



BALKANLARDA
İSLÂM
MİADI DOLMAYAN UMUT

İSLAM IN THE BALKANS
UNEXPIRED HOPE

VAKTİ AZİZDEN VAKTİ ZELALETE
FROM TIMES OF GLORY TO TIMES OF HUMILITY

EDİTÖR
MUHAMMET SAVAŞ KAFKASYALI



ANKARA - BELGRADE - BUCHAREST - BUDAPEST - CHISINAU - KIEV
PODGORICA - SARAJEVO - SKOPJE - TIRANA - ZAGREB





İnceleme Araştırma Dizisi Yayın No:19

BALKANLARDA İSLAM
MİADI DOLMAYAN UMUT

Cilt 4: Vakti Azizden Vakti Zelalete
From Times of Glory to Times of Humility

Editör

Dr. Muhammet Savaş KAFKASYALI

Balkanlarda İslam: Vakti Azizden Vakti Zelalete - *From Times of Glory to Times of Humility* / **Editör:** Dr. Muhammet Savaş Kafkasyalı
Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Türk İşbirliği ve Koordinasyon Ajansı Başkanlığı 2016 5.c.
(2902 s.) ; 16*24 cm T.C. Başbakanlık Türk İşbirliği ve Koordinasyon Ajansı Başkanlığı
inceleme-araştırma-dizisi; yayın no:19

İçindekiler:

- c.1:** Muğlaklıktan Berraklığa / *From Ambiguity to Clarity*
c.2: Türkistan'dan Balkanlara / *From Turkestan to the Balkans*
c.3: Gönül Fethinden Zihniyet Temsiline / *From the Conquest of
Hearts to the Representation of Mentality*
c.4: Vakti Azizden Vakti Zelalete / *From Times of Glory to Times of Humility*
c.5: Köprüler Yıkan Zihniyetin Yıkılışı / *Demolishing Mentality Which Demolishes Bridges*
ISBN: 978-605-9642-11-8 - Takım
ISBN: 978-605-9642-15-6 - Cilt-4
Kafkasyalı, Muhammet Savaş

Redaksiyon

Prof. Dr. İsmail ÇALIŞKAN
Prof. Dr. Ahmet YILDIRIM

Proje Ekibi

Doç. Dr. Bahadır GÜCÜYETER
Dr. Hamza KOLUKISA
Dr. Fatih VEYİS
Hasan BEKDEŞ

Tasarım-Baskı

Karınca Creative Ajans



Adres: Dr. Mediha Eldem Sokak 56/1 Kızılay/Ankara
Tel: 0 312 431 54 83 / Faks: 0312 431 54 84
<http://www.karincayayinlari.net>
karınca@karincayayinlari.net

Baskı Tarihi: 2016

Baskı Yeri: Ankara

Baskı ve Cilt: Eflal Matbaacılık

Sertifika No: 13987

© Tika Yayınları

GMK Bulvarı No:140 / Anadolu Meydanı
PK: 06570 Çankaya/ANKARA

Tel: +90 312 939 70 00

Fax: +90 312 939 75 15-16

www.tika.gov.tr



Bosnian Muslims and Their Educational Dilemmas in the Austro-Hungarian Period (1878-1918)

Enes KARIĆ

Prof. Dr., The Faculty of Islamic Studies in Sarajevo

Summary

The arrival of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878 meant a huge turning point for Bosniaks. They literally found themselves under the predominantly Catholic empire after being under the Ottoman Islamic rule for a couple of centuries. In those circumstances, Bosniaks started to question themselves deeply. One of the options chosen by many was emigration to Turkey – and that was a colloquial term for the remaining parts of the Ottoman Empire. The second large number of Bosniaks stayed in Bosnia and Herzegovina and tried to reach *modus vivendi* with their new ruler.

This study deals with the most sensitive topics for Bosniaks of those times – schools and education. Namely, religious and secular representatives of Bosniaks faced a great question: How to reform traditional madrasas? And could they be reformed at all? The Austro-

Hungarian authorities faced strong resistances on the field of the madrasa reform. That is why Austro-Hungarian Empire supported to a certain extent the establishment of rusdiyye, reformed schools which were established by the Ottoman Empire during the 19th century. As it is already known, rusdiyyes were state schools during the Ottoman Empire, in the ripe age of tanzimat. As it can be seen from this study, Austro-Hungarian Empire thoroughly reformed rusdiyyes, and they almost became new schools. The National Government in Bosnia and Herzegovina took over its funding. To create a kind of competition to the traditional madrasas, in 1887 Austro-Hungarian Empire created The Shari‘ah Judges School (Šerijatska sudačka škola) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and also encouraged the establishment of the school for the education of teachers, Dar almuallimin. During that time, Bosnian Muslim circles and ulama debated the reforms of maktabas and madrasas, the reform of script (should Latin and Cyrillic letters be adopted), the publishing of books in Bosnian about Islam as faith, but also as a culture and civilization. This time is also marked by the establishment of numerous Muslim journals in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

This study mentions a huge role played by the then rais al-ulama, Mehmed Džemaludin Čaušević, and his advocacy of the educational and cultural reform and progress in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In general, it can be said that the reform of the educational institutions of the Bosnian Muslims in the period 1878-1918 stopped in the middle. A huge polarization of Muslims occurred: traditionalists on one side, modernists on the other. This was the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina by the end of the WWI and the demise of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Bosnalı Müslümanlar ve Avusturya Macaristan Dönemindeki Eğitim İkilemleri (1878-1918)

Özet

1878 yılında Avusturya-Macaristan İmparatorluğu'nun Bosna-Hersek'e gelişi Boşnak'lar için büyük bir dönüm noktası anlamına geliyordu. Birkaç yüzyıl Osmanlı İslâm hâkimiyeti altında kaldıktan sonra tam anlamıyla ağırlıklı olarak Katolik imparatorluğun altında buldular kendilerini. Bu koşullar altında, Boşnaklar kendilerini derinden sorgulamaya başladılar. Birçoğu tarafından seçilen seçeneklerden birisi Türkiye'ye – amiyane tabiriyle Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun geri kalan kısmına göç etmek oldu. Boşnakların ikinci önemli kısmı Bosna-Hersek'te kalarak yeni hükümdarları ile geçici görüş birliğine ulaşmaya çalışmışlar.

Bu çalışmada Boşnakları için en hassas konu olan okulları ve eğitimi ele almaktadır. Bu kez Boşnakların dini ve laik temsilcileri önemli bir soru ile karşı karşıya kalmışlar: geleneksel medreselerin reformu nasıl olmalıdır? Reform edilebilir nitelikleri var mıydı? Avusturya-Macaristan yetkilileri medrese reformu alanında güçlü direnme ile karşı karşıya kaldılar. Bundan dolayı Avusturya-Macaristan İmpara-

torluğu belirli bir ölçüde 19. yüzyılda Osmanlı İmparatorluğu tarafından kurulan iyileştirilmiş okulları olan rüştiye mekteplerinin kurulmasını desteklediler. Bilindiği üzere Rüştiye mektepleri Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Tanzimat döneminin olgunluk döneminde var olan devlet okulları olup neredeyse yeni okul haline getirildiler. Finansmanları Bosna-Hersek Ulusal Hükümeti tarafından ele alındı. 1887 yılında geleneksel medreselere bir nevi rekabet oluşturmak adına Avusturya-Macaristan İmparatorluğu Bosna-Hersek'te kadılık okulları (Šerijatska sudačka škola) kurdular ve buna ilaveten öğretmenlerin eğitilmesi için öğretmen okulu olan Dar al-muallimin kurulmasını teşvik ettiler. Bu süre zarfında, Bosnalı Müslüman çevreleri ve ulema mektep ve medreselerin reformunu, yazının reformunu (Latince ve Kiril harfleri kabul edilmeli mi), Boşnak dilinde İslam'ın bir inanç olmakla birlikte bir kültür ve medeniyet olduğuna dair kitapların yayımlanmasını tartışıyorlardı. Bu dönem aynı zamanda Bosna-Hersek'te çok sayıda Müslüman dergilerin kurulması ile dikkat çekmektedir.

Bu çalışmada o dönemin Ulema Konseyi Başkanı olan Mehmed Džemaludin Čaušević tarafından Bosna-Hersek'te eğitim ve kültür reformları ve ilerlemenin teşvik edilmesinde oynadığı önemli role yer verilmiştir.

Genel olarak 1878-1918 döneminde Bosnalı Müslümanların eğitim kurumlarının reform çalışmalarının durduğu ve yarım kaldığı bir dönemdir. Müslümanlar arasında geniş çaplı bir kutuplaşma oluştu: gelenekçiler bir tarafta, modernistler bir tarafta kaldılar. I. Dünya Savaşı sonunda ve Avusturya-Macaristan İmparatorluğu'nun dağılması sırasında Bosna Hersek'in durumu böyle idi.

Giriş

Bosniak historical memory is full of unexpected paradoxes. Like the Serbs and other peoples of the Balkans, the Bosniaks were an important link during the many centuries of Ottoman Imperial rule, at least as far as the Balkan peninsula is concerned. Furthermore, the Bosniaks are Muslims, so that, unlike Serbs, Croats, Montenegrins, Greeks, Bulgarians and so on, they identified more deeply with the cultural, civilizational and historical spheres of the Ottoman Empire.

Herein lays one of the major reasons for the Bosniaks' fear and unease at the advent of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878. The Bosniaks had put up a strong, if disorganized, resistance against the "Schwabs"¹ in 1878. There were several reasons for this fierce resistance, of which the most important is that the departure of the Ottoman Empire hit the Bosniaks hard. *De jure*, Ottoman Imperial rule, headed by the Sultan, retained its sovereignty over Bosnia from 1878 until annexation in 1908. *De facto*, the Ottoman Empire had almost no influence on the situation in Bosnia after 1878. The period from 1878 onwards struck the Bosniaks as a complete change of civilization, from one world to another. It would be no exaggeration to say that many Bosniaks saw the coming of the Austro-Hungarian Empire to Bosnia as the approach of the end of the world.

As a people, they were faced in 1878 with a question that was as inexorable as the wall against which the executioner stands people condemned to death by firing squad: is it possible that we, Bosniaks and *ipso facto* Muslims, can be ruled by unbelievers?

In addition, the Bosniaks had unhappy memories of the foray of Eugene of Savoy into Bosnia in 1697. This is how the historian Nijaz Šukrić compares the coming of the Austro-Hungarians in 1878 and the invasion by Eugene of Savoy in 1697:

"With the invasion of Bosnia by the Austrian military commander Eugene of Savoy in 1697, the Muslim population as a whole, and Sarajevo in particular, had a bitter experience of the level of civilization of the Austrian army. That Austrian campaign left numerous victims, while much of the material wealth not only of the Muslims, but also of others, went up in flames or was lost as plunder. The institutions of Gazi Husrev Bey were a particular focus of attack.

After the occupation of 1878, the Austro-Hungarian authorities continued to remind the population of their long-past victory, giving the name Prince E Savoy to certain military units and barracks".²

1 The word "Schwab" is a pejorative colloquialism in Bosnia, Serbia, Croatia and Montenegro, signifying Germans in general, and the Austro-Hungarian military in particular, as, later, the German army during the Second World War.

2 Nijaz Šukrić, *Gazi Husrev-begova medresa u vrijeme austro-ugarske uprave (1878-1918)* (Gazi Husrev

However, things can always be worse in Bosnia, even worse than the Austro-Hungarians. It is as if the Serb proverb hovers above Bosnia: “Todor, alas, from bad to worse”.

One has only to recall the hard times that followed after 1918, when Serbia occupied Bosnia and Herzegovina, to see that the Austro-Hungarian Empire was a benign one, not quite as benign as the Ottoman Empire, but for all that it is well remembered by the people for having given Bosnia the status of a separate entity (*corpus separatum* or *territorium separatum*) within the Empire, for having built up Bosnia, giving her good communications and routes and fine buildings, and above all for the fact that the rule of law pertained in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, perhaps the last time that Bosnia and Herzegovina experienced the rule of law during the 19th and 20th centuries. (“During the Austro-Hungarian period you could carry a bag of gold over Romanija, and no one would dare to rob you” is a saying still heard in Bosnia. The Romanija mountain here stands for disorder, lawlessness and highway robbery.)

Both the Ottoman and the Austro-Hungarian empires were composed of different nations and faiths, including numerous multicultural societies. Like the other peoples, the Bosniaks too gradually adjusted during the period of Austro-Hungarian rule, and began to make some progress.

It was only in 1918, when they found themselves part of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, that the Bosniaks saw what they had lost with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. A Bosniak song that can be heard in central Bosnia, and which was not anti-Serb but anti-regime, neatly characterizes and summarizes the fate of the Bosniaks in the Balkans:

Ode Turska, ode majka,
 Ode Švabo, ode babo,
 Dođe bre³, ote sve,
 Dođe družē⁴, da sve do dna postruže
 Turkey gone, mother gone,
 Schwab gone, dad gone,
 Bre comes and grabs it all,
 Comrade comes and scrapes right to the bottom of the barrel.

Bey *madrasa* during the period of Austro-Hungarian rule (1878-1918)), published in “450 godina Gazi Husrev-begove medrese u Sarajevu” (450 years of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* in Sarajevo), Sarajevo, 1988, p. 37.

3 In this poem the word “bre” is, in a way, a typically Serbian expression used in Bosnia and particularly in Serbia as the symbol of Serbian domination in government. The word “bre” is one of the most common words of the Serbian language, expressing emphasis, wonder etc, and is very difficult to translate into any other language. Serbs and other peoples in the Balkans may be linguistically recognized by its use.

4 Comrade is a colloquialism referring to the communists.

But to return to the history of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* during the Austro-Hungarian period. The school entered the Austro-Hungarian period as an educational institution working according to the traditional school curricula of such schools in the Ottoman Empire. Since the Ottoman Empire was Islamic, the state did not have a separately organized Islamic community, distinct from the state, nor did there exist in the Ottoman Empire Islamic schools within the ambit of an Islamic community thus structured.

At the end of the period of Ottoman rule in Bosnia, as part of the reforms carried out by the Ottoman authorities, there were elementary schools known as *ruždija*. Along with the so-called *sibjan mekteb* and the *madrasas* (where Islamic education was obtained), the Ottoman reforms created new state, secular schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the *ruždija*. Children of all faiths could attend the *ruždija* – Muslims, Orthodox, Catholics etc. The *ruždija* was lower than the high school, and those who graduated from the *ruždija* could work as lower-grade state clerks. As Dr Hajrudin Ćurić says in his book *Muslimansko školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini do 1918*⁵:

“In [the *ruždijas*] pupils were equipped with lower-level clerical skills. The majority of those who left these schools did so as future office clerks. But pupils who completed the course in these schools could not only enter state service, but also continue their education. The *ruždijas* took in children who had finished *sibjan mekteb* and learned to read and write. At first it was only Muslim children, and later non-Muslim children were also permitted to attend these schools. In some *ruždijas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina prior to the occupation [of 1878] there were a few non-Muslim children. This is understandable when one recalls that the teaching medium was the Turkish language. Another reason for the poor attendance of non-Muslims is to be found in their lack of confidence in the Turkish administration, as well as in the unsettled political, social and economic circumstances of the region.”

But the Bosnian Muslims, as historical evidence shows, also lacked confidence in the *ruždijas*, but had confidence in the *sibjan mektebs* and *madrasas*, which had proven themselves to be good schools over the centuries. Dr Hajrudin Ćurić says:

“In 1869 the Turkish education law was passed. It provided for the formation of *ruždijas* for non-Muslim children, boys and girls, as well. However, it remained only on paper. Furthermore, throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina prior to the occupation, not one Muslim girls’ *ruždija* was opened, although the law had provided for them, since the Muslims were often suspicious of these new schools, in which secular subjects were also taught. It is not therefore surprising if not a single *ruždija* for non-Muslim pupils was opened in the region and that

5 Hajrudin Ćurić, *Muslimansko školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini do 1918* (Muslim education in Bosnia and Herzegovina up to 1918) published in Sarajevo, 1983, p. 136

their numbers in the Muslim boys' *ruždijas* were very small in comparison with the numbers of Muslim children. And even Muslim children did not attend these schools in large numbers. All novelties, even if they came from Istanbul, were in conflict with the conservative understanding of the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina. One of these novelties was the *ruždija*.⁶

The *ruždijas* that existed in Bosnia and Herzegovina prior to 1878 were in Sarajevo, Visoko, Tuzla, Bijeljina, Zvornik, Maglaj, Banja Luka, Bihać, Prijedor, Krupa, Travnik, Jajce, Prusce, Livno, Glamoč, Duvno, Mostar, Trebinje, Nevesinje, Novi Pazar, Bijelo Polje, Pljevlji and Prijepolje.⁷

If the Bosniaks were suspicious of the *ruždijas* even though they arose from reforms introduced by the Ottoman Empire, then it is easy to imagine how the Bosniaks withdrew into themselves and were suspicious of attempts by the Austro-Hungarian Empire to reform their education.

As will be seen later, during the entire Austro-Hungarian period it sought, without success even a partial reform of the Gazi Husrev Bey and other *madrasas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It would be wrong to attribute this entirely to the conservatism of the Bosniaks and their resistance to change. It is true that the Bosniaks were suspicious of everything new, but the reason for that was not solely their conservatism. A more convincing reason for their lack of confidence is to be found above all in the fact that for the Bosniaks, the old ways had been violently taken from them overnight. Deprived of the old and familiar, they were fearful of every novelty.

In order to break out of the impasse in educational and other reforms the Austro-Hungarians took another tack. The "Yellow Monarchy", as the Empire is called in historical works, turned to the establishment of an independent Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Nothing like this had existed in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the period of Ottoman rule.

In the Ottoman Empire the sultan was recognized as the legal and legitimate Caliph of all his Muslims, including those of Bosnia. In practice, however, the Ottoman Caliph delegated powers to the Istanbul *mufti*, who was known as the *Shaykh al Islam*.

The Istanbul *mufti* or *Shaykh al Islam* conducted the *shari'ah* and religious affairs of the Ottoman Empire and thus, *eo ipso*, those of Bosnia and Herzegovina until 1878.

However, with the coming of the Austro-Hungarian Empire to Bosnia in 1878, the Austro-Hungarian authorities at once attempted to establish a certain distinct religious Islamic hierarchy, unknown until then in Bosnia and Herzego-

6 *ibid.*, p. 137.

7 *ibid.*, p. 140-141.

vina. The Austro-Hungarian authorities sought in this way not only physically but spiritually to separate the Bosnian Muslims from the Ottoman Empire. For example, when the Austro-Hungarian troops entered Bosnia in 1878, they found that Husein Nur ef. Hafizović was supreme *shari'ah* judge in Sarajevo that year, and the Austro-Hungarian occupation authorities considered him as the supreme representative of the Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina.⁸

However, since the Austro-Hungarian Empire had undertaken, at the Berlin Congress of 1878, to respect religious freedom when “bringing order to Bosnia and Herzegovina”, and not to disrupt the connections of the Istanbul *Shaykh al Islam* with the Bosnian Muslims, the Bosnian Muslims expected that their principal religious representative would be appointed from Istanbul.

The Austro-Hungarian authorities, however, did not wholly honour this international commitment. The first example of failure to honour international commitments was when the Austro-Hungarian authorities did not permit Ahmed Šukri ef. to come to Bosnia and take up the post of Bosnian *mufti* (to which he had been appointed by the *Shaykh al Islam* on 18 June 1880).⁹

The fact that Ahmed Šukri ef. never took up the post of Bosnian *mufti* also testifies to the fact that the Austro-Hungarian Empire had really decided not to allow Istanbul to impose its choice of Bosnian *mufti* from outside the country. It was agreed in “diplomatic manoeuvres between Vienna and Istanbul”, as Mustafa Imamović calls them, that the Bosnian *mufti* would be Mustafa Hilmi Omerović from Bosnia. He was appointed to the post by the *Shaykh al Islam* on 22 March 1882. In this way the Porte, as Mustafa Imamović puts it, “indirectly recognized the need to appoint a single Islamic leadership in the occupied country. The Austro-Hungarians confirmed the appointment, and by Imperial decree of 17 October 1882 Hilmi ef. Omerović became the first *Reis ul Ulama* of the Islamic Religious Community of Bosnia and Herzegovina”.¹⁰ It is important to underline in this context that when the Austro-Hungarian Empire came to Bosnia Hilmi ef. Omerović (himself a graduate of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*) had been the first *mudarris* of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*. In addition, he held the posts of *nazir* (supervisor of the Gazi Husrev Bey *waqf* institutions) and of Sarajevo *mufti*. By appointing Hilmi ef. Omerović as *Reis ul Ulama*, the Austro-Hungarian Empire indirectly recognized the high esteem in which the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* was held as an Islamic high school in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The title *Reis ul Ulama* means leader of the *ulama*, representative of the *ulama*, president of the *ulama*. From 1882 onwards the Austro-Hungarians tried to

8 For more on this, see Mustafa Imamović, *Pregled razvitka Islamske zajednice u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Survey of the development of the Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina), in *Glasnik Rijaseta Islamske Zajednice u BiH* (Herald of the Rijaset of the Islamic Community in Bosnia and Herzegovina), issue no. 1, Sarajevo, 1994, pp. 53-63.

9 *ibid.*, p. 54.

10 *ibid.*, p. 54.

strengthen the institution of *Reis ul ulama* with the purpose of more effectively detaching the Bosnian Muslims from the Ottoman Empire. In that same year, 1882, the Austro-Hungarian authorities also appointed the first *Ulama majlis*, a circle of scholars or institution that was at that time composed of four men who, with the *Reis ul Ulama*, were principally responsible for the Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Practically speaking, these steps established the institution of the *Rijaset* or supreme council of the Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Austro-Hungarian authorities went even further, however. Realizing that the *waqfs*, from which the *madrastas*, mosques, libraries and other religious institutions were maintained, were exceptionally important for the Bosnian Muslims, they resolved to bring these under their full control as well. On 24 October 1882 the Imperial and Royal Ministry of Finance decreed the organization of the administration of religious and *waqf* affairs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. None of the leaders of religious and *waqf* institutions and affairs were elected, but appointed. As already noted, the Emperor himself appointed the *Reis ul Ulama* and members of the *Ulama majlis*, while lower-level officials were appointed by the National government in Sarajevo. Mustafa Imamović states:

“Religious bodies had no autonomy, since the authorized government commissioner could alter their decisions. In mid March 1883 the joint ministry of finance appointed an Interim Commission for the organization of *waqf* affairs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, for which the Sarajevo major, Mustajbeg Fadilpašić, was formally appointed as chair. In fact the Commission was led by two permanent government emissaries. This meant that all *waqf* affairs were under permanent governmental control.”¹¹

This was the situation of the central institutions of the Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the first decades of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The *mudarrises* in the *madrastas*, like the *qadis* and Bosniak *ulama* elite as a whole (with the exception of the so-called pro-Austro-Hungarian circle of secular intelligentsia formed around 1890—1900), regarded these arbitrary moves by the Austro-Hungarian authorities in regard to *waqf* affairs and the Islamic community with the deepest suspicion.

Historians of this period of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina claim that the fiat of the Austro-Hungarian authorities on *waqf* and *ma‘arif* affairs led to the famous “Movement for religious and *waqf*-*ma‘arif* autonomy”, and that the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* itself was at the heart of the debate on what kind of “*ma‘arif*” the Bosniaks needed, on the one hand, and what kind of “*ma‘arif*” the Austro-Hungarian authorities wanted to finance in Bosnia on the other hand.

¹¹ *ibid*, pp. 54-55.

The immediate occasion for the formation of the movement was a shocking event: some Catholic nuns abducted a little girl, Fata Omanović, daughter of a peasant, one Osman Omanović, living in the *kotar* (administrative district) of Mostar. This was just one of a series of arrogant instances of Catholic proselytism in Bosnia and Herzegovina during this period. Immediately after this event, on 5 May 1899, the citizens of Mostar gathered in a mass meeting and elected a committee of twelve people headed by the Mostar *mufi* Ali-Fehmi Džabić. This Mostar committee wrote several times to the Austro-Hungarian authorities to warn them that “with the coming of the occupation a large number of missionaries and friars have sneaked into our country, beginning at once to spread their Christianity”.

In his book *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini 1882-1903*¹², Tomislav Kraljačić analyzes the proselytizing activities of Kallay himself for the Christianization of the Bosnian Muslims. He writes that Kallay

“... then believed that it was necessary to create in Bosnia and Herzegovina the environment for the Muslims to convert to the Catholic faith, which would bring about a Catholic majority in the country and strengthen the position of the Monarchy there. He later gave the idea a theoretical framework in a letter to Baron Benka, dated 1893. In this letter he claimed that the Muslim would in the future, even if in the distant future, sooner or later “unconditionally convert to Christianity and disappear altogether”. This would rapidly occur following the emancipation of Muslim women, when they left the harem and accepted the European way of life. But the principal reason for the conversion of Muslims to Christianity was the fact that “Muhammadanism is not the essence of the Bosnian people, the Muhammadans are not foreigners, are not members of another race like the Ottomans, but pure and true children of the soil (“Landskinder”). They have a series of ancient local customs that connect them to the other inhabitants of the country.”

Kallay, Tomislav Kraljačić claims, hoped that Islam among the Bosniaks would disappear without trace, to be replaced by the national European ideology of Bosniakdom. Kallay heartily promoted the ideology of Bosniakdom in Bosnia among all her peoples, but wanted to drive away from their faith, Islam, only the Bosnian Muslims, with the help of Bosniakdom.

In the case of the Bosnian Orthodox and Bosnian Catholics, Kallay did not consider that Bosniakdom as a cohesive Bosnian national ideology should replace Orthodoxy and Catholicism. Kallay hoped that with the development of his concept of national Bosniakdom, the attachment of the Bosnian Muslims to their faith would weaken, “which would certainly increase the prospects of the Bosnian national ideology winning over the Muslims”.

12 Tomislav Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini 1882-1903* (Kallay's regime in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1882-1903), Sarajevo, 1987, p. 86.

However, Kallay was deluding himself in his judgment and his covert proselytizing intentions. The movement for religious and *waqf-ma'arif* autonomy gained wider support from the Bosniaks throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Bosnian Serbs, too, for their part and for the purpose of achieving their own national aims, offered to collaborate with the Mostar *mufti* Džabić. Gligorije Jeftanović and his associates, who were calling for “church and school autonomy” for the Serbs, were particularly active to that end.

The leaders of the movement for religious and *waqf-ma'arif* autonomy submitted several petitions to Kallay in Vienna, and even to the Emperor Franz Joseph himself. As Mustafa Imamović says, “the essence of the petitions was the expression of lack of confidence in the religious, *waqf* and *ma'arif* institutions appointed by the government and the call for the formation of autonomous Islamic institutions with broad jurisdiction”. The movement called for the *Reis ul Ulama* to be appointed and his *manshura* (act of appointment) to be issued first by the *Shaykh al Islam*, and then by the Austro-Hungarian Emperor. The movement also targeted the then *Ulama majlis* and Supreme *waqf* trusteeship (all people appointed by the Austro-Hungarian authorities), and *mufti* Džabić claimed that these institutions were responsible for the backwardness of Muslims in Bosnia and their religious bigotry.

The Austro-Hungarian authorities at first ignored the movement, underestimating its importance. As the movement gained in strength, the authorities took severe repressive measures to stamp out its ideas and its advocates. In 1902 they even decided to prohibit *mufti* Džabić (who in the meantime had travelled to Istanbul to consult the highest Islamic institutions there about future strategy) from returning to the country.

These were exceptionally difficult times for the Bosniaks in Bosnia and Herzegovina. A great wave of emigration of Muslims to Turkey began at this time. They sold their property for a song.

Around 1904 the first stage of the movement for religious and *waqf-ma'arif* autonomy came to an end, without any significant or concrete results.

The situation of the *madrasas*, including the most important one, the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*, became even worse during the time of the autonomy movement.

In 1905 the Austro-Hungarian authorities, using their full influence on the *waqf* trusteeship, issued a decision that the trusteeship should prescribe a tax for “the maintenance of Islamic educational institutions” amounting to 5%. However, the people reacted immediately, and the “almost unanimous response among the people was that they would not pay this surtax without the prior introduction of religious and *waqf* autonomy” (Mustafa Imamović).

It should be said here in passing that where Islamic education and schooling were concerned, the Austro-Hungarian authorities made the maintenance of the Gazi Husrev Bey and other *madrasas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina, of which there were some forty at this time, conditional upon changes in the curriculum, with the introduction of so-called secular subjects and so on. In this way the Austro-Hungarian authorities made it known that for them these *madrasas* were conservative, backward and disorganized.

Objectively, the Movement for religious and *waqf-ma'arif* administration was able to contribute very little to *madrasa* reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Although in its second phase (1905-1909) the movement succeeded in fighting for a more credible procedure for the election of *Reis ul Ulama* and extracted from the Austro-Hungarian authorities the adoption of a *Statute for the autonomous administration of religious and waqf-ma'arif affairs in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (1909), practically speaking it had neither a long-term strategy nor even the time for fundamental and systematic reform of the Gazi Husrev Bey and other *madrasas*. On the other hand, the Movement for religious and *waqf-ma'arif* autonomy moved on from its original demands and extended its activities to the issue of agrarian reform and other similar "political" problems. The movement was also faced with the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1908 and the Balkan wars of 1912-1913, followed by the First World War of 1914-1918.

Together with all this, it is worth knowing that a significant number of the Bosniak intellectuals of that time kept their distance from the ideology of Džabić's movement. Osman Nuri Hadžić, Edhem Mulabdić, Safvetbeg Bašagić, Zuhdi Bakarević and others had reservations about the *hojjas* and their "inertia", as it was then said. As in other Muslim environments, in Bosnia too at the start of the 20th century the newly-formed modern strata of Muslim intellectuals turned their attention to the *ulama* and their role in society. Just as there was this trend at this time in Egypt, India, the Maghreb countries and so on, so too in Bosnia, Muslim intellectuals considered that the symbolic wealth of Islam did not belong only to the *ulama*, but to all Muslims, especially the learned. The spiritual intelligentsia or *ulama* was considered "unqualified for their knowledge and position". Furthermore, the progressives accused the *ulama* of being "mainly drones" who lived off the labours of the people.¹³ And indeed, around 1900 a number of educational, cultural and entertainment periodicals were launched. The secular intellectuals Safvet-beg Bašagić, Edhem Mulabdić and Osman Nuri Hadžić launched the family magazine *Behar* in 1900, while Bašagić himself launched *Ogledalo* in 1907. These magazines were published in Bosnia and in the Latin alphabet. The *ulama*' face was saved by Džemaludin Čaušević, who in the first decade of the 20th century launched a number of magazines in the Bosnian language (but in *arebica*, the Bosnian language written in specially modified Arabic script): *Tarik* (The Way), *Muallim* (Teacher), *Misbah* (The Lamp) and *Yeni Misbah* (the New Lamp).

13 See Mustafa Imamović, *Historija Bošnjaka* (History of the Bosniaks), Sarajevo, 1997, p. 410 *passim*.

All these magazines advocated what one might broadly call progressive and reformed Islam. They particularly addressed the issue of education and schooling.

To return to the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*, however. In order to effect the reform of Islamic education, and above all the reform of the numerous *madrasas* including the Gazi Husrev Bey, the Austro-Hungarian authorities took the line of least resistance, concerned about how the Bosnian Muslims would react to fundamental reform of the *madrasas*. This is what Hajrudin Ćurić writes on the subject:

“Before the autonomy movement began, the Muslims were complaining about the poor condition of their religious educational institutions, including the *madrasas*. They asserted that the *madrasas* were neglected, that the religious *waqf* bodies took no interest in them, that the number of *madrasas* had fallen significantly since the occupation, and that the number of *mudarrises* had also fallen.

The national government was denying all responsibility for the condition of the *madrasas*. In the report referred to, they stated that the organization and teaching of the *madrasas*, which they had taken over from the previous regime, did not meet the demands required of such high schools. The national government considered that it would be impossible to carry out a reform of the studies in the *madrasas* since it would give rise to “fanatical resistance” by the Muslims. According to Government statements, a draft organizational statute and educational decree for the *madrasas* had been planned, but it had been concluded that it would be opportune neither from the state nor the religious perspective to impose such reforms. Thus it was that these institutions remained as they were, pending a more favourable moment for the introduction of *madrasa* reform.”¹⁴

However, in order indirectly to impact on the transformation of the *madrasas*, the Austro-Hungarian authorities hurriedly opened schools that would act as competition to the *madrasas*. In addition, the Austro-Hungarian authorities were compelled to restore and reform the schools that had already been formed under the Ottoman Empire, the *ruždijas*; however, they did so too late, only in 1913, after much hesitation.

With the occupation of 1878 the *ruždijas* almost completely disappeared, and were never restored thereafter to their original numbers. As Dr Hajrudin Ćurić says (referring to the writings of Ljuboje Dlustuš, who analyzed Muslim education in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1882) during the Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina the authorities refused at first to recognize the *ruždijas* as their schools, which led to their collapse. This is how Ljuboje Dlustuš assesses the attitude of the Austro-Hungarian authorities towards the *ruždijas*:

“When the national government had convinced itself that this type of school was far from appropriate to the institutions of Ottoman education law, and that

¹⁴ Hajrudin Ćurić, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

education in those schools had no practical value, nor did it allow of adaptation to modern principles, all assistance for the maintenance of [the *ruždijas*] was cut back, with the result that they failed”.¹⁵

For all that, a fundamental reorganization of the *ruždijas* was embarked upon by decree of the Austro-Hungarian authorities (decree of the National Government dated 2 July 1913). However, this reorganization of the *ruždijas* meant, in effect, their abolition. The First World War broke out very shortly afterwards, so that the “reorganization of the *ruždijas*” remained without any significant impact.

Two schools opened by the Austro-Hungarians in Sarajevo did enter the history of education in Bosnia and Herzegovina: the *Shari‘ah* judges’ school (*Maktab-i-Nuwab*)¹⁶ and the Teacher training school or *Darul muallimin*¹⁷. These were modern type schools, that should have served as the nucleus of reform of the entire Muslim educational system in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Teacher training school or *Darul muallimin* in particular offered support to the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*, serving as a provider of tuition in “secular subjects”, as subjects such as geography, Bosnian, history, mathematics and so on were commonly called by the press in those days.

This is how the modernist paper *Bošnjak* announced the formation of the Teacher training school or *Darul muallimin* to its readers:

“. . . our waqf administration is debating the issue of the organization of a school for training teachers for our maktab, who would in time enter the circle of modern teachers of Enlightenment Europe and would thereby also give our children a worthwhile education”.¹⁸

The newspaper stated in the same passage that the subjects taught in the school would be religious education, oriental languages, pedagogy with practical exercises, Bosnian, German, geography, history, mathematics, geometry, natural history, physics, economics, handwriting, painting and drawing, musical education and gymnastics.

And indeed, the *Darul muallimin* or teacher training school was opened in Sarajevo in 1891. (It may be recalled that a school with the same name had been opened in Sarajevo during the Ottoman period, in 1869, with the aim of training teachers in accordance with the reform aspirations proclaimed at that time in Istanbul. However, with the 1878 occupation, that school ceased to function.)

The author Edhem Mulabdić, who was a lecturer at the *Darul muallimin*, wrote that pupils of the Kuršumlija *madrasa* were attending classes of secular

¹⁵ quoted in Hajrudin Ćurić, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

¹⁶ The *Shari‘ah* judges school was founded by decree no 23972 of the National Government, dated 14 May 1887.

¹⁷ The Teacher training school was founded by decree no. 22476/1 of the National Government, dated 16 May 1891.

¹⁸ *Bošnjak*, issue no. 17, dated 22 October 1891 (emphases added).

subjects in the teacher training school as early as the academic year 1891/92. The fact that pupils of the Gazi Husrev Bey (Kuršumlija) *madrasa* went to hear secular subjects at the *Darul muallimin* speaks for itself of the degree to which professors of the Gazi Husrev Bey or Kuršumlija *madrasa* were counting upon the introduction of secular subjects in their school.

Just before the First World War, cooperation between the Gazi Husrev Bey (Kuršumlija) *madrasa* and the *Darul muallimin* improved, and in 1913 the *Darul muallimin* moved into the building of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*. In the turmoil of the First World War, in the academic year 1917/18, these two school were, formally at least, wholly merged (although each had its own curriculum and teachers).

However, in the case of the *Shari'ah* judges' school, founded by the Austro-Hungarian authorities on 14 May 1887, paid it particular attention. The rationale for opening the school was so that the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina could "resolve their marital, family and inheritance affairs in accordance with *shari'ah* law". For this purpose, in other words for the courts that would deal with these issues, it was essential to train personnel who would be well informed about the *shari'ah*, but who would also "initiate changes in the legal environment".

The subjects taught at the *Shari'ah* judges' school were Arabic, logic, rhetoric and stylistics, dogmatics, *shari'ah* law, *usul al fiqh* (the history of jurisprudence), legal stylistics, inheritance law, *shari'ah* procedural law, land ownership law, European law, Bosnian, mathematics, geography and general history.

The *Shari'ah* judges' school was elitist both as regards its students and its teaching staff. It numbered three *Reis ul ulama* – Mehmed Teufik Azapagić, Sulejman Šarac and Džemaludin Čaušević – among its professors. Professors of other nationalities also taught there, Croats, Serbs and others, for example Milan Prelog, Josip Goldberg, Jozo Dujmišić, Stanislaw Tobiasz, Emilijan Lilek, and others. Prominent Bosniak authors such as Edhem Mulabdić and Osman Nuri Hadžić also taught in the school.

The Austro-Hungarian authorities hoped to achieve at least two objectives with the creation of these schools. First, by founding and developing modern schools, indirectly to force the Bosniaks themselves, alone or in collaboration with the Austro-Hungarian authorities, to embark on a reorganization of their *madrastas*. The second objective of the Austro-Hungarians was to use these schools to detach the Bosnian Muslims, at least to some extent, from the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, the Austro-Hungarians demonstrated this in architecture also. Many buildings from the Austro-Hungarian period were built in the so-called pseudo-moorish style, such as for example the City Hall, the building of the *Shari'ah* judges' school (*maktab nuwab*), and so on. Prior to this the pseudo-moorish style of architecture had been unknown in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Despite the concerns referred to, the Austro-Hungarian authorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina did try several times, in accordance with their plans, to break out of the impasse of reform of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* and other lower-level *madrasas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The reasons for these concerns on the part of the Austro-Hungarian authorities were several.

First, *madrasa* reform was difficult because the Austro-Hungarian authorities were confronted with an interesting process among the Bosniaks – the connection with their confessional and religious institutions. During this period the Bosniaks were of all the peoples of the country the most interested in their confessional educational institutions. Furthermore, in the numerous reading-rooms (*kiraethana*, *qira'at khana*) that the Bosniaks founded during this period throughout Bosnia, the majority, if not all, bore the epithet *Muslim* and not *Bosniak*. In this shift of emphasis towards the religious one may see a Bosniak national consensus that Islam in Bosnia was threatened at this time and must above all be saved.

At one of the sessions of the Muslim Conference, held in 1901, Baron Kutscher, speaking in the name of the Austro-Hungarian authorities in Sarajevo, spoke of the Bosniak resistance to change in these words:

“We have not laid a hand on the *madrasas*, and have always avoided doing so, but we think that if you [Bosniaks] want to be successful you must introduce some of the worldly sciences into your *madrasas*, and then come under the supervision of the government. . . *Ma'arif*, where true *ma'arif* is concerned, and not merely religious education, always comes under the supervision of the authorities as a right that cannot be withheld in any way, since there is concern for general order and conduct, so that no exception can be made for any single *madrasa* not to be under any kind of supervision by the government.”¹⁹

In the case of reform of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasas*, the battle was fought not only between the Austro-Hungarian authorities on one side and the teaching staff of the school (and those of other *madrasas*) on the other, but opposing views very rapidly appeared within the Muslim religious intelligentsia itself.

Two Islamic educational research projects were carried out by the *Ulama majlis*, which testifies to the urgency and difficulty of the problem. The first was held in 1910, and the second in 1911-12. At the meetings of these projects, the most debated issue was that of the *madrasa* curriculum. Mehmed Džemaludin ef. Čaušević was on the side of those who had already been advocating fundamental changes in the Gazi Husrev Bey and other *madrasas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It may be said with full justification that he was the leader of the reformist wing of the Islamic intelligentsia in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Mehmed Džemaludin ef. Čaušević, a long-time member of the *Ulama majlis* and later, as is well known, *Reis ul Ulama* (1913-1930), spoke of his efforts on behalf of *madrasa* reform:

19 Muslim Conference 1901, Minute IX, session held on 19 February 1901, p. 36.

“I attempted to introduce the Turkish language as a compulsory subject, to introduce various subjects, for example arithmetic, mathematics, history, but this was criticized. A minute was taken about it, but it didn't go well, because some were calling for everything to be [taught in] Turkish, for example geography, mathematics, and then there was a debate that when everything was in Turkish then we should introduce our own language into the madrasas so that the pupils completing four to eight years should learn to read and write [in Latin script].

At this the criticisms stopped, however, for some said that it was absolutely unacceptable to introduce the Latin script into the madrasas.”²⁰

Džemaludin ef. Čaušević did not agree with Ahmed ef. Burek on superficial reform of the Kuršumlja *madrasa* (which was to be officially known as the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* from 1921 onwards). According to Nijaz Šukrić, who quotes the Minutes of the Islamic research project at the tenth session of the project held on 31 December 1911, Ahmed ef. Burek considered that secular subjects would be taught up to the sixth grade, “and that if possible they should be compressed into the lower grades of the *madrasa*, so that at least the upper two grades [seventh and eighth] could remain solely for oriental subjects.” At the same session, claims, N. Šukrić, “Dž. Čaušević and S. Alajbegović reacted to this proposal” with the view that “secular subjects should be taught in all grades”.²¹

Nijaz Šukrić states that two opinions formed during the Austro-Hungarian period on the issue of the reform of the Gazi Husrev Bey and other *madrasas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina:

“The advocates of the first were against major changes to the educational process, and were for modest alterations with the introduction of some secular subjects in the lower levels of *madrasa* education generally. Some considered that the pupils could round out their education in secular subjects in some of the purely secular schools, such as the teacher training school (*Darul muallimin*) in Sarajevo.

It was considered essential to maintain the old curriculum and subjects as in Turkey, since graduates of the madrasas of Bosnia and Herzegovina at this time were aimed solely at the religious callings of *khatib*, *muallim*, *mudarris*, *qadi* and *mufti*”.²²

Šukrić claims in the same passage that the advocates of this opinion were Šakir ef. Pandža and Munib ef. Korkut, members of the National *waqf* trusteeship and the *Ulama majlis*. Šukrić goes on to describe the second opinion expressed about the reform of the *madrasas* of Bosnia and Herzegovina:

20 Šukrić, *op.cit.*, p. 51.

21 *ibid.*, p. 51.

22 *ibid.*, p. 52.

“The second opinion, calling for radical changes to the educational and preceptorial process, the organization and the work of the Kuršumljija *madrasa*, as well as to the objectives set, was led almost from the start by the late Džemaludin ef. Čaušević, as a member of the *Ulama majlis* and the National *waqf* trusteeship of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this he was later joined by the administrator of the Gazi Husrev Bey *waqf*, H. Muteveliđ.

As advocates of reform of the *madrasas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina, one may add to these two certain members of the Islamic educational research project held under the auspices of the *Ulama majlis* in Sarajevo between 1910 and 1912. During the course of this project this opinion was supported by those members who called for the introduction of the Latin alphabet as well as the Arabic, and of the Bosnian language, as well as for compulsory secular subjects throughout the entire *madrasa* education and not only in the lower grades”.²³

In early 1900 the newspaper *Bošnjak*, which as already noted supported the general modernization of Muslim education in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and particularly in the *madrasas*, published an article by a certain analyst of Muslim education who signed himself Miri Zija (probably a pseudonym). In seven instalments this Miri Zija analyzed the sorry state of education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The title of his seven instalments was a Turkish saying, “*Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir*” (“A good decree is half of destiny”). Almost at the very beginning of the text Miri Zija says:

“Almost no nation has fallen because others destroyed it, but rather because it has thrown itself into the maelstrom of ruin; similarly, no nation has raised itself up and made its good fortune unless it has sought that fortune for itself, rejecting the ugly and embracing the good. If we tackle history, that mirror of past times and principal source of present-day experience, we shall find many, many such examples.”²⁴

Miri Zija then refers to the Roman Empire “which ruled almost the whole of the then known world”, and which fell precisely because the Romans themselves destroyed it, by giving themselves up to a life of luxury and dissolution, and principally because they no longer had that patriotism which had raised them to that degree of fame. They no longer worked for the common cause, but each one took for himself”. Miri Zija then mentions the Arabs, who, as he says, declined because they “rejected hamiya [patriotism] and working for the common cause; they rejected the fundamental principles of Islam and lost sight of the goal to which Islam leads.” Writing according to the method of “scold the daughter and pick on the daughter-in-law”, Miri Zija’s intention with these words is to draw attention, not to the ancient Romans or Arabs, but to the Bosniaks themselves at

²³ *ibid.*, p. 52.

²⁴ Miri Zija, “Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir”, *Bošnjak*, issue no. 1, Sarajevo, 11 January 1900, p. 1.

the turn of the 19th to 20th centuries, warning them that their survival depends above all on themselves.

Later in the text, adroitly concealing the object of his criticisms (Bosniak lack of concern for their cultural institutions and negligence towards education and their schools), Miri Zija shows that the Arabs declined because

“discord and selfishness prevailed among them, knowledge was discarded and those among them who were worthy of high position disappeared, while those who gained such positions were ignorant and grasping people who would destroy all the people’s good fortune and progress for gain, becoming with time in some cases moral, in others both moral and material slaves of foreigners”.²⁵

A little later, Miri Zija, whose acute thinking and harsh criticism compel one to believe that it was Mehmed Džemaludin ef. Čaušević himself (who was still a student in Istanbul in 1900) concealed behind this name, draws attention to the fact that he has Bosnia and the state of her Bosniaks at heart. Miri Zija’s opinions are sombre, since all around him he sees general decadence:

“I have examined our situation and ourselves here in this beloved homeland of ours, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and to our great regret it is clear that we are rapidly declining day by day, and that the cause of our decline is precisely what I have just said, and that what is destroying us is above all our general ignorance (*jahala*). We have lost all our noble traits, and accepted what the worthless, as a result of this wretched and destructive *jahala*.”²⁶

Miri Zija then goes to the heart of the matter, saying that the principal reason for “our Bosniak *jahala*” is “that we have reduced all Islamic studies to the superseded textbooks “Bergivija” and “[uruti Salat”, and if ten of us in Bosnia and Herzegovina know those two we are doing well. If anyone has learned Arabic grammar, he is already counted as a *hojja*”.²⁷ It is clear that Miri Zija’s criticism of education in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the Austro-Hungarian period is intended for the traditional *madrasas*. At this time education in the *madrasas* had become pure technique, lifeless content that would bring no improvement either to the Bosniaks or to Islam in Bosnia. Later Miri Zija says:

“Islam is not only faith, it is also knowledge, which determines all the needs of life and all possible circumstances that could arise, whether in spiritual, private, public or social life. Knowledge, which determines the duties of man towards God, the rights that belong to the individual man, family, state, etc., and as such again [Islam] relies upon all existing disciplines that are now called secular sciences, and one who wishes to study it as it needs to be studied has to be well-informed in all these fields, and when it is such in regard to the one who wants

25 *ibid.*, p. 2.

26 *ibid.*, p. 2.

27 *ibid.*, p. 2.

to study it, then what is needed for the one who wants to explain it to others, for example our *hojjas*?"²⁸

With these words our author allows himself to say that in his day the *madrasas* had nothing to fear from the introduction of mathematics, physics, geography and other "secular sciences", as they were called in the press in those days. Later in his text Miri Zija demonstrates that it is wrong to consider these subjects un-Islamic. It is absurd to think so, since it was the Arabs themselves who promoted geography, say. As for geography, Miri Zija has this to say:

"The Qur'an says, "You think that the mountains stand firm, but they float like the clouds". Was this comprehensible without mathematical geography? But the Arabs (glory upon them!) were not lazy as we are, but got to work and as a result of this very *ayat karim*, which clarified their minds, saw that the world was round and that it moves, and made globes, which were later introduced to Europe. While many among us today, as a result of flawed understanding, say that the world is flat and that it is thus in faith, doing so because of their *jahala*, and thus fall into error".²⁹

The impression gained in this passage of Miri Zija is of the kind of teacher of which there were many in Bosnia during the Austro-Hungarian period. But it would be wrong to reduce Miri Zija's motives to the purely pedagogical. These words must also be interpreted as a cry for help, a plaint. For the Bosniak Islamic schools, the *madrasas*, had closed in upon themselves and were clinging to the old educational clichés that were worth nothing outside the *madrasas* themselves. In 1900 Miri Zija was not warning of the backwardness of Tehran's *madrasas*, but of those of Bosnia and Herzegovina, only a few hundred kilometres as the crow flies from Rome and the Vatican. It would not be wrong to read him thus.

In the following instalment, which appeared on 11 January 1900, Miri Zija expresses strong criticism of the fact that in the Islamic primary schools in Bosnia (the so called *maktab ibtidayyi* or simply *ibtidayyi*) the children were taught in the Turkish language, which was incomprehensible to them, instead of teaching them about their faith in Bosnian. The only thing Miri Zija praises about these Islamic primary schools is that the children were taught the fundamentals of Qur'an recitation and the short Qur'anic *suras*, which he calls the "main fruit" of the *ibtidayyi*. And now, instead of the children reflecting on their faith in Bosnian, they have to parrot it in a Turkish "that was spoken three hundred years [ago] and that even the Ottomans themselves no longer use".³⁰

Miri Zija goes on, in the third issue of *Bošnjak* (which came out on 18 January 1900) to praise the *ruždijas* because "the children are already beginning to

28 *ibid*, p. 2.

29 *ibid*, p. 2.

30 Miri Zija, "Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir", *Bošnjak*, issue no. 2, Sarajevo, 11 January 1900, p. 1.

learn Bosnian too”, but the *ruždijas* themselves are slaves to the ossified clichés of education and, once again, use the same textbooks (for example “Bergivija”, “Durrijekjta”) that are “written in old Turkish”. This, in Miri Zija’s view, is the weakness of the *ruždijas*.

A little further on Miri Zija turns to a description of the situation in the Bosnian *madrasas*. Taking as a bad example the *madrasas* of Sarajevo, where he sees a clear decline, Miri Zija says:

“There are five *madrasas* in all in Sarajevo, of which not one is anywhere near adequate to its task. Let us take for example the Kuršumlija [Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*], which is supposedly the best, and which is the *waqf* of our benefactor and *khayir sahib marhum* Gazi Husrev Bey. From the material point of view, this *madrasa* is well supplied, since the *mudarris* themselves receive a salary of more than 100 *for.* monthly, and the boarders have an apartment, food and services, as a result of which the *madrasa* could have made great progress; but unfortunately the reverse is true, since the *talib* [student] who enters the *madrasa*, even if he were to study there for twenty years, would learn nothing more than “Muladžamija”, since it is this book which is read finally, and that book alone takes up a full four years. This is how “very good” marks are obtained there!”

It is clear that Miri Zija is criticizing the curriculum of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* and the slow rate at which the textbooks and educational material is studied. There had already been attempts before 1900 to reform this *madrasa*, but in an absurd fashion. In order not to provoke a reaction among the conservative element of the *ulama* in Bosnia and Herzegovina, it was decided not to introduce any novelties into the curriculum of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* itself, but that its students would compulsorily attend the *Darul muallimin* or teacher training school. This was not an isolated case; it was not just in the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*, which in practice became just a dormitory or students’ hall for the *Darul muallimin*, but also in other *madrasas* in Bosnia and Herzegovina, that classes ground to a complete halt while the pupils went to nearby *ruždijas* to learn something.

In the same passage Miri Zija states with astonishment that in this way “studies in the *madrasas* have come to such a pass that nothing sadder can be expressed”. Miri Zija then asks, “And is the *Darul muallimin* to blame for this? No, never! It is the method and timetable that are to blame”.

Since the *madrasa*’s students were Bosniaks who used the Bosnian language for everyday communication, Miri Zija refers again to the problem of a *madrasa* in which nothing is learned about Islam in Bosnian, but only in Turkish and Arabic. He says, “These days a young man of fifteen to eighteen years old enters the Kuršumlija knowing nothing about [how to read and write] Bosnian”.

For this reason Miri Zija’s sympathies lie with the teacher training school or *Darul muallimin*, or rather its curriculum:

“studies in the *madrasa* are completely ignored and lack all method (usuli tedrisa). . . It can be most easily seen and understood from this to what level the said *madrasa* has sunk, to say nothing of the other *madrasas* in Sarajevo or of those in other towns in our Bosnia and Herzegovina”.³¹

Referring in the same passage to some of these other *madrasas*, Miri Zija says:

“In Travnik our government has erected a building for a *madrasa* such as is hardly to be found even in Istanbul, and supplied it with all necessities, but that *madrasa* is as much use to us as all the others. In Mostar, which was once at the highest level as regards the teaching of Islamic studies, as the work of *marhum mufti* Karabeg testifies, and where *ijazets* (diplomas) were issued as in Istanbul, in that town, then, the three or four *madrasas* have become nothing more than boarding houses for children who attend the *ruždija*”.

Not wanting merely to describe and criticize the situation in the *madrasas* of Bosnia in 1900, Miri Zija then turns to some proposals. His first proposal is formulated as follows:

“There is a pressing need to write and compose an *ilmi hal* [textbook of religious studies] in our Bosnian language, that the children will be able easily to understand, and that could in good part also be useful to many adults”.³²

In the same passage Miri Zija advocates the publication of an Arabic grammar in Bosnian: “there is a need to write an Arabic grammar in our Bosnian language so that the Arabic language may be more easily and rapidly learned”.

The third pressing need for the Islamic schools of Bosnia, Miri Zija believes, is an Arabic-Bosnian dictionary, “since this is the most important requirement for learning any language”.³³

Miri Zija then says that he does not consider himself an expert on education and that it is not his profession that led him to write this series of articles in the newspaper *Bošnjak*. On the contrary, he says that it was patriotism that led him to write the articles:

“I must say that I am not such an expert on the reform of our educational institutions, nor have I time to give thought to the best way of organizing our *maktabs* and *madrasas*, but I have long wanted us Bosniak Muslims to wake from our apathy and to see our educational institutions organized in such a way as will set our feet firmly on the ground”.³⁴

Whether or not it is Mehmed Džemaludin ef. Čaušević who lies behind the name Miri Zija, it is well known that the greatest reformist moves in the *madrasas*

31 Miri Zija, “Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir”, *Bošnjak*, issue no. 3, Sarajevo, 18 January 1900, p. 2.

32 Miri Zija, “Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir”, *Bošnjak*, issue no. 4, Sarajevo, 25 January 1900, p. 2.

33 *ibid.*, p. 2.

34 Miri Zija, “Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir”, *Bošnjak*, Sarajevo, 1 February 1900, p. 1.

were carried out by M. Dž. Čaušević himself. As already mentioned, Čaušević was in favour of the introduction of so-called secular subjects to the *madrasas*. Čaušević also did much to free the Bosnian Muslims of their fear of using the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets. He called for the Friday sermon or *khutba* to be held in Bosnian, etc.

During the Austro-Hungarian period, and in particular between 1900 and 1914, as well as during the First World War, the Gazi Husrev Bey madrasa (that is, the Kuršumljija) was sliding into complete decline. Although compulsory annual examinations for the pupils were introduced at the beginning of the 20th century, this was just one of the small cosmetic changes for the best that was not deeply felt. In addition, the number of pupils in the senior grades of the school fell off during these years, since many pupils found employment before graduating from school. In 1911-12 and 1913-14, there were only twenty-four pupils in this, the principal *madrasa* of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Thus it was that during the maelstrom of war, in 1916-17, the *Ulama majlis* decided to end the marriage of necessity that had been formed between the *Darul muallimin* and the Kuršumljija *madrasa*. The marriage was a failure, and the *Darul muallimin* was dissolved. In that same academic year the *Ulama majlis* decided to open the District *madrasa* in Sarajevo, but that experiment too proved to be a failure.

In 1921 the *Ulama majlis* decided to merge the Kuršumljija and Hanika *madrasas* into one, henceforth to be called the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa*.

In this form the school faced the difficult years between the two world wars.

Bibliography

- ŠUKRIĆ, Nijas, *Gazi Husrev-begova medresa u vrijeme austro-ugarske uprave (1878-1918)* (Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* during the period of Austro-Hungarian rule (1878-1918)), published in "450 godina Gazi Husrev-begove medrese u Sarajevu" (450 years of the Gazi Husrev Bey *madrasa* in Sarajevo), Sarajevo, 1988.
- ĆURIC, Hajrudin, *Muslimansko školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini do 1918* (Muslim education in Bosnia and Herzegovina up to 1918) published in Sarajevo, 1983.
- IMAMOVIĆ, Mustafa, *Pregled razvitka Islamske zajednice u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Survey of the development of the Islamic community in Bosnia and Herzegovina), in *Glasnik Rijaseta Islamske Zajednice u BiH* (Herald of the Rijaset of the Islamic Community in Bosnia and Herzegovina), issue no. 1, Sarajevo, 1994, pp. 53-63.
- KRALJAČIĆ, Tomislav, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini 1882-1903* (Kallay's regime in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1882-1903), Sarajevo, 1987.
- IMAMOVIĆ, Mustafa, *Historija Bošnjaka* (History of the Bosniaks), Sarajevo, 1997. *Bošnjak*, issue no. 17, dated 22 October 1891 (emphases added).
- Muslim Conference 1901, Minute IX, session held on 19 February 1901.
- ZIJA, Miri, "Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir", *Bošnjak*, issue no. 1, Sarajevo, 11 January 1900.
- ZIJA, Miri, "Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir", *Bošnjak*, issue no. 3, Sarajevo, 18 January 1900.
- ZIJA, Miri, "Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir", *Bošnjak*, issue no. 4, Sarajevo, 25 January 1900.
- ZIJA, Miri, "Husni tedbir, nisfi takdir", *Bošnjak*, Sarajevo, 1 February 1900.