Introduction

Maximilian Hartmuth & Ayşe Dilsiz Hartmuth (University of Vienna)

After the failed Siege of Vienna of 1683, the Ottoman Empire gradually withdrew from Europe. Even so, monumental reminders of its former presence survived throughout the continent. How these remains were approached differed greatly according to the period and place.[1]

This volume examines the locus of material remains from the Ottoman period (or the lack thereof) in relation to the identity constructions of the modern nations that came to inherit them and of the Muslim communities on their territories. In the scholarly discourses on the histories of displacement and the region's architectural reminders of an Ottoman past, these two processes are frequently lumped together as a regional historical phenomenon dubbed 'de-Ottomanization'.[2] In so doing, the substantial differences in approaches that the various successor states adopted towards the empire's architectural legacies (including Turkey) are downplayed. Even within the same countries, different policies appear to have been pursued in different periods (and regions), in keeping with differing circumstances.

This volume presents case studies from various areas in formerly Ottoman Europe. They inquire from diverse vantage points how visible remains of the empire's presence (and, with that, of Islam's presence) have been coped with discursively and materially. Importantly, readers will find that it is almost impossible to disentangle these two levels of action. To foster a common perspective, the volume draws upon a concept that describes the discursive process that elevates objects to become a community's or territory's heritage as 'patrimonialization'.

1 On this heritage, its problems and interpretations, see also Hartmuth & Dilsiz (2010), Hartmuth (2010), and Sindbaek & Hartmuth (2011).

2 For a discussion, see Ginio & Kaser (2013).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

Patrimonialization, heritagization, heritization?

Like its (equally awkward) terminological twins 'heritagization' and 'heritization', 'patrimonialization' regards heritage not as preexisting and undisputable fact but as the outcome of a moderated process. Depending on the overall agenda, certain objects and values are prioritized over others in the course of its implementation.[3] Subsequently, a community's resources are mobilized so as to preserve and promote this essential assortment of buildings, objects, and practices.

The available scholarly literature has, to our knowledge, thus far not engaged in conscientious efforts to differentiate these terms; they are largely used interchangeably in the scholarly literature. That said, it appears that 'patrimonialization' is more likely to be used in French or Francophile studies,[4] with *patrimoine* corresponding to the English 'heritage'. Both terms derive from Latin: *Patrimonium* denotes a passing of assets or obligations (*monium*) from father (*pater*, as also in *patrie*, fatherland) to son;[5] 'heritage' derives from the Latin term for heir (*heres*, gen. *heredis*) and entered standard English as a French loanword (*héritage*). As the French suffix *-age* indicates, it signifies the outcome of a process (*héritier*, to inherit). Thus, epistemologically, in both

3 Thouki (2002, p. 1036) maintains that the term 'heritagization' emerged in the late 20th century to mark a shift in heritage discourse – a shift "from what heritage *is* to what heritage *does*" (our emphasis). Carter et al. (2020, p. 2) emphasize the usefulness of the term as an analytical instrument to untangle the intricate dynamics that have changed societies' relationship with the past – an "ongoing negotiation between memory, identity and space." Yet, they also note that the practices of heritage production have usually worked in favor of the authorities and their quest to establish legitimacy through their approach to history. For Harrison (2013, p. 69), 'heritagization' in effect marks a transition from useful to representational. He defines it as "the process by which objects and places are transformed from functional 'things' into objects of display and exhibition." Frigolé (2010, p. 14) similarly sees decontextualization and recontextualization as part and parcel of the process of 'patrimonialization'. While these definitions speak of loss (of original purpose, context) and manipulation, not all appraisals of term and concept are as critical of this manipulative enterprise. Loulanski & Loulanski (2014), for instance, have presented the 'heritization' of rose cultivation in Bulgaria as a means of promoting sustainable tourism.

4 The term, has been defined by Gillot et al. (2013, p. 3) as describing "historically situated projects and procedures that transform places, people, practices and artifacts into a heritage to be protected, exhibited and highlighted."

5 For the rapport of these terms, see also Salais (1993).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

'heritage' and 'patrimony' a present condition is being related to events in the past.

Outside the humanities, both terms are used in much broader ways than simply designating old buildings and objects. In American English, 'heritage' is also used to denote kinship in genealogical terms. In its British usage, 'heritage' may be more often used in contexts of touristic marketability than elsewhere.[6] It is, perhaps, because of these unwanted associations, as well as to circumvent using a term awkwardly by doubling the suffixes of *-age* and *-ize*, that we have chosen to use patrimonialization rather than heritagization (or heritization) in this volume. Beyond that, our choice has no meaning or implications.

Inheritances treasured, disregarded, or discarded

Despite the skepticism with regard to terminology, we believe that the analogy with inheriting is still useful to understand the processes at play. For sure, there is a stark difference between the legal inheritance by an *individual* (or several) of a deceased ancestor's assets and a *community*'s claiming of such assets, lacking a strictly legal entitlement. Nevertheless, the decisions taken during the course of inheriting, triggered by the fact that something (a human being, a polity, another community's presence) has expired, can well be linked. This is illustrated by another analogy laying bare the different approaches to inherited assets. They may be assigned (at least) three different categories:

The first category pertains to assets prized by the inheritor to an extent that they become part of his or her identity. This may be because these objects are esteemed for their association with the deceased ancestors or simply because of their market value.

Another category consists of those goods identified as of little use to the inheritor. They are sold or discarded, being bereft of emotional value to the inheritor.

There is also a middling category between the two. It concerns objects that are perhaps recognized as being of some value, to somebody, at some point,

6 This is maybe due to the fact that, more than elsewhere, heritage preservation is expected to decrease government subsidies. Britain's key preservationist institution 'English Heritage', for instance, which guards over 400 sites and monuments, is organized as a self-financing charity. Its unwanted reliance on state funding, of course, impacts pricing policies and the use of properties.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

but their utility to the inheritor in the present situation is unclear. The inheritor may not want to exhibit them as part of his or her household for lack of identification with their origins, their lacking use value, or their unpersuasive aesthetic qualities. Even so, they are also not actively discarded. Instead, they remain boxed up or left to their own. A univocal decision regarding their destiny is delayed. Their existence may not be entirely forgotten, but there is resolution to not accord prominence to them in the present. These different approaches – treasuring, disregarding, and discarding – are echoed in the choices made by communities when they negotiate their relationship with the past.

Secondary inheritances and the politics and economies of interest

It is important to stress the difference between the middling category and the other two. To disregard parts of an inheritance does not mean that this choice cannot be reconsidered at a later point. For instance, Crimea's Muslim heritage appears to have only become part and parcel of a Ukrainian 'heritage package' following Russia's encroachment upon Ukrainian territory, as addressed in the contribution by Demchuk. Curiously, an act of administrative disinheriting fostered a belated (now largely symbolic) inheriting.

Hartmuth's contribution explains how an inheritance that would have been discarded in the Habsburg political context around 1700 – whether through destruction or adaptive reuse, because of its status as a burdensome leftover of the Ottoman archenemy – was treated very differently around 1900. A patrimonialization was promoted (if with limited consequence) because of its political usefulness in communicating with a minoritized community.[7]

On Cyprus, as Sabri demonstrates, the British administrators prioritized what could be considered a shared heritage: the pre-Ottoman cathedrals-turned-mosques, which were both Muslim and Western. 'Real' Ottoman-period monuments were initially relegated to the middling category. In Crimea, as discussed in Guboglo's paper, the focus of preservationist efforts under Russian rule was similarly first focused on Greek and Genoese remains, relegating "Turkish and Tatar" buildings to secondary significance.

7 In early Soviet Crimea (discussed by Kançal-Ferrari), by contrast, village mosques were easily transformed beyond recognition into cinemas by destroying only their minarets and reorganizing their interiors.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

In the Serbian case, discussed by Radovanović, the Islamic 'pious foundations', or *evkaf*, came to be considered an anachronism associated with a past (to be) overcome, while in Bosnia and Cyprus they became a key lever in solidifying control over a population skeptical of foreign rule. Yet, also in Turkey, *evkaf* were first omitted from the secular republic's national heritage narrations on account of their religious connotation. Dilsiz Hartmuth demonstrates that, around 1940, there were attempts at a kind of conceptual secularization, which were to turn a religious (non-)heritage into a national/cultural one.

In sum, we see considerable movement between these categories. Disregarded heritage may be reassessed, and eventually *re*valued; it may also be *de*valued. Of course, an inheritance long met with disinterest tends not to benefit from the resources mobilized to preserve 'primary inheritances'. As time takes its toll, such goods may be 'un-preserved' in material terms, resulting in an eventual disposal that, at that point, seems to lack alternatives. In such cases, we see not an active destruction but simply a non-intervention to an ongoing deterioration. The significance of given objects to the inheriting community or communities could not be argued in a manner ensuring that substantial resources are directed toward their preservation.

Bandwidths of post-Ottoman patrimonialization

The present volume gathers a selection of papers presented at two single-day workshops organized at the University of Vienna in June and Novemeber 2022. Their aim was to collect case studies from various regions in formerly Ottoman Europe and Turkey to address the question of how visible remains of the empire's presence (and of Islam's presence) have been coped with discursively and materially. They operated on the premise that both levels of action are really inseparable from each other. Thus, the workshops' problematic focused on how buildings, environments, and objects were appropriated for different purposes and by different actors using the medium of language. Through a comparison

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

of methods and outcomes, the relevant fault lines would be identified.[8] The organizers, who are also this volume's editors, asked:

How central was the factor of continued use by a Muslim community for the preservation of Ottoman architectural works? Did the approaches differ structurally in territories appropriated by emerging nations or those occupied or annexed by external powers, such as Austria-Hungary or Russia? Did an emerging nation's commitment to either language or religion as the primary marker of its ethnic distinction impact the approach to buildings and populations associated with Ottoman rule? Were there antagonisms in these discourses – and, if so, why did certain actors/voices prevail over others? How did the changing role of Turkey since 1989 influence perceptions of Ottoman inheritances in Balkan countries? At which points did the policies of the traditional protector of Muslim communities in Southeast Europe change and why?

The first bloc of papers focuses on Ottoman leftovers in territories taken over by the Habsburgs. Maximilian HARTMUTH looks at how the rich Islamic inheritance of Bosnia, which switched hands from the Ottomans to the Habsburgs in 1878, was integrated into a trans-confessional imperial heritage narrative around 1900. This fascinating, if forgotten, project posed conceptual challenges to its promoters.

Gergő KOVÁCS focuses on the mausoleum of an Ottoman sheikh that has been preserved in Budapest, today Hungary's capital. He demonstrates how the symbolic significance accorded to this object greatly outweighed its architectural significance, showing how it also became a medium in bilateral relations.

Ajla BAJRAMOVIĆ turns to an Ottoman mosque in the Bosnian mining town of Tuzla that was completely rebuilt by the Habsburg authorities. Curiously, this brought about a monumentalization of this object. In her paper's second part, she analyses the findings from an empirical survey conducted among local residents about the perceptions of this building.

8 The fact that this volume features not all papers presented at the two workshops has resulted in a largely unintentional focus on entities that "did not seamlessly transition from the Ottoman domains to a nation state," as one of the manuscript's anonymous reviewers aptly put it. This, indeed, can be said of Hungary, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cyprus, Crimea, and Serbia. In light of previous scholarship's focus on 'classic' post-Ottoman Balkan nations like Bulgaria, Greece, or Albania, we deem this to be an advantage of this volume rather than a deficit. For a guide to previous scholarship on the Ottoman architectural heritage in other Southeast European countries, much of which authored by Machiel Kiel, see the introduction to Hartmuth & Dilsiz (2010).

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

The second bloc of papers focuses on Crimea, which switched hands from the Ottomans to the Romanovs in 1783. Anna GUBOGLO inquires about the perceived role of Crimea's heritage in the later Russian empire and among the non-Russian communities therein. Importantly, she emphasizes the accomplishments of non-state patrimonialization efforts.

Stefaniia DEMCHUK reflects about the place of Crimea's heritage in art historical narrations of Ukraine's heritage. Notably, she points to narrative shifts during the course of the past years and decades. Nicole KANÇAL-FERRARI, finally, focuses on interventions to Ottoman-era and Muslim buildings in post-Ottoman Crimea, with a focus on recent decades.

The third bloc of papers focuses on the question of 'pious foundations' (*evkaf*, *awqaf*) and their endowed properties in different post-Ottoman territories. Reyhan SABRİ looks at the case of the British administration of Cyprus and mechanisms installed to manage the Muslim community's assets. Jelena RADOVANOVIĆ examines a similar issue in Serbia, showing how *evkaf* became demoted from weighty social institutions to a minority's religious property. Ayşe DİLSİZ HARTMUTH inquires about the secular Turkish republic's approaches to this religiously-connotated heritage, identifying rather curious attempts at an appropriation through nationalization and secularization of this central Islamic institution.

Ercan AKYOL continues this discussion by looking at Turkey's Ottoman-period literary heritage and how republican actors sought to unburden it of its ideological weight. By way of conclusion, Jeremy WALTON, who participated as an invited commentator at both workshops, reviews all contributions from his cultural anthropological perspective.

We hope that these contributions will help add nuance to the scholarly discourse on de-Ottomanization – a term that rather inaccurately implies a linear process – and on patrimonialization projects on European soil.

Works cited

Carter, Thomas & Harvey, David & Jones, Roy & Robertson, Iain (eds.). *Creating heritage: Unrecognised pasts and rejected futures*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020.

Frigolé, Joan. "Patrimonialization and mercantilization of the authentic: Two fundamental strategies in a tertiary economy," in: *Constructing cultural and*

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND

natural heritage: Parks, museums and rural heritage, eds. Xavier Roigé & Joan Frigolé. Girona: Documenta Universitaria, 2010, pp. 13–24.

Ginio, Eyal & Kaser, Karl. "Introduction: Towards a comparative study of the Balkans and the Middle East," in: *Ottoman legacies in the contemporary Mediterranean: The Balkans and the Middle East compared*, eds. Eyal Ginio & Karl Kaser. Jerusalem: The European Forum at the Hebrew University, 2013, pp. 3–21.

Harrison, Rodney. *Heritage: Critical approaches*. Routledge: Milton Park, 2013.

Gillot, Laurence & Maffi, Irene & Trémon, Anne-Christine. (2013). "'Heritage-scape' or 'heritage-scapes'"? Critical considerations on a concept," *Ethnologies* 35/2 (2013), pp. 3–29

Hartmuth, Maximilian & Dilsiz, Ayşe (eds.). *Monuments, patrons, contexts: Papers on Ottoman Europe presented to Machiel Kiel*. Leiden: NINO, 2010.

Hartmuth, Maximilian (ed.). *Centres and peripheries in Ottoman architecture: Rediscovering a Balkan heritage = Centri i periferije u osmanskoj arhitekturi: Ponovo otkrivanje balkanskog naslijeđa*. Sarajevo: ChwB, 2011.

Loulanski, Vesselin & Loulanski, Tolina. "The heritization of Bulgarian rose," *Acta Geographica Slovenica* 54/2 (2014), pp. 401–10.

Salais, Robert (ed.). *Patrie, patrimoine*, special issue of *Genèses: Sciences sociales et histoire* 11 (1993).

Sindbaek, Tea & Hartmuth, Maximilian (eds.). *Images of imperial legacy: Modern discourses on the social and cultural impact of Ottoman and Habsburg rule in Southeast Europe*. Berlin: Lit, 2011.

Thouki, Alexis. "Heritagization of religious sites: In search of visitor agency and the dialectics underlying heritage planning assemblages," *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 28/9 (2022), pp. 1036–65.

https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471043-001 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY-NC-ND