

# No news as good news?

## Occupied Bosnia's Ottoman heritage in the Habsburg imperial imaginary ca. 1900

---

Maximilian Hartmuth (University of Vienna)

**Abstract:** *This paper discusses how occupied Bosnia's Ottoman-era architectural inheritance was approached by the Habsburg imperial centre. It inquires about how Vienna and its proxies imagined that the occupied territory's Islamic heritage might be integrated into, and harmonized with, the empire's cultural self-image. Looking at attempts to include monumental works of Ottoman architecture in Bosnia into an empire-wide canon of notable buildings across the confessional divides, the study asks: Was an art history of the Habsburg lands that included cathedrals and mosques alike considered possible and desirable?*

In 1878, after more than four centuries of subordination to Istanbul, Bosnia changed hands. The distinctly Ottoman imprint on Bosnia proved a burdensome legacy for the new Habsburg authorities. The occupation turned around half a million Muslims into Habsburg subjects. Most of them were sceptical of the prospect of rule by a Christian monarch, to say the least.<sup>1</sup>

Under the pretext of advancing conciliation and modernization, the regime's bureaucracy quickly penetrated into many aspects of its new subjects' lives. This did not stop at the Muslim community's infrastructure of worship and confessional education, most of which was facilitated by way of endowments (Arabic *awqaf*, Ottoman Turkish *evkaf*, Bosnian *vakufi*). To supervise and regulate a system of operations through which endowed assets generated incomes then used for the upkeep of public services and the buildings in which they were hosted, the territorial administration (*Landesregierung*) installed in

---

1 For the broader political context, see e.g. Okey (2007).

1883 a so-called *Vakuf-Commission*. Although nominally headed by a prominent Muslim,<sup>2</sup> the commission may be better characterized as an agency of the regime. Its authority to decide whether to demolish, restore, renovate, or rebuild a dilapidated Ottoman-period building cannot be underestimated.<sup>3</sup>

The curiously Orientalizing style informing most of these interventions was the focus of an ERC project, in the context of which this paper was researched.<sup>4</sup> Instead of continuing a provincial Ottoman aesthetic, that new style drew upon a generalized Islamic heritage. It aimed not to conserve but to embellish objects that were perceived as lacking ambitions to individualism or monumentality.<sup>5</sup> Occasionally, it was also simply cheaper to construct a new building than to repair a derelict old one.<sup>6</sup> In other cases, Habsburg-period interventions left little or no mark.

Evidently, there were deliberations that preceded the decisions of how to go about a given project, taking into consideration its prominence just as much as an intervention's financial feasibility. These deliberations may not always have been documented in writing; perhaps they were top-down decisions communicated orally.

There is no doubt that the Habsburg authorities' interest in safeguarding Bosnia's Ottoman-Islamic heritage owed more to considerations of *realpolitik* rather than to an earnest esteem for the alien faith's cultural infrastructure. The *Vakuf-Commission* was a useful instrument to parade the new regime's benevolence towards its Muslim subjects. Architecture became both instrument and medium for this message. Ironically, there were few other periods in Bosnia's history in which so many notable mosques and *medreses* were built or rebuilt in such a short time.

---

2 Note the parallel with the corresponding institution in British Cyprus, discussed in the contribution by Sabri to this volume.

3 The history of this Habsburg-period institution is understudied. Fundamentals are explained e.g. in Omerčić (2017). An older standard work is Begović (1963). A useful regional perspective is taken by Popović (1994), with Yugoslavia treated on pp. 206–12.

4 "Islamic Architecture and Orientalizing Style in Habsburg Bosnia, 1878–1918," Grant agreement No. 758099, 2018–2023, PI: Maximilian Hartmuth. For information on the project's goals and outputs, see [ercbos.univie.ac.at](http://ercbos.univie.ac.at).

5 On this mindset, see Hartmuth (2010). On style, see Hartmuth (2018).

6 In the case of the *Elçi İbrahim Paşa Medresesi*, which was demolished so that railways could arrive in Travnik, a reconstruction of the building was reported to cost 60.000 guilders (*Vatan* 469 [1893], p. 2), whereas the grandiose rebuilding eventually undertaken amounted to 70.000 guilders (*Bosnische Post* 55 [1895], p. 3).

## The Habsburg empire's Muslim inheritance

This paper inquires about how the architectural heritage of the pre-Habsburg Ottoman period was seen and approached at the imperial centre. More specifically, it examines how the imperial centre imagined that Bosnia's Ottoman heritage might be integrated into, and harmonized with, the empire's cultural self-image. Given the centuries-long enmity of both empires, this was certainly no easy task. Any positioning had to be well-reasoned. While we have seen in our investigations of this period's *new* architecture that the authorities were willing to cultivate an aesthetic which would balance the country's Islamic tradition with the ambition of assimilating Bosnia into a modern European milieu (Fig. 1), it remains to ask how the *old* architecture fit into this picture. Were there attempts to include Bosnia's monumental works of Ottoman architecture into an empire-wide canon of notable historical buildings across the confessional divides? Differently stated, could there be an art history of the Habsburg lands that included cathedrals and mosques alike?

Before this paper concludes with a hesitant *yes*, it first needs to identify a source on which such a claim can be credibly made, and then proceed to analyse it in accordance with that hypothesis. Such a source is the imperial panorama titled *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*. It was issued between 1886 and 1902 in 24 volumes, which covered all territories under Habsburg rule. The publication project was instigated by crown prince Rudolph and received the emperor Francis Joseph's blessing. An editorial committee, headed by Rudolph, was installed in the *Hofburg* imperial complex in Vienna. All volumes were published by the royal printing house, the *k.u.k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei*. For these and other reasons, *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild* must be considered an official account of the empire's domains. In view of the unwieldy full title, it soon became known as the *Kronprinzenwerk*.<sup>7</sup>

Its largely decentralized mode of production, with most authors and illustrators recruited in the very provinces covered, must not distract us from the fact that all information compiled and disseminated was ultimately endorsed at the imperial centre. For that reason, I will take the liberty to regard the contents of the volume on Bosnia, published in 1901 as the penultimate volume, not as necessarily reflecting the attributed authors' opinions, but as a closely edited representation of, essentially, an official cultural policy.

---

7 For an overview of the project, a standard reference is Wagner (1989).



*Fig. 1: Sarajevo, mixed-use building known as Đulagin dvor, 1896–97, Arch. Hans Niemeczek, photograph by Anida Krečo, 2023.*

One might go one step further and suggest that the challenge of representing Bosnia to a national and international audience may have been a catalyst for devising a narrative that catered to the sensitivities of various stakeholders. These included not only the three (ethno-)confessional groups in Bosnia that were competing for influence, but also actors and communities in the empire's core lands, newly divided into two halves, with the Hungarian half eager to underpin its position through historical claims in the Balkans. It is most likely due to the requirement of balancing various interests carefully that the Bosnian volume's publication was delayed by a full five years.<sup>8</sup>

Bosnia's administrative status as an occupied territory consigned neither to the empire's Austrian nor to the Hungarian half resulted in a curiously irregular mode of production as well. The volume's contents were supervised not by the editorial committees in Vienna and Budapest but by the general superintendent of the occupied territories, Benjámín von Kállay (1839–1903), a Balkan connoisseur whose principal office was actually that of the Austrian and Hungarian joint finance minister.<sup>9</sup> It was he and his collaborators who had to ensure that the final product was tolerable to anyone claiming a stake in Bosnia's past, present, and future.

How this affected the choice of illustrators and the distribution of areas and subjects among teams is discussed in detail in another publication by the author,<sup>10</sup> but it should be mentioned here that the Bosnian volume was exceptional because it did not mobilize authors or artists native to the territory portrayed. This makes it more 'colonial' in scope than any other volume in the series, in which such participatory mobilization seems to have been a vital component of the overall cohesion-building enterprise.

The preference for expatriates over local contributors to author the chapters in the Bosnian volume was probably implemented because local contributors were regarded as too partisan to entrust them with the occupied territory's representation abroad. The fact that no native artists were hired as illustrators, on the other hand, probably rather reflected the fact that the Western mode of representation used in the *Kronprinzenwerk* was still largely in the domain of expatriates. As the series was to share a common aesthetic and artistic quality,<sup>11</sup>

8 On the volume's difficult realization, see also Hartmuth (forthcoming).

9 For a standard study of the Kállay period and system, see Kraljačić (1987).

10 Hartmuth (forthcoming).

11 On aesthetic concerns, see Wagner (1989, esp. p. 63), and Kohl (1997).

representing (according to the series' preface) an empire unified in its diversity,<sup>12</sup> the bulk of the artists were recruited in Vienna and Budapest.

The chapter surveying Bosnia's art-historically relevant assets was authored by Johann Kellner, a long-serving public official dispatched to Sarajevo from his native Brno to work in the occupation government's construction department. That chapter will be analysed here in detail regarding content, organization, and illustration, and the origins of its framework design in policy concerns will be speculated upon.<sup>13</sup>

### Scope: Whose art history?

Kellner's chapter was titled *Baukunst*, or the "art of building," meaning architecture, and thus explicitly excluding other art forms. This already marks a notable distinction from other volumes in the series, with comparison laying bare a basic difference between the volumes covering the Austrian and the Hungarian territories: the volumes on the Austrian crown lands usually contain chapters dealing with all three fine arts – architecture, painting, and sculpture – while most Hungarian volumes are comprised of regional surveys limited to architecture. Repeatedly, the patchiness of the Hungarian survey chapters with regard to the arts and periods covered (or not) was excused with the reason that the persistent Ottoman menace had not been conducive to cultural development in these areas.<sup>14</sup>

In that sense, the Bosnian volume is more Hungarian than Austrian. It starts off with the same apologia, excusing with reference to the province's traditional frontier status the lack of remarkable (Christian) art as well as the absence of noteworthy works in the genres of painting and sculpture more generally. The focus is instead on the one fine art in which, in Kellner's view,

---

12 See the illustrative preface to the inaugural volume (*Kronprinzenwerk* 1886).

13 That chapter, it should be noted, has only 22 pages, including 12 images, so the analysis is somewhat microscopic and rests as much on comparison as on content as such.

14 In the third Hungarian volume of the *Kronprinzenwerk* (1893) we read e.g. on p. 96: "Die 145 jährige Türkenherrschaft hat Budapest um die Entwicklung der durch König Matthias eingebürgerten Renaissance-Architektur gebracht." In this volume's chapter on painting and sculpture we read on p. 413: "Die vielhundertjährigen Stürme, welche das Leben Ungarns beunruhigten, sind dem Aufblühen der bildenden Künste so hinderlich gewesen, daß hierin fast nur die neueste Zeit augenfällige Erfolge auszuweisen hat."

Ottoman culture produced the most notable results: architecture.<sup>15</sup> Of course, these omissions would also reflect contemporaries' inability to treat Orthodox icon painting or Islamic calligraphy in a similarly dutiful way. Artfully crafted ceramics, carpets, and metal objects are relegated to a chapter titled *Haus- und Kunstgewerbe*. Curiously, even the Middle Ages are omitted entirely from the *Baukunst* chapter. Its scattered material remains are discussed in the archaeological chapter, which is otherwise focused on tombstones.

All things considered, the unfamiliar cultural tradition of Bosnia posed structural problems for the narrative framing of this heritage by outsiders. It could not be presented in a way that would make it easily comparable to other Habsburg lands – except for its architectural heritage. Thus, from the editors' perspective, a history of 'Bosnian' architecture that excluded ruined and adapted buildings basically began with the Ottomans.

## Periodization: Politics or culture?

Kellner's architectural survey is divided into only two periods translating as "the period of Ottoman administration" and "the period of Habsburg administration."<sup>16</sup> The emphasis on the term 'administration' is worth questioning here; a political framework's use to narrate artistic production was not the context of choice in any other *Kronprinzenwerk* volume. Instead, a sequence of styles, as in standard art history, was the preferred mode of narration.

Was the Bosnian chapter's foregrounding of politics over aesthetics due to a scheme to diminish the ubiquitous Ottoman legacy to that of a mere episode in a longer sequence? In the text, the two periods are indeed – if in passing – contrasted with regard to how, and for which art forms, they were conducive (or not). Did this reflect the regime's desired perception as a body administering something that existed independent of it, to suggest that local creative forces could be mobilized differently in accordance with who (and how well one) managed them?

Of course, here as elsewhere it is almost impossible to say which of the formulations were due to Kellner and which to his editors and superiors. Of significant interest in this regard is the fact that Kellner published only one

15 Kellner (1901), p. 414. ("Vorwiegend ist es die Baukunst, die durch das neue Culturelement einen erfrischenden Impuls erhält.")

16 *Ibid.*, p. 413, 429.

year later a text he more unpretentiously called “Contributions to an architectural history of Bosnia.”<sup>17</sup> It now included the Roman and medieval periods and excluded the Habsburg period, which he may not have thought of as sufficiently ancient to include. The section on Ottoman architecture is almost entirely identical in both texts. Yet, publishing outside the framework of the *Kronprinzenwerk*, he chose to label it “the Mohammedan period” rather than “the period of Ottoman administration.” As a private person, a cultural rather than political framework may have made more sense to Kellner. However, for the reasons discussed above, the *Kronprinzenwerk* was simply edited to conform to a different logic.

### Modes of narration: Typology, survey, illustration

Kellner's survey in the *Kronprinzenwerk* was neither in title nor in content a truly historical one. It dealt with an artistic genre – architecture – and not with the history of architecture. In that way, past and present could be combined and compared. There was an evident imbalance, however: the well-informed survey of Bosnia's Ottoman architecture covers three quarters of the text, the Habsburg period the remaining quarter. Oddly, both sections follow different narrative structures, and neither proceeds chronologically.

Ottoman architecture is presented in accordance with a typological classification, starting with mosques, schools, and dervish convents – all of which are tacitly assigned to a common category of religious architecture. Among the secular buildings, bathhouses and commercial structures are highlighted as occasionally of artistic relevance. Towards the end, townscapes, bridges, and transport infrastructures are discussed. Among the townscapes, those of Sarajevo, Mostar, Travnik, and Počitelj are singled out as “unambiguously Mohammedan creations.”<sup>18</sup> One can sense an appreciation here, probably echoed in the fact that so many picturesque townscapes are depicted throughout the volume, though mostly in other chapters (Fig. 2).

---

17 Kellner (1902).

18 Kellner (1901), p. 424 (“spezifisch mohammedanische Schöpfungen”).




Fig. 2: Town views of Počitelj, Travnik, Stolac, and Jajce in the *Kronprinzenwerk's* volume on Bosnia, in original drawings (before 1901) by Rudolf Otto von Ottenfeld (left top/bottom) and Gyula Hány (right top/bottom), Austrian National Library POR Pk 1131, 1551; Pk 1131, 952, Pk 1131, 1550; Pk 1131, 948.

Buildings from the Habsburg period, by contrast, are then presented in accordance with their stylistic affiliation – with the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, etc. Special attention is devoted to buildings in the Orientalizing style, which account for a quarter of the illustrations in the *Baukunst* chapter. The accompanying text emphasizes the government's resolve towards a “preservation and revival of the Arab style.”<sup>19</sup> As if to further that claim, it is mentioned that the government had sent an architect to Cairo to document specified monuments there in detail. These drawings were then used to decorate Sarajevo's

19 Ibid, p. 432. (“besondere Aufmerksamkeit wendet die Regierung der Erhaltung und Wiederbelebung des arabischen Stils zu”).

City Hall (Fig. 3). It is worth emphasizing that the origins of the ‘Oriental’ or ‘Mohammedan’ style to be revived were thus sought in the Arab lands rather than the Ottomans’. That dynasty’s architectural heritage is only briefly mentioned as derivative of a Byzantine tradition.<sup>20</sup>



*Fig. 3: Sarajevo, former City Hall, 1892–95 (various architects), in drawing of 1898 by Bartolomeo Knopfmacher for use in the Kronprinzenwerk, Austrian National Library POR Pk 1131, 1146*


The chapter’s illustrations mostly but not entirely reflect the text’s focus. In a way, they can be said to constitute a parallel text. Seven of the twelve images concern buildings associated with the Muslim community (among which are five Ottoman and two Habsburg buildings; Fig. 4, green frames). Only two images – the new Catholic cathedral and the later theatre – feature buildings in standard Central European Historicist forms (Fig. 4, blue frames). Eight

20 Ibid, p. 433 (“gründliche Studien des seither verstorbenen Regierungsarchitekten Alexander Wittek, besonders an der Sultan Hasan-Moschee in Cairo und an der aus dem XV. Jahrhunderte stammenden Grabmoschee des Sultan Kait-Bai nächst Cairo [haben] die Basis gebildet”) and p. 414 (“der centrale Kuppelbau nach byzantinischem Muster und zwar vorwiegend als monumentaler Steinbau [wird] sehr häufig angewendet”).

of the twelve images are either Ottoman or in an Orientalizing style (Fig. 4, red frames), making the chapter's aesthetic impression heavily Oriental. The two heritage objects associated with the Orthodox community may simply have been chosen so as to also have that heritage represented (Fig. 4, purple frames).<sup>21</sup>

---

21 The two illustrations with Orthodox motifs would have fit just as well in the regional-topographical survey. They correspond to a minor section in the text, in which Christian works from the Ottoman period are marginally addressed, using terms such as “poor” and “sad” to describe them. Cf. Kellner (1901), p. 413. (“[die] kümmerlichen Schöpfungen der christlichen Baukunst dieser Epoche”) and p. 414 (“Illustration des traurigen Zustandes der religiösen christlichen Baukunst”). They may have been included so as to not be reproached for underselling Bosnia's Orthodox majority.



*Fig. 4: The 22 pages of the Kronprinzenwerk's Bosnian volume's "Baukunst" chapter: green marks buildings associated with the Muslim community, blue marks buildings in standard Central European Historicist forms, red frames mark buildings either Ottoman or in an Orientalizing style, and purple marks heritage objects associated with the Orthodox community.*

## Highlights: A canon prefigured

Finally, it can also be remarked that the chapter is not a cultural history in the sense that it highlights accomplishments and seeks to link them chronologically or geographically. Kellner presents his typology, and for some building types he has little more to say than that we must not look for major accomplishments in which.<sup>22</sup> More than an appreciation, this is a taxonomy.

Kellner was clearly most interested in the mosques. The relative abundance of monumental examples of this functional type certainly facilitated their comparative appraisal. Presented and related are mosques not only in Sarajevo but throughout the country. Thus, he prefigured here what was to become the canon of noteworthy buildings.<sup>23</sup>


The paramount monument is the mosque of Gazi Hüsrev Bey (Bosnian *Gazi Husrev-beg*) in Sarajevo, known as the Begova Mosque, completed in AH 938 (CE 1530/1). It claims one of only two full-page illustrations in the chapter, engraved from an accurate drawing by Rudolf Bernt, a trained architect (Fig. 5). A vantage point facing eastward was chosen – perhaps from the upper storey of a bazaar shop – so as to include all distinctive elements in one single picture: the large central dome and one of the two lateral domes, indicating architectural ambition; the minaret and the portico. The ablution fountain to the left is also allowed some prominence. This was actually a Habsburg-period reconstruction (Fig. 6),<sup>24</sup> as was the Orientalizing decoration on the portico's rear wall (Fig. 7), but that fact is not stated in the text. The Habsburg-period additions seem to have been thought of as blending in with the historical structure or even as embellishing it, as was claimed for its redecorated interior, which was not chosen for illustration.<sup>25</sup>

22 E.g. *ibid.*, p. 422 (“Profanbauten haben die Mohammedaner in den seltensten Fällen monumentalen Charakter gegeben”).

23 *Ibid.*, pp. 414–8.

24 See Hartmuth (forthcoming).


25 Kellner (1901, p. 416) only stresses that the interior was redecorated in multicolor during the Habsburg period, and that it added to its grandeur (“prachtvolle Wirkung des Innenraumes wird gehoben durch reiche [vor einigen Jahren ausgeführte] Polychromirung”). This section is notably missing in the 1902 survey by Kellner, which may indicate that the editors of the *Kronprinzenwerk* had required him to include it. Some contemporaries had apparently thought that this decoration was an eyesore: Truhelka (1912), p. 162: “islíkana je džamija iznova a te sadanje slikarije doimlju se



*Fig. 5: Sarajevo, Begova Mosque, 1530/1, in drawing (from before 1901) by Rudolf Bernt for use in the Kronprinzenwerk, Austrian National Library POR Pk 1131, 286.*

---


posmatrača kao na žalost neuspjeli pokus, da se orijentalnim arhitektonskim formama najbolje dobe priljubi ornamentika modernog arhitekta, koji je više vadio impulse iz svoje fantazije, nego li iz onog upravo neiscrpivog vrela prebujne orijentalne umjetnosti"). This possible controversy may have led to the fact that no depiction from the mosque's interior was included.



*Fig. 6: Sarajevo, Begova Mosque, canopied ablution fountain with wooden canopy (replaced with a replica in recent years) over faux-Ottoman stone basin (1893), Arch. Hans Niemeczek, photographed by Auguste Léon in 1912, Musée Albert Kahn, photo ID A1718.*



*Fig. 7: Sarajevo, Begova Mosque, portico wall with decorations of 1885 (later over-painted), Arch. Hans Niemeczek, photographed by Auguste Léon in 1912, Musée Albert Kahn, photo ID A1715.*



*Fig. 8: Foča, Aladža džamija, in drawing of 1897 by Hugo Charlemont for use in the Kronprinzenwerk, Austrian National Library POR 1131, 710.*

The Begova Mosque was certainly the most-reported Ottoman building in Bosnia. It was featured in travel guides; a model of it was exhibited in Vienna and elsewhere.<sup>26</sup> The other full-page image is devoted to the famous interior of the so-called Coloured Mosque of Foča (Fig. 8) which dated to the mid-16<sup>th</sup> century. The artist, Hugo Charlemont, added two praying men to the composition, imbuing this image with an ethnographic, perhaps Orientalist, quality. Again, the vantage point was cleverly chosen so that key elements of the mosque interior could be incorporated: prayer niche, pulpit, squinches, and – most importantly – what remained of the much-praised historical decoration. For the Austro-Hungarians, this uniquely preserved interior, erroneously believed to draw upon original Arabic and Persian motifs,<sup>27</sup> figured as a sort of museum of Oriental art. It, too, was standardly recommended in travel guides and featured in publications.<sup>28</sup>

A third Ottoman monument standardly featured was the *medrese* of Gazi Hüsrev Bey (*Gazi Husrev-begova medresa*) inaugurated in AH 943 (CE 1537). It is described in a lengthy paragraph and depicted in a bipartite illustration with a facade view and a courtyard view. In all three cases, these buildings and their interiors were described in detail in older publications that Kellner could base his elaborations on.<sup>29</sup>

## Conclusion: Prevalence and persistence of the Oriental

What did contemporaries mean when they spoke of ‘preservation’ with regard to Bosnia’s architectural inheritance? My impression is that style, perceived as an expression of a community’s collective culture, was foregrounded over material historicity. In this discourse, there was little differentiation between an ‘Oriental style’ of old and new. The Oriental stylistic tradition that Kellner presented was not only *not* interrupted by the end of Ottoman rule; it was even rejuvenated thereafter. Style was divorced from the Ottoman political context

26 One public official later authored a seminal monographic study of it, in which he likened its importance to that of the Acropolis for Athens. Truhelka (1912), p. 91: “Ko će si na primjer pomisliti Atenu bez Akropole, Pariz bez Louvrea, Zagreb bez Svetoga Kralja, a *si parva licet comparare magnis*, Sarajeva bez Begove džamije?”

27 Kellner (1901), p. 418 (“arabische Formen mit persischen Anklängen”).

28 See e.g. the extensive appreciation in the popular panorama by Renner (1896), pp. 144–8.

29 Notably Stix (1887).

and construed as a living tradition of the Bosnians. This teleology was supported by the fact that eight out of the twelve images in that chapter concern either Ottoman or Orientalizing buildings (Fig. 4, red frames). The latter were, in a way, proposed as a progression of the former.

In addition, the interest in preservation was focused less on individual buildings, which only occasionally enthused the expatriates, than on the townscapes, ensembles, and picturesque settings that enchanted many a visitor from across the Sava. However, the removal of dilapidated objects soon amounted to a loss of character that the new buildings could not compensate. While it was undisputed that ramshackle structures should make way for improvements, buildings identified as noteworthy were preserved, restored, and advertized. From the viewpoint of the restorers, the buildings' Oriental qualities were even emphasized – just as new buildings in an Orientalizing style were seen as a contribution to the preservation of a cultural tradition, even when they replaced actual historical structures.<sup>30</sup>

This strongly distinguishes Sarajevo from other Balkan capitals around 1900. Athens, Sofia, and Belgrade aimed for a transformation in which the remains of the Ottoman period would successively disappear from view. The emerging nations of Greece, Bulgaria, and Serbia staked the claim of belonging to modern Europe through the architecture of their capitals.<sup>31</sup> In Sarajevo, by contrast, what is often perceived as a concerted Europeanization appears more like a logical consequence of adjusted frameworks – notably building codes – than of premeditated grand designs.<sup>32</sup> The persistence of reminders of the Ottoman past was not put into question – much like the presence of Muslims that continued to use them. In effect, these buildings were a useful constituent in an iconography translating into the townscape the political narrative of conciliatory modernization. It is no coincidence that, purportedly, the world's first mosque to be electrified was Sarajevo's Begova, in 1898.

Even so, in empire-wide appraisals these buildings remained outsiders. While the purpose of the *Kronprinzenwerk* volume on Bosnia may have been to lay the foundations for the assimilation of those buildings and their perceived successors into an empire-wide cultural narrative, one cannot help but get the impression that many, if not most, readers may still have conceived of them

30 Kellner (1901), p. 343 and Hartmuth (2010).

31 On this regional context, see Hartmuth (2007).

32 On building codes, see Jäger-Klein et al. (2021). On the construction business, see Sparks (2014).

as something else: as trophies concluding a centuries-long struggle with the Ottoman archenemy.

## Works cited

- Begović, Mehmed. *Vakufi u Jugoslaviji*. Belgrade: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 1963.
- Hartmuth, Maximilian. *The Kaiser's mosques: Islamic architecture and Orientalizing style in Habsburg Bosnia, 1878–1918*. Geneva: Peter Lang, forthcoming in 2024.
- Hartmuth, Maximilian. “Amtssprache Maurisch? Zum Problem der Interpretation des orientalisierenden Baustils im habsburgischen Bosnien-Herzegowina,” in: *Bosnien-Herzegowina und Österreich-Ungarn, 1878–1918: Annäherungen an eine Kolonie*, eds. Clemens Ruthner & Tamara Scheer. Tübingen: Narr, 2018, pp. 251–68.
- Hartmuth, Maximilian. “Insufficiently oriental? An early episode in the study and preservation of the Ottoman architectural heritage in the Balkans,” in: *Monuments, patrons, contexts: Papers on Ottoman Europe presented to Machiel Kiel*, eds. Maximilian Hartmuth & Ayşe Dilsiz. Leiden: Netherlands Institute for the Near East, 2010, pp. 171–84.
- Hartmuth, Maximilian. “Negotiating tradition and ambition: Comparative de-Ottomanization of the Balkan cityscapes,” *Ethnologia Balkanica* X (2007), pp. 15–33.
- Jäger-Klein, Caroline & Bajramovic, Ajla & Stampfer, Lukas. “Fire prevention in Ottoman and Habsburg building codes for Bosnia and their application in Travnik,” in: *New technologies for a sustainable conservation of heritage structures*, eds. Pere Roca & Luca Pelà & Climent Molins. Madrid: CINME, 2021, pp. 2768–79.
- Kohl, Irene. “Entstehungsgeschichte und Konzeption des ‘Kronprinzenwerkes’ (Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild),” in: *Galizien in Bildern*, eds. Irene Kohl & Emil Brix & Klaus Beitzl. Vienna: Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde, 1997, pp. 11–8.
- Kraljačić, Tomislav. *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini (1882–1903)*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1987.
- Kellner, Johann. “Beitrag zur Baugeschichte Bosniens und der Herzegowina,” in: *Festschrift zur Erinnerung an die Feier des fünfzigjährigen Bestandes der deut-*

- schen Staats-Oberrealschule in Brünn*. Brno: Verlag der Schülerlade der deutschen Slaats-Oberrealschule, 1902, pp. 205–23.
- Kellner, Johann. “Baukunst,” in: *Kronprinzenwerk = Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild: Bosnien und Hercegovina*. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1901, pp. 414–34.
- Kronprinzenwerk = *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*, 22 vols. Vienna: Kaiserlich-königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1886–1902.
- Okey, Robin. *Taming Balkan nationalism: The Habsburg ‘civilizing mission’ in Bosnia, 1878–1914*. Oxford: University Press, 2007.
- Omerčić, Jasmin. “Waqf in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> century,” *ICR Journal* VIII/3 (2017), pp. 342–67.
- Popovic, Alexandre. “Le waqf dans les pays du sud-est Europeen a l’epoque post-ottomane,” in: *Le ‘waqf’ dans le monde musulman contemporain (XIXe-XXe siècles): Fonctions sociale, économique et politique*, ed. Faruk Bilici. Istanbul: IFEA, 1994, pp. 199–213.
- Renner, Heinrich. *Durch Bosnien und die Hercegovina kreuz und quer: Wanderungen*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1896.
- Sparks, Mary. *The development of Austro-Hungarian Sarajevo, 1878–1918: An urban history*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014.
- Stix, Edmund. *Das Bauwesen in Bosnien und der Hercegovina vom Beginn der Occupation durch die Österr.-ung. Monarchie bis in das Jahr 1887: Eine technisch-statistische Studie, nach ämtlichen Quellen zusammengestellt*. Vienna: Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1887.
- Truhelka, Ćiro. “Gazi Husrefbeg, njegov život i njegovo doba,” *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja*, XXIV (1912), pp. 91–233.
- Wagner, Robert. “Das Kronprinzenwerk,” in: *Rudolf: Ein Leben im Schatten von Mayerling*. Vienna: Museen der Stadt Wien, 1989, pp. 59–70.

Note: Articles in the newspapers *Bosnische Post* and *Vatan* are referenced in the footnotes.

