies we had reliable sources and literature, and whose work in the field of logic left visible traces, research of Oriental manuscript anthologies by our authors revealed to us another number of authors, and in addition to them a certain number of the names of logic teachers and transcribers of a large number of works in this field. However, on the majority of them we did not succeed in finding valid sources which would help us to at least partially reconstruct their biographies and to establish their full identities. Nevertheless, for this work, we selected three more authors who have some major essays on logic, and with whom, as an integral part of their names, an indication exists showing the place of birth or place of living, or whose works contain data based on which it is possible to establish an at least approximate time of their creation.

⁶⁷ Mustafa Ejubović, *Šarḥ Isāgūḡī ...*, 49.

⁶⁸ See: A. Ljubović, "Na marginama rukopisnih djela Mustafe Ejubovića (1651-1707)", *Hercegovina*, no. 4. Mostar, 1985, 231-233.

⁶⁹ J. Blaškovič and others, *Arabische, türkische und persische Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek in Bratislava*, Bratislava, 1961, No 249-260, 192-202.

⁷⁰ Muhamed Čajničanin, *Fatḥ al-asrār ...*, fol. 61b.

1. Ibrahim, son of Ramadan, Bosniak

This author was first indicated upon by Mehmed Handžić in his text "Several Precious Manuscripts at the Karadžoz-Bey's Library in Mostar",⁷¹ when he found a manuscript titled *Ta'liqāt 'alā Šarḥ aš-Šamsiyya* [Notes to the "Commentary of the Sun Treatise"]. M. Handžić focused his attention to the introductory words, which among other things, state: "...Ibrahim, son of Ramadan, Bosniak, al-Aqhisari (Pruščak), al-Nawabadi says: These words that I have written pertain to the *Commentary of the "Sun Treatise"* by a prominent scholar, Bosniak..., when I had the honor to study it in front of him."⁷² Based on these words, he concluded that the "prominent scholar, Bosniak" is a reference to Mustafa Ejubović, and that this was his pupil and a gloss to his commentary.

In his doctoral dissertation, criticizing the conclusion of M. Handžić, rashly made, in his opinion, Kamel al-Buhi assumed that this pertained to Muhammad Musić Allamek, margin notes on his work and his pupil.⁷³

All the subsequent researchers of our heritage in the Oriental languages who mentioned this author were biased against either of these assumptions, not entering the content of the work itself. Probably one of the reasons was also that in his work M. Handžić did not state the number of the manuscript code or any other data on the manuscript at the time when he reviewed it himself.

Tracing back the data saying that this manuscript used to be kept at the manuscript fund of the Karadžoz-Bey's library, we managed to find this manuscript at the Gazi Husrev-Bey's library,⁷⁴ so that we can state the following on this work and on its author:

- the full name of author, given in transliteration, is: Ibrāhīm b. Ramaḍān al-Bōsnavī al-Āqhišārī al-Nawābādī,⁷⁵

⁷¹ M. Handžić, "Nekoliko dragocjenih rukopisa u Karadžozbegovoj biblioteci u Mostaru" [Several precious manuscripts at the Karadžoz-bey's Library in Mostar], *GIVZ*, II/12, 1934, 633-639.

⁷² Ibrahim, son of Ramadan, *Ta'liqāt...*, fol. 1b.

M. Handžić brings this sentence in the original and in the Bosnian translation, however, with Handžić, the words "al-Āqhišārī al-Nawābādī" are missing. We do not know why.

⁷³ Kame al-Buhi, *Arapski radovi jugoslovenskih pisaca*, Beograd, 1963, 394-395.

Buhi brings the conclusion based on the assumption that Mustafa Ejubović was more known under the name of "al-Mōstārī", and that Ibrahim son of Ramadan, if he had meant him, would have used this denotation rather than "al-Bosnawī". Based on the quotation he took from Handžić's work (with the mistake that occurred to Handžić), we can assume that Buhi had had no insight into the manuscript itself.

⁷⁴ GHB, R 4043 (the code of the Karadžoz-bey's Library is K 718). The manuscript has 55 sheets (fol. 1a-55a), sized 19 × 12 cm, with 17 lines each.

⁷⁵ Fol. 1b.

- there is no original title in the manuscript, but, having in mind the formulation such as provided by the author in the introductory work, the title could be accepted as the one denoted by M. Handžić, *Ta'liqāt 'alā Šarḥ aš-Šamsiyya* [Notes to the “Commentary of the Sun Treatise”];⁷⁶
- based on a detailed text analysis, one can say that it constitutes margin notes, given *in continuo*, to the work of Muhammad Musić Allamek *Commentary to the “Sun Treatise”*;
- the work is not completed (unless some other copy is found in which everything is complete), but it was commented on until just before the end of the first section (faṣl) of the first article (maqāla)⁷⁷ or, in other words, it contains glosses to:
 1. *Preamble*,
 2. *Introduction*,
 - a) *Discussion on the essence of logic*,
 - b) *Discussion on the subject of logic*,
 3. *On individual notions*,
 - a) *Section on words*.⁷⁸

It is very hard to establish today who Ibrahim, son of Ramadan was. However, from the scarce data found in the introduction to his work, it is quite certain that he lived in mid-17th century, that he was the pupil of Muhammed Musić, which means that the work was written before 1636, that he originates from Prusac or, more precisely, that he is associated to the toponyme of Nawabad, a settlement in the vicinity of Prusac, founded by Hasan Kāfī Pruščak.⁷⁹ Based on some indications such as the name of Ibrahim or the denotation of Pruščak, the time of activity, the field of interest and the like, there is a possibility that this is the same author mentioned by G. Flügel in his *Catalogue* as the author of the brief text on logic (two pages) pertaining to the four syllogism figures.⁸⁰ However, we have no sufficient valid proof to confirm this assumption.

⁷⁶ See: M. Handžić, “Nekoliko ...”, 635.

⁷⁷ The basic text and the text of Musić’s commentary are divided into: Introduction (with two discussions), three Articles, and the Conclusion.

⁷⁸ For Arabic titles for individual chapters see the text above addressing the *Commentary of the “Sun Treatise”* by Muhammad Musić and the *New Commentary to the “Sun Treatise”* by Mustafa Ejubović.

⁷⁹ See H. Šabanović, *Književnost...*, 176, and A. Handžić, “O formiranju nekih gradskih naselja u Bosni u XVI vijeku” [On the formation of some urban settlements in Bosnia in the 16th century], *POF*, XXV/1975, Sarajevo, 1976, 148-152.

⁸⁰ The title of this short discussion is *ar-Risāla al-muta’llaqa bi al-aškāl al-arba’a* (The Tractate pertaining to the four figures), it was written (sic! Or transcribed?) in 1695/96 (1107), and today it is found at the National Library in Vienna, Mixt. 1327,3 (fol. 122v-123r). For comparison: H. Šabanović, *Književnost...*, p. 663, and S. Trako, “Ibrahim Munib Akhisari i njegov ‘Pravni zbornik’ [Ibrahim Munib Akhisari and his “Legal Almanac”], *POF*, 28-29/1978-9, Sarajevo, 1980, 215.

As for the work of the *Notes to the "Commentary of the Sun Treatise"*, one can say that besides constituting margin notes (*ḥāṣhiya*) to Musić's work by their form, they are also of epigonic character by their contents. In the majority of these notes (*ta'liqāt*), Ibrahim son of Ramadan was only trying to clarify what Musić in certain cases had said more briefly or more simply, and very seldom referring to the literature where the author himself had not done so, primarily to the works by Ibn Sina.

2. Fadil Užičanin

This author is not mentioned in any of the major works of bibliographic character (either in the Ottoman chronicles, or in the most recent works). Gathering the Oriental manuscripts throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina for the then JAZU in Zagreb, Aleksej Olesnicki found a manuscript on logic authored by a certain Fadil Užičanin, filed it into the Oriental Archive of the JAZU and made a catalogized it for internal use. Based on this catalogization, Fadil Užičanin and his work are mentioned by M. Ždralović in one of the notes to the work "A Contribution to Knowledge About the Work of Shayh Yuyo".⁸¹ After a detailed inspection of the manuscript copy of the work carrying the title of *Šarḥ matn Īsāgūgī li mawlā al-Fāḍil Ūžičawlī* [The Commentary to the Text of Isagogue by mula-Fadil Užičanin], which is found in the manuscript archive of JAZU even today,⁸² we can say the following:

- "mula-Fadil Užičanin" was denoted as the author;
- the text carries the aforementioned title denoted by A. Olesnicki as well, and the text itself shows that it falls into the category of medium extensive commentaries of *Isagogue* by Esirudin al-Ebheri;
- the content is divided, according to the basic text, into the following:
 1. *Preamble*, fol. 1b-3a,
 2. *Isagogue* (encompassing a discussion of words and a discussion of the five universal principles), fol. 3a-9a,
 3. *On interpretative speech* (rules of forming definitions and descriptions), fol. 9a-10b,
 4. *On judgments*, fol. 10b-20a,
 5. *On syllogism*, fol. 20a-26b,
 6. *Apodyctic*, fol. 26b-28a,
 7. *Dialectic*, fol. 28a-28b,
 8. *Rhetoric*, fol. 28b,
 9. *Poetics*, fol. 28b, and
 10. *Sophistic*, fol. 28b-29a.⁸³

⁸¹ M. Ždralović, "Prilog poznavanju ...", *Hercegovina*, no. 1, Mostar, 1981, 136, note no. 33.

⁸² OZ HAZU, N. 728. The manuscript has 29 sheets (fol. 1a-29a), sized 18 × 12 cm, with 25 lines each. It is bound in leather. This is possibly an autograph.

⁸³ For Arabic names for individual chapters see in the adaptation of the *Commentary to "Isagogue"* by Mustafa Ejubović.

The work was completed in the summer (more precisely, between July 23 and August 2) of 1657.⁸⁴ Based on the sources and literature we have at our disposal today, one can not establish who Fadil Uzicanin was, even the denotation "Fāḍil" itself, which we accepted to be more of a personal name, does not have to be this. Namely, in the manuscripts of Oriental origins it is a frequent practice that instead of the name of an author renowned at that time, the word "fadil" should be used, in the meaning of exquisite, excellent; prominent; learned, and the like.⁸⁵

Both by its internal structure and content, the work itself is very similar to the work by Mustafa Ejubović *Commentary to "Isagogue"* and the one by Muhammad Čajničanin *Revealing Secrets*. The obvious difference in the structure between this work and the other works we have addressed in the text above is that in his commentary Fadil Užičanin has no particular introduction, not even a particular invocation, but he goes on directly to the commentary of the basic work, and that on the first sheet (fol. 1a) he has a brief table of contents for the work in the Turkish language. Of the major differences in the contents, we need to mention that in the chapter *On Syllogism* (qiyās) Fadil Uzicanin focused his attention on the first syllogistic figure and its modes, whereas for the other figures he only states the rules of implementation.⁸⁶

3. Muhammad, son of Yusuf, Bosniak

The work under the title *Fath al-asrār fī šarḥ Īsāğūğī fī 'ilm al-manṭiq* (Revealing Secrets in Commenting on the "Isagogue" in the science of logic), authored by Muhammad son of Yusuf, "al-Bosnawi", just like the previous work, was discovered and processed for the internal catalogue of Oriental manuscripts of JAZU by A. Olesnicki,⁸⁷ and then, in one of his notes, it was mentioned by M. Ždralović.⁸⁸

Just like other works constituting the commentary to *Isagogue* by Esirudin al-Ebheri we have addressed in the text above, this work too has a fully identical structure:

1. *Preamble*, fol. 107b-112b,
2. *Isagogue*, fol. 112a-117b,
3. *On interpretative speech*, fol. 117b-119a,

⁸⁴ Fadil Užičanin, *Šarḥ matn ...*, fol. 29a.

⁸⁵ As a typical example of such use of this word we had in the aforementioned work by Ibrahim son of Ramadan, who in place of the full name of Muhamed Musić states: "al-fāḍil an-niḥḍīr al-Bōsnawī", which was quite sufficient to recognize the person referred to at the time and in the environment he lived in.

⁸⁶ See fol. 22b-23a.

⁸⁷ OZ HAZU, No. 797/III. The work has 26 sheets (fol. 107a-132b), sized 11 × 16.8 cm, with 15 lines per page. It is bound in leather. The whole code, even this work, was transcribed by a certain Omar Pilav, son of Salih, in 1841 (1257).

⁸⁸ M. Ždralović, "Prilog poznavanju ...", *Hercegovina*, no. 1, Mostar, 1981, 130, note no. 34.

4. *On judgments*, fol. 119a-125b,
5. *On syllogism*, fol. 125b-130a,
6. *Apodyctic*, fol. 130a-131a,
7. *Dialectic*, fol. 131a-131b,
8. *Rhetoric*, fol. 131b,
9. *Poetics*, fol. 131b, and
10. *Sophistic*, fol. 131b-132a.⁸⁹

As can be seen in the presented above, this work falls into the category of brief (*ṣaġīr*) commentaries, and by its contents it is similar to the commentaries of *Isagogue* addressed in the text above. This text too, just like in the work by Fadil Užičanin, in the chapter *On Syllogism* (*fī al-qiyās*), closer addresses the first syllogistic figure, whereas for the other three rules of implementation are stated as well as the number of modes for each figure.⁹⁰

The work was created before 1841 (which is the date of transcription), and most probably a closer dating would be the second half of the 18th century. Although we have not managed to find reliable data, we feel free to present our assumption that this is the same persons addressed by S. Kemura⁹¹ and H. Šabanović,⁹² this is Muhammad, son of Yusuf (died in 1770), who was the librarian of the Osman-Šehdi's Library in Sarajevo and was a Sarajevo supreme judge (1758-1763), and he wrote two works in the Arabic syntax.⁹³

This exhausts the list of authors whose scope of work consists of one or more works in the field of logic. Beyond this, there remains a row of names for which, as mentioned above, we could not catch the threads that would allow us to constitute a solid factual material on the authors and to classify the gathered materials. However, in spite of this, one can say for these materials that they for a major part constitute fragments of commentaries to *Isagogue* by Esirudin al-Ebheri (most often these involve syllogistics or presentation of the four syllogistic figures) and various mnemo-technical essays such as logical rules made up in verses or schematic presentations of various classifications. And finally, let us say that in these materials we have found nothing new or relevantly different from that contained in the works addressed in the texts above.

⁸⁹ For Arabic titles for individual chapters, please see in the text above addressing *The Commentary to "Isagogue"* by Mustafa Ejubović.

⁹⁰ See fol. 127a.

⁹¹ S. Kemura, *Sarajevske muftije od 926-1519, do 1334-1916*, Sarajevo, 1916, 14-15 and 15-16.

⁹² H. Šabanović, *Književnost...*, 490-491.

⁹³ The title of the first work is *Ṭabīb al-mubtadi'īn*, it was completed in 1748 (1161), and its subject is the Arabic syntax. It was written in the Turkish language (manuscript: OIS, R 1128).

The second work bears the title of *al-Yaqīn*, and it constitutes a commentary of the work on the Arabic grammar for beginners. The work was also written in the Turkish language (manuscript: OIS, R 2584).

*

Even a brief survey of the contents of the works on logic in the Arabic language and their Bosniak authors such as this one provides an opportunity to draw a number of more general conclusions:

1. The survey clearly tells us about the continuous involvement in logic and the interest in it in Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly from the beginning of the 16th century when some more intensive work began of our people in the Arabic language, within the circle of the Arabic-Islamic spiritual and cultural tradition, until the end of the 19th century.

2. In the contents of works by our authors, in spite of the various structures and types of works or, more precisely, the various mutual association of the issues addressed along individual chapters, sections, subsections and the like, in all of them (except for the glosses which represent a separate form of work) one can nevertheless feel a single general topic framework and a clear focus on the basic issues. In accordance with the tradition headed by al-Farabi and Ibn Sina and founded by Aristotle, and in acceptance of the definition that logic is an assumption for any kind of thinking in general, and that its direct goal is to “use language analysis in order to perform an analysis of the knowledge of the objective reality”, and thus to reach even a scientific method of learning which will be completely secure and uncontestable. From Aristotle, one accepts not only this basic goal of logical research but also the basic segments of his logical system, which is very well illustrated exactly in the chart breakdowns of the structure of debates, as well as the method of processing and responses to the basic logical issues (the theory of basic subject-thought provisions, the theory of meaning and understanding the truth, the teaching on logical forms of thinking, the teaching on scientific method of thinking – syllogistics, on scientific and non-scientific presentation of evidence, and the like).

The focus of the research lies in the teaching on the syllogism, a form of deductive conclusion making which is the only one offering “a reliable method” in reaching out to the scientific, secure and uncontestable knowledge. All the other issues reviewed in these works are treated either as the assumptions for a better understanding of the syllogism, its structure, absoluteness, necessity and generality or as its application in apodyctics which is opposed to the other forms of thinking and knowledge, which are, more or less, probable, apparent, wrongful or fallacious.

3. The feature of all of these works, which is also a feature of the work heavily influenced by Ibn Sina is, that all these issues addressed in these works, regardless of the various classifications, make up only segments of an integral whole of the Arabic organon. That is, these are not separate branches of logic⁹⁴ based on their own rules, as the logical corpus was seen in the early centuries of the Arabic logic history, but these are its segments which make up a very complex but concrete unity, and,

⁹⁴ See: A. N. Prior, *Historija logike* [History of Logic], Zagreb, 1970, 48-49.

4. In terms of evaluating the works by our authors, it is important to underline, and this is on the basis of analysis of the texts that were in the focus of our attention as well as a larger number of texts on logic we have reviewed and based on their comparison, that among them, in the class of textbook character, a particularly distinguishing piece is the work of Hasan Kafi Pruščak *Kafi's Compendium on Logic* which provides definitions in a very brief but logical and systematic way, offering answers to the major questions and basic classifications, and as such by both form and contents it constitutes a typical example of a textbook in excerpt. This one is run up by the textbook *The Commentary of "Isagogue"* by Mustafa Ejubović. Among the commentaries, by its width and depth of scope of the issue, by its systematism, extraordinary integration of the basic text, literature and own thoughts and views, a particularly distinguishing one is *The New Commentary to the "Sun Treatise"* by Mustafa Ejubović.

DJELA BOŠNJAKA IZ LOGIKE NA ARAPSKOM JEZIKU

SAŽETAK

U ovom se radu, a na osnovu autentične rukopisne građe (oko 1000 rukopisnih stranica), daje pregled najznačajnijih autora – Bošnjaka i njihovih djela na arapskom jeziku. U središtu pažnje su bili:

- Hasan Kafija Pruščak i njegova djela *Kafijin kompendijum iz logike* (Muhtašar al-Kāfi min al-mantiq, 1580), i *Komentar "Kafijina kompendijuma iz logike"* (Šarḥ Muhtašar al-Kāfi min al-mantiq, 1583);
- Muhamed, sin Muse, Allamek i njegovo djelo *Komentar "Sunčanog traktata"* (Šarḥ ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya, 1626);
- Mustafa Ejubović – Šejh Jujo i njegova četiri djela: *Komentar "Esirijevog traktata iz logike"* (Šarḥ ar-Risāla al-Aṭiriyya fī al-mantiq, 1682) ili, kako se popularno nazivao *Komentar "Isagoge"* (Šarḥ Īsāgūgī); *Korisna glosa uz "Al-Fenarijeve napomene" za Esirudinov traktat iz logike* (Ḥāšiya mufida li al-Fawā'id al-Fanāriyya 'alā ar-Risāla fī al-mantiq, 1692); *Novi komentar "Sunčanog traktata"* (aš-Šarḥ al-ğadīd 'alā aš-Šamsiyya fī al-mantiq, 1690); *Komentar "Obuka iz logike i apologetike"* (Šarḥ 'alā Tahdīb al-mantiq wa al-kalām, 1706);
- Muhamed Čajničanin i njegovo djelo *Otkrivanje tajni u komentarisanoju "Isagoge"* (Fatḥ al-asrār fī šarḥ Īsāgūgī, oko 1780);
- Ibrahim, sin Ramadana, Bošnjak i njegovo djelo *Ta'liqāt 'alā Šarḥ aš-Šamsiyya* (Bilješke uz "Komentar Sunčanog traktata", sredina XVII stoljeća);
- Fadil Užičanin i njegovo djelo *Šarḥ matn Īsāgūgī li mawlā al-Fāḍil Ūzičawalī* (Komentar teksta "Isagoga" od mula Fadila Užičanina, sredina XVII stoljeća) i
- Muhamed, sin Jusufov, Bošnjak i njegovo djelo *Fatḥ al-asrār fī šarḥ Īsāgūgī fī 'ilm al-mantiq* (Otkrivanje tajni u komentarisanoju "Isagoge" iz nauke o logici, druga polovina XVIII vijeka).

Pregled ovih djela jasno govori o kontinuiranom bavljenju logikom i interesom za nju u Bosni i Hercegovini, a posebno od početka XVI stoljeća kada počinje intenzivniji rad naših ljudi na arapskom jeziku i u krugu arapsko-islamske duhovne i kulturne tradicije, pa do kraja XIX stoljeća.

Iz sadržaja djela naših autora, i pored različitih struktura i tipova djela ili, tačnije, različitog međusobnog povezivanja pitanja koja se obrađuju uz pojedina poglavlja, odsjeke, pododsjeke i dr., u svim njima (izuzev glosa koje predstavljaju poseban oblik stvaralaštva) se, ipak, osjeća jedinstvena opšta tematika i jasno usmjerenje na osnovnu problematiku. Prihvatajući određenje – u skladu sa tradicijom na čijem čelu su bili al-Farabi i Ibn Sina i njen utemeljivač Aristotel – da je logika pretpostavka za svako mišljenje uopšte, a njen neposredni zadatak da se “kroz analizu jezika izvrši analiza saznanja objektivne stvarnosti”, te da se, na taj način, dođe i do znanstvene metode saznanja koje će biti potpuno sigurno i neoborivo. Od Aristotela se prihvata ne samo ovaj osnovni cilj logičkih ispitivanja nego i osnovni dijelovi njegovog logičkog sistema, što veoma ilustrativno pokazuju upravo tabelarni pregledi strukture rasprava, kao i način obrade i odgovori na osnovnu logičku problematiku (teorija osnovnih predmetno-misaonih odredaba, teorija značenja i shvatanje istine, učenje o logičkim formama mišljenja, učenje o naučnoj metodi mišljenja – silogistici, o naučnom i nenaučnom dokazivanju i dr.).

U središtu istraživanja je učenje o silogizmu, obliku deduktivnog zaključka koji jedini pruža “pouzdan metod” u dosezanju do znanstvenog, sigurnog i neoborivog saznanja. Sva ostala problematika koja se razmatra u ovim djelima tretira se ili kao pretpostavka boljeg razumijevanja silogizma, njegove strukture, apsolutnosti, nužnosti i opštosti ili kao njegova primjena u apodiktici koja se suprotstavlja drugim oblicima mišljenja i saznanja koja su, manje ili više, vjerovatna, prividna, pogrešna ili lažna.

Karakteristika svih ovih djela, što je i karakteristika čitavog stvaralaštva koje je bilo pod snažnim uticajem Ibn Sina-a, je ta da sva pitanja koja se tretiraju u ovim djelima, bez obzira na različite podjele, čine samo dijelove jedinstvene cjeline arapskog organona. Dakle, nije riječ o zasebnim granama logike koje počivaju na vlastitim kanonima, kako se na logički korpus gledalo u prvim vjekovima istorije arapske logike, nego o njenim dijelovima koji čine veoma složeno ali konkretno jedinstvo.

U pogledu vrednovanja djela naših autora, nužno je podvući – a na osnovu analize tekstova koji su bili predmet naše pažnje kao i većeg broja tekstova iz logike koje smo pregledali i njihovog poređenja – da se među njima od djela udžbeničkog karaktera posebno izdvaja djelo Hasana Kafije Prušćaka *Kafijin kompendijum iz logike* u kojem se na veoma sažet, ali logičan i sistematičan način, daju definicije, odgovori na najznačajnija pitanja i osnovne klasifikacije, te kao takav i po formi i po sadržaju predstavlja tipičan primjer udžbenika u izvodu. Potom dolazi udžbenik *Komentar “Isagoge”* Mustafe Ejubovića. Od komentara, po širini i dubini obuhvata problema, po svojoj sistematičnosti, izvanrednom povezivanju osnovnog teksta, literature i sopstvenih misli i pogleda, posebno se izdvaja *Novi komentar “Sunčanog traktata”* Mustafe Ejubovića.

WORKS BY BOSNIAKS IN THE FIELD
OF LOGIC IN THE ARABIC LANGUAGE

SUMMARY

This paper gives a survey of the most prominent Bosniak authors, and their writings in Arabic based on authentic manuscripts (around 1,000 manuscript pages). Our focus has been on:

- Hasan Kāfī Prušćak and his work: *Kafi's Compendium of Logic* (Muḥ-
taṣar al-Kāfī min al-manṭiq, 1580) and Commentary on *Kafi's Com-
pendium of Logic* (Šarḥ Muḥtaṣar al-Kāfī min al-manṭiq, 1583);
- Muhamed, the son of Musa, Allamek and his work Commentary on
the Shining Treatise (Šarḥ ar-Risāla aš-šamsiyya, 1626);
- Mustafa Ejubović – Šejh Jujo and his four writings: *Commentary on
Treatise on Logic* (Šarḥ ar-Risāla al-Aṭīriyya fī al-manṭiq, 1682), or,
as it was popularly called, *Commentary on "Isagogi* (Šarḥ Īsāgūgī); *A
Useful Gloss for "Al-Fanāri Notes on Afīri" Treatise on Logic*" (Hāši-
ya muḥida li al-Fawā'id al-Fanāriyya 'alā ar-Riṣāla fī al-manṭiq, 1692); *New
Commentary on the "Shining Treatise"* (aš-Šarḥ al-ğadīd 'alā aš-
Šamsiyya fī al-manṭiq, 1690); *Commentary on "Education in Logic
and Apologetic"* (Šarḥ 'alā Tahdīb al-manṭiq wa al-kalām, 1706);
- Muhamed Čajničanin and his work *Revealing Secrets of Commenting
on Isagogue* (Faḥ al-asrār fī šarḥ Īsāgūgī, 1780);
- Ibrahim, the son of Ramadan, Bosniak and his work Notes on the
"Commentary on Shining Treatise" (*Ta'liqat 'ala Šarḥ aš-Šamsiyya*,
the mid-17th century);
- Fadil Užičanin and his work Commentary on the text "Isagogua" by
the mullah Fadil Užičanin (*Šarḥ matn Īsāgūgī li mawlā al-Fāḍil Ūži-
čawalī*, the mid-17th century) and
- Muhamed, the son of Yusuf, Bosniak and his work *Revealing Secrets
of Commenting on "Isagoga"*, the science of logic, the second part of
the 18th century (*Faḥ al-asrār fī šarḥ Īsāgūgī fī 'ilm al-manṭiq*).

The survey of these writings clearly tells of continuons dealing with logic and interest in it in Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly from the beginng of the 16th century when our people started creating more intensively in the Arabic language and in the Arabic-Islamic spiritual and cultural traditions, to the end of the 19th century.

From the contents of the works by our authors, in spite of their different structure and types or, more precisely, different interrelations between the issues dealt with in some chapters, sections, subsections etc., in all of them (except the glosses that are a specific form of creativity) integral general themes can be felt with a clear focus on basic issues. Accepting the definition, in accordance with the tradition headed by al-Farabi and Ibn Sina whose fo-
under was Aristotle, that logic is generally a prerequisite for any opinion and

that its immediate task is “through the language analysis to do analysis of the knowledge of objective world”, and in this way to find out scientific methods of the knowledge which will be completely certain and undeniable. Not only was this a basic aim of logical inquiry accepted from Aristotle, but also basic parts of his logical system. It is very illustratively shown in the charts of the structure of discussions, as well as by the way the basic logical issues were dealt with and answered (the theory of the meaning and understanding of truth, the teaching of logical forms of thinking, the teaching of scientific methods of thinking – syllogistics of scientific and non-scientific argumentation etc.).

The focus of the research is on the teaching of syllogism, a form of deductive conclusion, as the only way of offering a “reliable method” for acquiring scientific and irrefutable knowledge. All other issues dealt with in these works are taken either as a premise of a better understanding of syllogism, its structure, absoluteness, necessity and universality, or as its use in apodictic theory which is opposed to other forms of thinking and knowledge that are, more or less, probable, apparent, wrong or false.

Characteristic of all these works, as it is of the whole creative work being under strong influence of Ibn Sina, is that all the issues dealt with in these works, regardless of different divisions, are only parts of a unique whole of the Arabic organon. Therefore, these are not separate branches of logic based on their own canons, as the logical corpus was looked at in the first centuries of the history of Arabic logic, but they are rather its parts making up very complex but concrete unity.

With regard to the evaluation of the works by our authors, and on the basis of the analyses of the texts that were the subject of our attention, on the basis of a larger number of texts on logic that we studied and of their comparison, it is essential to emphasize that the work by Hasan Kāfī Pruščak, *Kāfī's Compendium of Logic*, excels among them as a textbook. In it, definitions and answers to the most important questions of basic classifications are given in a very condensed but logical way. As such it is a typical example of a short textbook both by its form and contents. Then follows the textbook *Commentary on “Isagoga”* by Mustafa Ejubović. Among commentaries, *New Commentary on the “Shining Treatise”* by Mustafa Ejubović, too, stands out regarding its scope and depth, systematicness and extraordinary interrelations between the basic text, literature and his own thoughts and views.