

INTRODUCTION



František Šístek

The main purpose of this book is to highlight the importance of the rich encounters, transfers and exchanges between the peoples of Central Europe and the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the development and transformations of modern Bosnian Muslim identity and its representations from the nineteenth century until the present. It also provides evidence of how the history of relations with the Bosnian Muslims shaped attitudes and policies towards Muslims and Islam in general in the Habsburg Empire, among its various peoples, and also in the post-Habsburg successor states of the region. The representations and conceptualizations of the Bosnian Muslims, constructed by Central European authors and observers of various national and social backgrounds, did not remain without effect on the Bosnian Muslims themselves, their self-conceptualizations, and the wider process of ‘reordering the universe’ in the radically different post-Ottoman era and the turbulent twentieth century. From the Central European perspective, the autochthonous Slavic Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina represented the closest Muslim population, a rare outpost of the Orient on European soil. The occupation of the Ottoman province of Bosnia and Herzegovina, with its relatively sizeable Muslim community, by the predominantly Roman Catholic Austria–Hungary in 1878 set the scene for a series of unique policies and modernization efforts with the aim of pacifying, controlling, accommodating and modernizing the Bosnian Muslim society, especially Muslim elites and institutions. Partly as a legacy of Habsburg colonial rule over Bosnia and Herzegovina (1878–1918), but also because of geographic proximity and other factors, namely the influx of refugees as a result of the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1992–95), the peoples of Central Europe and the Bosnian Muslims have maintained intense contacts and ties in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

This collective monograph devotes considerable attention to representations and conceptualizations of the Bosnian Muslims and their development from the nineteenth century onwards. The peoples of Central Europe played an important (indeed in many ways a pioneering) role in the real as well as discursive discovery of the Slavic Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Until the end of the twentieth century, when the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina was receiving global attention that generated a wave of similarly global academic and media interest, a significant part of what could be termed general (European or Western) as well as scholarly knowledge about Bosnia and Herzegovina and its Muslims arguably originated in Central Europe, or was filtered and channelled through Central European sources and interpreters. Bosnia and Herzegovina has often been conceptualized in a somewhat patronizing way as ‘our’ (Habsburg, Central European, Slavic) piece of the Orient, and its Muslims increasingly as ‘our’ (European, secular, tolerant) Muslims rather than exotic aliens and hereditary enemies of Christendom. Since the nineteenth century, Central European authors and observers – officials, diplomats, travellers, scholars, journalists, artists and tourists – have produced a wide range of representations and conceptualizations of Bosnian Muslims. Apart from the mainstream, Habsburg, or common Central European discourse on the Bosnian Muslims, this book pays special attention to specific national discourses on the Bosnian Muslims developed within the Habsburg Monarchy and its successor states (e.g. Czech, Slovene, Croatian).

Far from celebrating the self-proclaimed Habsburg ‘civilizing mission’ and the results of the cultural work achieved by Austria–Hungary, this collective volume presents a more critical and ambivalent but hopefully also a more balanced view of the complex history of transnational encounters between the peoples of Central Europe and the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina. It provides representative samples of different types of Central European contributions to conceptualizations and representations of Bosnian Muslims, and it discusses the formative influence of Habsburg imperial policies on education and the transformation of Islamic institutions, as well as the very recent experiences of Bosnian Muslims as immigrants in Central European countries and the ongoing reinterpretations of Bosnian Muslim identity within the context of contemporary debates on the integration and coexistence of Muslims in Europe.

This volume represents the final outcome of a larger research project that focused on multiple links between Central Europe and Balkan Muslims from the nineteenth century until the present, including not only the Bosnian Muslims but also the Albanians, Turks, and other Muslim groups of the Balkan peninsula. The project was supported by the Czech Academy of Sciences research framework Strategy AV21 – Top Research in the Public Interest, more precisely in 2017 by the research programme for social sciences and humanities entitled ‘Europe and the State: Between Civilization and Barbarity’. The output of our particular research project, entitled ‘Střední Evropa a balkánští muslimové: vztahy,

obrazy, stereotypy' [Central Europe and Balkan Muslims: Relations, Images, Stereotypes], coordinated by Ladislav Hladký (Institute of History, Czech Academy of Sciences, Brno) and František Šístek (Institute of History, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague), included several workshops, public presentations, and an interdisciplinary conference.

Ladislav Hladký and I first conceived the idea of an international and interdisciplinary research project focusing on the links between Central Europe and the Balkan Muslims as the European migration crisis of 2015 and 2016 was reaching its peak. Due to its geographical position, the Czech Republic remained practically unaffected by the refugee flows coming from the Middle East via the so-called Balkan route; however, the country's public space was literally swept by a tide of anti-refugee hysteria and Islamophobia. Most alleged sightings of suspected dark-skinned aliens and Islamic radicals by concerned citizens, the defenders of Christian values and patriots, resulted in grotesque police manhunts against grossly wrong targets, who in the end turned out to be football players of African origin, Bulgarian workers from a local factory, and even chimney sweeps. Despite its irrational causes and proportions, the wave of xenophobia was skillfully instrumentalized by a significant segment of the political class, including leaders of mainstream political parties and the Czech Republic's top political representatives, and further augmented by the alarmist media, often owned or indirectly controlled by the very same politicians. Meanwhile, voices of reason appeared as well. As in other countries, experts frequently stressed the fact that Islam and the Muslim world are far from homogeneous and monolithic, and that there are many ways of practising and thinking the Muslim identity. After discussions with other colleagues researching, in one way or another, the past and present of Balkan Muslim societies, we were convinced that there was a strong need for a more intense exchange of ideas and experiences, for cooperation and coordination in the face of the irrational avalanche of lies, prejudice and outright racism. The best answer we could think of, apart from individual civic activism, was the intensification of research on the Muslims we know best, namely the Balkan Muslims, who for centuries have lived literally next door, and increasingly also in Central Europe itself.

Scholars dealing with the Balkan Muslims, their links and exchanges with the lands and peoples of Central Europe, and their representations in this area, often work with similar material, face similar problems, and raise similar questions. The existence of multiple languages in Central and South Eastern Europe, however, complicates the picture: many sources, and a significant portion of older as well as recent academic output, are available only in the national languages of the region rather than in English. Research on the Balkan Muslims and their relations with Central Europe has been further burdened by the prevalence of old-fashioned attitudes, partiality, inconsistency, and the relatively slow penetration of fresh methodological approaches and concepts. These tendencies, primarily

with regard to particular national academic milieux, have already received critical attention from some Central European scholars. In a text dealing primarily with German-speaking authors from the late Habsburg period, the historian Christian Promitzer laments the lack of major scholarly works on the topic, despite the fact that the period in question represented a formative era for the acquisition of knowledge about the Balkans. While some literature on the topic does indeed exist, mostly addressing the German-speaking countries together (thus underplaying the imperial, multinational and multilingual context of the Habsburg Balkan experience), Promitzer maintains that ‘its level of elaboration remains positivist, and tends to treat the respective authors in uncritical, affirmative terms’ (Promitzer 2015: 198). Focusing on a different but sufficiently close national milieu in the same period, the Turcologist Jitka Malečková comes to similar conclusions in her recent article on Czech representations of Bosnian Turks (Muslims). She notes, among other things, the absence of the Western framework of colonialism, imperialism and Orientalism in the studies of Czech attitudes towards the Ottoman Empire and Balkan Muslims during the late Habsburg period: ‘Leaving aside older critiques of Czech capitalist expansion . . . , mainstream Czech historiography does not pay attention to Czech colonial ambitions. Orientalism is mostly mentioned in value-free descriptions of nineteenth-century Czech art’. She further expresses ‘the need to examine the Czech relationship with Muslim Others within the context of societies that lacked overseas colonies’ (Malečková 2018: 16).

Another problematic perspective regarding Central European attitudes towards the Balkan Muslims re-emerged in the 2010s, though it may have never completely disappeared. It was probably most evident during the centenary of the *Islamgesetz* (Islam Law) of 1912, the law that recognized freedom of worship and regulated the religious needs of the Islamic community in late Habsburg Austria, but which was symbolically replaced in 2015 with a contemporary version of the *Islamgesetz* (see Hafez 2014; Fillafer 2016; Skowron-Nalborczyk 2016; Kropáček 2017; Rexhepi 2019). Its adoption practically coincided with the European refugee crisis, the related wave of Islamophobia and, on a brighter note, with increasing interest in the accommodation of Islam and the integration of Muslims in Europe. In public discourses, journalistic accounts, and sometimes even in the academic community, some voices suggested that the Habsburgs and the peoples of Central Europe in general knew how to handle the Muslims, presumably unlike the current generation of regional politicians and unlike Brussels and all the other usual culprits. This is certainly not our position: the authors of this volume refuse and problematize the self-proclaimed civilizing mission of the Habsburg Empire in the Balkans, as well as other related ideas such as the presumed leading Czech role in the process of the awakening, cultivation and modernization of the South Slavs, the civilizational superiority of the Slovenes (or Croats) above the backward Yugoslav southerners, and so on. On a more general

level, we are trying to avoid hegemonistic, exclusivist and paternalistic discourses rooted in the hierarchical mental mapping of Europe, which tend to ascribe a privileged position to Central Europe *vis-à-vis* the Balkans, with their less developed, less fortunate, and allegedly somehow less European populations (see Todorova 1997: 140–60). A conference called ‘Central Europe and Balkan Muslims: Relations and Representations’, which took place at Vila Lanna in Prague in October 2017 as part of our research project, revealed a relative richness and variability of research on Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks), who received considerably greater attention from our group of scholars of different disciplines than other Muslim populations of South Eastern Europe. This imbalance partly reflects the current state of research priorities in Central Europe, characterized by a relatively stable interest in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its Muslims, with most attention being focused on the formative experience of Habsburg rule (1878–1918) and the post-Yugoslav era (1992–present). This interest can also be attributed to the shared history of coexistence under the common roof of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (as well as Yugoslavia in the case of the Slovenes, Croats and Serbs), to specific national traditions of research rooted in the (post-)Habsburg and/or Slavic and Slavophile contexts, to the relative geographic proximity and accessibility of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and, last but not least, to an increased presence of Bosnian Muslims in Central Europe following the wars of Yugoslav succession in the 1990s. The results of new and innovative research on various aspects of Bosnian Muslim historical and contemporary experiences with Central Europe, and the rich representations of Bosnian Muslims in literature, scholarly works, textbooks, paintings, proverbs, songs, journalistic accounts, political discourses and the media, which are reflected in the individual chapters compiled in the present volume, hopefully justify our decision to narrow the focus of this book to the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina, their links and exchanges with Central Europe, and their representations in this area.

Central Europe and Bosnian Muslims: Delimitation and Terminology

It is certainly not the intention of this book to contribute to the already plentiful conceptualizations of Central Europe, let alone debates about its proper delimitations or discussions of its allegedly specific character, whether rooted in the region’s exceptional cultural traditions, unique historical experiences, precarious geopolitical position, inimitable coffeehouse culture, or otherwise. Our definition of Central Europe is primarily practical and relatively flexible when it comes to perceived limits of the region, which are notoriously difficult to define. For the purpose of this volume, Central Europe primarily, but not exclusively, corresponds to the historical region of the late Habsburg Empire and its imperial legacy. In our view, during its first post-Habsburg century, the core of this space, charac-

terized by numerous similarities and shared, parallel, and overlapping traditions and practices at different levels of life (from politics to popular culture), roughly corresponded to the present-day nation states of Austria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia and Croatia. Relations between these lands and their peoples with Bosnia and Herzegovina and its Muslims have been relatively extensive, as are the resulting representations and conceptualizations of the Bosnian Muslims in the various national milieux and languages of this space. The long-term academic interest in Bosnia's history and present is reflected in the considerable number and variety of scholarly texts published by authors originating from or working in the successor states of the Habsburg Monarchy (see the selected but representative bibliography *Forschungsliteratur zu Bosnien-Herzegowina* in Ruthner and Scheer 2018: 539–60).

Apart from the core area of the late Habsburg Monarchy, we have also included material from Croatia and Serbia. This might raise some eyebrows: are not the Croats, let alone the Serbs, supposed to belong to the Balkans rather than to Central Europe? The Serbs and Croats have indeed enjoyed a special position *vis-à-vis* the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Serb, Croat, and Bosnian Muslim (Bosniak) ethnic spaces, histories, and national discourses have been intensely intertwined and overlapping, especially in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina itself (Okey 2011). From the nineteenth century onwards, the process of collective self-conceptualization of the Bosnian Muslims, with its successive reinterpretations, has developed as a result of a complex interplay of the Croat and Serb national discourses. By way of cultural transfers, some representations, conceptualizations and stereotypes of Bosnian Muslims generated in the Serb and Croat milieux also influenced the ways the population was imagined by those peoples of Central Europe living further afield.

Since the break-up of Yugoslavia and the establishment of Croatian independence in the early 1990s, there have been serious attempts to do away with the unwelcome Balkan identity, which is too closely associated with the shared but recently repudiated Yugoslav history and the supposedly Balkan Serbs as the negatively conceived Other in contemporary Croatia. In official discourses, Croatia has been conceptualized primarily as a Central European (or at best a Central European and Mediterranean) country (Luketić 2013); however, for the purposes of this volume, the treatment of the Croats as Central Europeans should not be understood as a pledge of support for discourses that construct the Central European identity of the Croats at the expense of their neighbours, but rather as an acknowledgment of their position in particular historical contexts. The territory of the present-day Republic of Croatia was, in its entirety, an integral part of the late Habsburg Empire. As subjects of the Habsburg Empire, the Croats played an important role in the Austro-Hungarian (semi-)colonial enterprise in Bosnia and Herzegovina after 1878, while their political and cultural elites developed their own images and visions of the Bosnian Muslims beginning in the early days

of the Croatian national awakening in the first half of the nineteenth century (Baskar 2008: 70–73; Stehlík 2013; Stehlík 2015). Along with other South Slavs, the Bosnian Muslims and Croats spent the greater part of the twentieth century as citizens of the Yugoslav state. Despite the recent history of hostilities, ethnic unmixing, and ongoing nationalist antagonisms after Yugoslavia's collapse, the Croats and Bosniaks continue to be closely intertwined in many ways.

Similar arguments can be made in the case of the Serbs. Despite the core of the modern Serbian state developing on the fringes of the Ottoman Empire, and the nascent Serb national discourses being strongly influenced by authors and traditions from the post-Ottoman territories, including not only present-day Serbia but also Montenegro and other areas (see the chapter by Marija Mandić in this volume), it would be a mistake to exclude the Serbs from our conception of Central Europe. Before 1918, large numbers of Serbs lived along the southern borderlands of the Habsburg Empire, from Dalmatia and Croatia in the west and the present-day Serbian province of Vojvodina to eastern Banat in modern-day Romania. Novi Sad, Sremski Karlovci, and other towns and cities in southern Hungary represented radiant centres of Serb national life during the late Habsburg Monarchy. The River Danube, which in many ways epitomizes the myth of Central Europe, also played the role of the vital axis and artery of the Serb national revival and the subsequent process of mass ethnic homogenization (Roksandić 1991: 66–80). There are many good reasons to include both Serbs and Croats in a book on Central Europe and the Bosnian Muslims rather than exclude them as impure or incomplete Central Europeans simply because they can be simultaneously ascribed to alternative imagined regions such as the Balkans, South Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean (Bjelić and Savić 2002). After all, overlapping of imperial legacies, ethnic spaces, and territorial concepts has been the rule rather than the exception in Central and South Eastern Europe.

Most contributions gathered in this volume focus on Habsburg and post-Habsburg Central Europe; however, the Habsburg legacy obviously cannot remain the only defining factor one hundred years after the demise of the old empire and three decades after the fall of the Iron Curtain. In fact, it seems that the myth of Central Europe has already lost much of the glamour and appeal it held at the peak of its popularity in the 1980s and 1990s. As a result of postsocialist transformations, globalization, and the process of European integration, the idea of a specific Central European historical and cultural identity does not always seem to correspond to current realities. The postcommunist states of Central Europe joined the European Union in 2004, nine years after Austria. Croatia followed in 2013. Once in the EU, the notion of a specific Central European identity became progressively blurred in the complex world of new, pragmatic and temporary allegiances and alliances. Its symbolic capital seemed largely spent after the dream of a return to Europe finally came true, but it soon gave way to a dull, grey, everyday reality that did not quite match the original expectations of

catching up with the West. Since the global financial crisis (2009) and the European refugee crisis (2015), the countries of Central Europe have gained increasing notoriety for the anti-immigrant, Islamophobic, and nationalist stands of their political leaders. In the meantime, the considerable importance of Germany for contemporary Central (and South East) Europe has become even more obvious than before. Whether it is fully or partly *Mittel* European or predominantly West European remains an eternal academic question; however, Germany indisputably performs the role of an economic engine of Europe and often epitomizes the EU and its policies in popular imagination across the continent. This has become most evident in the case of the great European refugee crisis that culminated in 2015 and 2016, and in the attitudes towards immigration and the integration of newcomers, especially those of Islamic faith and/or Muslim cultural origin. In Austria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and the post-Yugoslav states, Germany (rather than Austria) plays an important role in internal debates, politics, and popular imagination in many topics, and is regarded both as a model worthy of emulation by some and as a negative example that must be avoided at all costs by others. While we might erect a discursive fence between Central Europe and Germany for a number of reasons and practical considerations, this cannot change the fact that much of Central Europe lives in Germany's shadow; therefore, we have also included some contributions based on material from Germany in the closing part of the volume dedicated to the post-1989 period and up to the present.

This collective monograph focuses on the Bosnian Muslims, their interactions with the peoples and states of Central Europe, and the representations of them that have developed in the region. A short terminological clarification is needed at this point. We have opted for the term 'Bosnian Muslim' instead of the term 'Bosniak'. Since 1993, the appellation 'Bosniak' has denoted the South Slavic nation (*narod*) previously officially recognized under the ethnonym 'Muslim' (*Musliman*) in late socialist Yugoslavia. When spelled with the lower-case 'm', as in 'musliman', the term was reserved for Islamic religious identity regardless of ethnic background (Bringa 1995: 10; Bougarel 2001: 112–13; Bougarel 2015: 10). The term 'Bosniak', denoting modern national rather than confessional identity, is appropriately employed in several contributions in this book focusing on the post-Yugoslav period; however, some chapters focus on earlier periods prior to the start of the process of modern ethnic homogenization, when prenational identities were the norm across the region (Detrez 2013: 13). The term 'Bosniak' would represent an ahistorical projection if used in inappropriate contexts. On the other hand, the term 'Bosnian Muslim' remains relatively flexible, as it can be fairly accurately used for the Ottoman era, for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and also for the present, especially in cases when the focus is primarily on religious identity. Another reason for the term 'Bosnian Muslim' being more accurate for our purposes is that the present volume does not focus on the Bosniaks

as a national group in their entirety, living not only in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where they represent the most numerous of the three main ethnic groups, but also as ethnic minorities on the territory of the neighbouring states of Serbia and Montenegro, and even in the more distant Kosovo.

Throughout the volume, the full name Bosnia and Herzegovina is used rather than the hyphenated version Bosnia-Herzegovina or the abbreviated form BiH (derived from the original South Slavic name *Bosna i Hercegovina*). Bosnia and Herzegovina was the official appellation of the province under Habsburg rule (1878–1918). From 1945 until 1992, Bosnia and Herzegovina was the official name of one of the six republics that together comprised the socialist Yugoslav federation. Since 1992, Bosnia and Herzegovina has again been the official name, this time of an independent and internationally recognized state; nevertheless, Herzegovina and Bosnia remain two distinct historical and geographical regions, albeit closely intertwined. At the time of the Ottoman conquest of this part of the Balkan peninsula in the fifteenth century, there was already a distinction between ‘the king’s lands’ (Bosnia proper) and ‘the duke’s lands’ (Herzegovina): ‘In their usual conservative fashion, this division was retained by the Ottomans’ (Heywood 1994: 29). In the last decades of Ottoman rule at the end of the nineteenth century, as Edin Hajdarpašić explains, ‘Bosnia was the name of the larger province that absorbed the south-eastern region of Herzegovina after it was reorganized several times and disbanded in 1865, later resulting in the official designation of the land as Bosnia-Herzegovina; the name Bosnia was a common shorthand for the entire region’ (Hajdarpašić 2015: 6). Both regions, inhabited by a similarly mixed population composed of Christian Orthodox (Serbs), Roman Catholics (Croats) and Muslims (Bosniaks), have mostly been governed together and treated as one land in modern times. For practical reasons, the full name of the province/republic/state of Bosnia and Herzegovina is often shortened to Bosnia. This trend has also been evident in much scholarly literature, whether dealing with the past (the ‘history of Bosnia’) or present (‘postwar Bosnia’) of this territory (e.g. Malcolm 1996; Bieber 2006). In this book, we have tried to use the full ‘impractical’ name whenever possible, but to pay attention to cases where regional distinctions between Herzegovina and Bosnia are expressed.

However, even staunch opponents of the tendency to use the term Bosnia as a substitute for the name of the entire country acknowledge the fact that, in some cases, deviations from the ideal do make sense as ‘it would indeed be difficult and impractical to speak of a “Bosnian-Herzegovinian language” or a “Bosniak-Herzegovinian people”’ (Ančić 2015: 23). For these reasons, we have, throughout this volume, used the term ‘Bosnian Muslims’ rather than ‘Bosnian-Herzegovinian Muslims’ or ‘Bosnian and Herzegovinian Muslims’ for all the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina of Muslim faith and family background. The term Bosnian Muslims has been well established in recent scholarly literature and popular discourse. There are other practical reasons in modern times to treat the Bosnian

Muslims as one population. With due respect to the specificity of Herzegovina and its inhabitants, similar regional differences in historical development, geography, dialect, and what is commonly perceived as differences in ‘mentality’ in the emic perspective, can also be encountered within Bosnia proper – for example, between people from the Krajina region in the north-west and the Drina valley in the east.

In the present volume, the appellation ‘Muslim’ is used not only *sensu stricto* as a description of believers and practitioners of Islam of Bosnian and Herzegovinian origin but also in a more general sense for people of Bosnian Muslim family and cultural backgrounds, including agnostics and atheists who have been relatively numerous in Bosnian society since the Second World War as a result of the processes of secularization under socialist Yugoslavia. Labelling an atheist a ‘sociological Muslim’ may not be the most fortunate choice imaginable, but it has commonly been used in daily life in Bosnia and Herzegovina and, for practical reasons, in much scholarly literature also.

Many of the authors in this volume do in fact put more emphasis on various aspects of the religious rather than the national identity of the Bosnian Muslims in different periods of their modern development. Before the occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria–Hungary in 1878, Bosnian Muslims tended to be overwhelmingly perceived in Central Europe as a local variety of Turk. Not only in the writings of observers from beyond the region (e.g. Rataj 2002) but also among the locals, the term ‘Turk’ was predominantly used in order to denote the Islamic religious identity in general, basically as a regional synonym for the term ‘Muslim’. Similarly, the term ‘Latin’ was popularly deployed for Roman Catholics, and ‘Serb’ (*Srbín*) for adherents of Christian Orthodoxy in the Western Balkans, including Bosnia and Herzegovina, before the process of modern ethnic differentiation and homogenization (see the chapter by Božidar Jezernik in this volume). Under the rule of the predominantly Roman Catholic Habsburg Empire (1878–1918), the Slavic Muslim population of the newly acquired provinces was primarily perceived, organized and controlled with regard to its Islamic religious identity (see the chapter by Zora Hesová in this volume). Meanwhile, the question of national consciousness among the Bosnian Muslims and indeed the entire population of the provinces, including the Christian Orthodox (Serbs) and Roman Catholics (Croats), was steadily gaining in importance during the Austro-Hungarian era (Mujanović 2018; Babuna 2018; Džihić 2018). The Habsburg administration seriously experimented with its own nation-building project, the goal of which was the creation of a common Bosnian identity (*bošnjaštvo*) that would simultaneously transcend the previous religious divides, uproot the nascent processes of Serb and Croat national homogenization among Orthodox and Catholic Christians of the provinces, and, finally, ensure the lasting political loyalty of the newly homogenized mass of the Slavic citizens of Bosnian nationality (Donia 1981; Kraljačić 1987; Velikonja 2003;

Hladký 2005; Okey 2007). However, the religious identity of the Bosnian Muslims arguably remained more important in practical policies, conceptualizations and representations of this population before 1918 than their nascent and ambivalent ethnic identity. Even some of the contributions in this volume that deal with the post-1989 period, including the present, address Bosnian Muslims in the religious sense. Of course, the choice of this perspective does not mean that we are trying to deny or diminish the importance of the ethnic differentiation, national homogenization, or nationalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which have all received attention from numerous authors in recent decades.

Concepts and Themes

This interdisciplinary volume has brought together historians, anthropologists, and political and literary scholars. Most of them come from and are institutionally based in countries of Central and South Eastern Europe. As is usually the case, the individual chapters are characterized by their focus on diverse problems through different methodological approaches. In the following section, we will briefly highlight several major concepts and themes of this book.

The concept of ‘Orientalism’, as defined by Edward Said (Said 1978; Said 1993), has been sufficiently well known and debated in academic circles for four decades. As such, the concept is used by different authors throughout the book, although it generally refers to a certain perspective characteristic for visual and textual representations rather than a full acknowledgement of the existence of the monolithic and hegemonic Western discourse on the (Middle Eastern) Orient as originally conceived by Said himself. The specific features of Habsburg Orientalism, its discourses, practices and agents have recently been analysed elsewhere (Heiss and Feichtinger 2013; Gingrich 2016; Feichtinger 2018). Johann Heiss and Johannes Feichtinger maintain that it is not possible to speak of a single and uniform Habsburg Orientalist discourse. They distinguish between two distinct imaginary Orients: the first is distant, represented primarily by the Ottoman Empire and the Turks, while the second is located closer to home and epitomized by Bosnia and Herzegovina and the South Slav populations of the Western Balkans in general. In addition, a variety of Orientalist discourses with particular features developed in the multilingual Habsburg Empire (and the new Balkan nation states to the south-east) in non-German languages and national milieux. Some of the following chapters provide glimpses into these generally lesser-known Orientalist discourses vis-à-vis the Bosnian Muslims and the Balkans (especially Croatian, Serbian, Slovene and Czech).

The concept of frontier Orientalism has been gaining increasing currency in academic circles across Central and South Eastern Europe (Sabatos 2020). The term appeared for the first time in a conference paper by the anthropologist Andre

Gingrich (Gingrich 1998). Gingrich defines frontier Orientalism as a ‘systematic set of metaphorical figures and mythological explanations’ (Gingrich 1998: 119). Unlike Edward Said, who was primarily concerned with elite forms of academic, literary and political discourse in the West, Gingrich’s idea of frontier Orientalism is derived from his analysis of Austrian popular discourses, namely the folk and public culture, and particularly that of Eastern Austria as the region most directly affected by the Habsburg–Ottoman wars before the Siege of Vienna in 1683 turned the fortunes decisively in favour of the Habsburg Monarchy. Numerous traces of this turbulent history are still memorialized in the public space and collective memory across Austria and the region in general (see also Sutter Fichtner 2008). Gingrich distinguishes between two discursive figures: that of a bad (hostile and threatening) Muslim, represented in the past by the Turk and increasingly replaced today by the Arab, and the good Muslim, incarnated in the Bosnian Muslim (Gingrich 1998: 107): ‘[T]he bad Muslim refers to early modernity; he is associated with a direct threat to “our” physical and cultural existence. . . . The good Muslim Oriental, on the other hand, refers to late colonialism. Here, the Muslim is no longer a dangerous rival but is transformed into a loyal subject. The good Oriental exists on this, “our”, side of the frontier’ (Gingrich 1998: 117–18).

The concept of frontier Orientalism has recently been applied by different authors to material from other regions that for centuries constituted the wider borderlands of empires and zones of conflict and exchange between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans. In their chapter on the Turkish threat and its memory in the present-day Czech lands, Ladislav Hladký and Petr Stehlík reach the conclusion that frontier Orientalism cannot properly reflect the Czech (or more precisely the Moravian) case due to the fact that south-eastern Moravia, let alone the rest of the Bohemian Crownlands, was not directly affected by the Habsburg–Ottoman wars (although it did in fact suffer from incursions of smaller, irregular advance units of the Ottoman army). In his chapter on representations of Bosnian Muslims in Czech language sources during the late Habsburg era, František Šístek maintains that the term does indeed adequately capture the essence of the standard set of images of the Turk (Muslim) in Moravian folklore and tradition, despite the fact that direct military encounters between the two empires took place in nearby Lower Austria and Hungary. Writing about the images of Bosnian Muslims in the literary work of nineteenth-century Croatian author Vjenceslav Novak, Charles Sabatos analyses the relationship between Central European frontier Orientalism, Western Orientalism, and Balkanism as defined by Maria Todorova (Todorova 1997). In her chapter on the changing perceptions of Bosnian Muslims in post-Yugoslav Slovenia, Alenka Bartulović speaks, in turn, of the framework of Yugoslav Orientalism, where varieties of frontier Orientalism mixed with ideologically constructed and nurtured memories of underprivileged *rayah*.

The term ‘Balkanism’ as defined by Maria Todorova in her influential book *Imagining the Balkans* (Todorova 1997) describes a spatialized, largely negatively prejudiced discourse about the Balkans and its inhabitants. She maintains that Balkanism ‘is not merely a subspecies of Orientalism’ and should be understood as a phenomenon that developed independently of Orientalism (ibid.: 8, 20). Despite strong stereotypical associations with violence and backwardness, the Balkans are considered to be an integral part of Europe; their inhabitants, therefore, represent internal Others, Europeans from a periphery rather than essentially different, non-European Others, such as the primarily Muslim inhabitants of the Middle East as seen in Western imagination. Another feature that distinguishes Balkanism from Orientalism is ‘the absence of colonial legacy (despite the often-exploited analogies)’ (ibid.: 20). Todorova defines the Balkans primarily as a historical and cultural legacy of the Ottoman Empire: in territorial terms, therefore, the Balkans are, more or less, identical to the old Turkey-in-Europe. Bosnia and Herzegovina, under Ottoman control until the Austro-Hungarian occupation of 1878 (and formally until annexation three decades later), certainly qualifies as a Balkan country and an object of Balkanist discourse as analysed by Todorova. The authors of the present volume have paid relatively limited attention to Balkanism in their particular contributions, with the exception of those chapters devoted to the analysis of representations in literature and other texts in a narrower sense. This can primarily be attributed to the overall focus of our volume on the colonial legacy of the Habsburg Empire, which succeeded the Ottomans in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Despite analogies and overlaps with neighbouring regions, Bosnia and Herzegovina also represents a unique case of a colonial experience in the classical sense in the Balkans, consisting of a direct domination and exploitation by a major European power of the time. The process of de-Ottomanization under late Austria–Hungary, linked with a perceived need for Europeanization and modernization but taking into account the existence of a large Muslim population, displayed specific features distinguishing Bosnia and Herzegovina (and its Muslims) from the fate of the Ottoman territories that became part of the new Christian national states and were subjected to other, usually more pronounced, anti-Ottoman and anti-Muslim nation-building projects (Šišteć 2016: 30–34). In this volume, the focus on Bosnian Muslims, a group more closely linked with the perceived Oriental legacy and the Islamic world than most other Balkan populations, inevitably increased the attention our authors devoted to Orientalist representations and their derivations.

Another useful concept that has become increasingly common in the past few years, especially among historians and anthropologists, including several of the authors of this volume, can be attributed to the historian Edin Hajdarpašić and his monograph on nationalism and political imagination in Bosnia and Herzegovina from the late Ottoman period until the First World War (Hajdarpašić 2015). In his analysis of national narratives relating to Bosnian Muslims in the

observed period and debates over their national identity, which included not only Bosnian Muslims themselves but also Serbs and Croats, Hajdarpašić explores the figure of the '(br)other'. This concept, echoing the term 'frenemy' best known from popular psychological discourses, integrates both binary perspectives characteristic for the ambivalent discourse on the Bosnian Muslims and their position in South Slavic identity struggles. According to particular needs and demands, they could be conceptualized both as hostile Oriental Others as well as brothers of their fellow South Slavs, the Serbs and Croats. Again, as in the previously cited works of Austrian specialists who have discovered similar discursive figures of the bad, alien, faraway Muslims versus the good, 'our', close-to-home Muslims based on their research on Austrian material, differentiation of this type eventually opens space for representations of the Bosnian Muslims as our, good Muslims: 'Within the proliferating nineteenth-century debates over the meanings of South Slavic brotherhood, the "Turks" occupied particularly conspicuous roles. Some Serbian and Croatian national activists tried to distinguish between the Turks (meaning non-Slavic Ottoman rulers) and "our" Turks (meaning Bosnian Muslims)' (Hajdarpašić 2015: 203). This approach obviously enabled the discursive and symbolic integration of the Bosnian Muslims in the framework of the South Slavic ideology and the later Yugoslav state-building projects, culminating in the period of officially promoted brotherhood and unity under socialist Yugoslavia.

The concept of a '(br)other' fittingly captures the Serb and Croat attitudes in the particular temporal and spatial context analysed by Edin Hajdarpašić and arguably also in many of the later Serb, Croat, Yugoslav, post-Yugoslav and Bosniak discourses. As some authors of this volume have shown, it can also be meaningfully applied to other Slavic nations living further afield such as the Slovenes and Czechs, and their attitudes to Bosnian Muslims and potentially to other fellow Slavs. Despite the greater geographical distance and relatively lower intensity of contacts with the Bosnian Muslims in comparison with the Serbs and Croats, the common Slavic identity provided a sufficiently powerful stimulus and opportunity for the development of similar discourses on Otherness and brotherhood vis-à-vis the Muslim population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The chapter by František Šístek on representations of Bosnian Muslims in Czech sources under Habsburg rule – largely the same period covered by Hajdarpašić – reveals a number of similar strategies in the twists and turns of Czech conceptualizations of the Bosnian Muslims. Alenka Bartulović, in her chapter on the changing attitudes towards Bosnian Muslims in post-Yugoslav and post-socialist Slovenia, applies the term '(br)other' to Slovene perspectives on Bosnian Muslims from the 1980s until the present. The brotherhood in question is linked with experiences of common life in former Yugoslavia, in its demise, and in the newly independent Slovenia. In many ways, this is the story of the rise of the South Slavic brotherhood in reverse (from brothers to Others).

This book represents, among other things, a new contribution to the existing literature on representations of the Bosnian Muslims, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Balkans in general (e.g. Todorova 1997; Goldsworthy 1998; Hadžiseli-mović 2001; Jezernik 2004; Ruthner 2018). The multitude of faces of the elusive figure of the Bosnian Muslim in Central European sources testifies to a rich history of representations, transfers and exchanges, and, without a doubt, to a long-term fascination with the exotic, with the perceived Oriental world, and, on a more general level, with everything that contrasted most with one's own experiences, social norms and cultural expectations. (It has repeatedly and perhaps rightly been pointed out that of the three main ethnoreligious communities of the country, the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina have attracted disproportionate attention in comparison with that devoted to their Christian Orthodox Serb and Roman Catholic Croat neighbours and fellow citizens.) On the pages of this book, the reader will have a chance to observe a long procession of successive images of the Bosnian Muslims: Bosnian Muslims cast as renegades, traitors of the ancestral faith who converted to Islam (*poturice*), enemies of their fellow Christian South Slavs and collaborators with their Ottoman and later Habsburg occupiers and oppressors; Bosnian Muslims as descendants of the medieval aristocracy and the heretical Bogomils; Bosnian Muslims as anachronistic relicts of another time, whose further survival in modern Europe is hard to imagine; Bosnian Muslims as potential converts to Christianity; Bosnian Muslims as 'ours' (Habsburg, Slavic, Yugoslav, European, white), as good Muslims as opposed to the bad, foreign, Asiatic Turks and Arabs; the fanatical and brave as well as passive and decadent Bosnian Muslims; Bosnian Muslims as loyal citizens of a secular state; Bosnian Muslims as real or potential Islamic radicals and terrorists; Bosnian Muslims as Slavic brothers; Bosnian Muslims as Orientals, as peasants from the Balkan South, *gastarbeiters* (guest workers), economic migrants and war refugees; as people of exemplary religious tolerance and even as members of the white race, who today can quietly integrate in the increasingly racist West, unlike the less fortunate Muslims of non-European origin.

The contributions gathered in this volume provide the reader with a diachronic, *longue durée* perspective from the early modern times until the present. The book places special emphasis on Habsburg rule over Bosnia and Herzegovina (1878–1918), its self-proclaimed civilizing mission, and the legacy of this key period for the Bosnian Muslims and for the development and transformations of their representations in general. From a geographical point of view, we can imagine the space that is observed in this book as an axis, with its starting point in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Apart from this land that represents (among other things) both the real and the symbolic homeland of the Bosnian Muslims, individual chapters cover topics dealing with Croats and Serbs as their compatriots sharing the same homeland and or immediate neighbours, with their more distant Slavic brothers (as they were conceptualized in the nineteenth century – namely

the Slovenes and Czechs), with Austria and its complex conundrum of imperial experiences and their postimperial reflections, and, finally, as we progress in time and space, also briefly with Germany and the wider European context of debates on Islam, immigration and integration in the early twenty-first century.

Note on Contributions

In the opening chapter on Czech reflections of the Turkish threat in the context of early modern Central Europe, Ladislav Hladký and Petr Stehlík first provide a summary of the role of the Bohemian lands in the Habsburg–Ottoman military conflicts. Thus far, the significant and long-term financial and military contributions of the Bohemian lands to the defence of the Habsburg Monarchy against Ottoman expansion have not received sufficient attention in English-language scholarly literature. The second part of their chapter analyses the changing representations of the Turk in Czech (Bohemian) discourses between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. Despite certain specific features that can be attributed to the fact that the Bohemian lands were spared the direct effects of the devastating military conflicts between the two empires, these discourses can, in fact, be regarded as variations on a wider transnational discourse on the topic, with its more or less characteristic tropes well known from other regions and national milieux (e.g. Bartulović 2010). The authors believe that the wider Central European discourse on the Turk – often indistinguishable from the wider discourse on Muslims in general – preconditioned and influenced the formation of later representations of the Bosnian Muslims in the Habsburg Monarchy. Therefore, their chapter serves as a specific prologue to the other contributions, which provide rich evidence of the uneasy transformation of the traditional negative image of the Turk into a more nuanced or even positive image of a Bosnian Muslim. Finally, Hladký and Stehlík underline the fact that the historical role of the Bohemian lands in the Habsburg–Ottoman military conflicts has failed to assume a prominent place in the Czech collective consciousness. Despite a considerable wave of Islamophobia after 2015, linked with the European refugee crisis, attempts at instrumentalizing the memory of the wars against the Ottomans have been marginal and underdeveloped in the contemporary Czech Republic.

In his chapter, Božidar Jezernik paints a broad picture of the development of Bosnian Muslim collective identities, from the prenatal, primarily religious, and regional sense of belonging characteristic for the Ottoman Empire and the process of nationalization accelerated during the Austro-Hungarian period through to identity debates in the interwar Yugoslav kingdom. Jezernik's text is based on a rich selection of period sources, comparing and contrasting a plenitude of successive voices over centuries, those of outside observers as well as natives. The long existence of the millet system ('millet' is characterized as a con-

fessional nation), both as a central concept and a practical tool of collective identity and identity politics during much of the Ottoman era, had a lasting effect on the subsequent process of nationalizing collective identities during the Habsburg period. Jezernik believes that ‘the inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina adopted the term “*nacija*” (nation) simply as a translation of the old term “*millet*”’. He further underlines the interconnectedness of the process of nationalization in which the Bosnian Muslims often reacted to impulses and perceived threats from their nationally more awakened fellow Christian citizens. The pressure to accept either Serb or Croat national identity resulted in the growth of a distinct collective consciousness among the Bosnian Muslims in interwar Yugoslavia.

In the introductory part of his chapter on ambivalent perceptions of the Bosnian Muslims in the Austro-Hungarian German-language press during the occupation campaign of 1878, Martin Gabriel paints the conquest of the Bosnian vilayet by the invasion army under the command of General Josip Filipović in an uncompromising light as a violent, brutal and bloody affair. In the German-language press of the Dual Monarchy, the Muslim enemy fighters were portrayed as barbarians and savages waiting for the first opportunity to cut off heads, limbs and other body parts. An Austrian provincial paper quoted by the author argued that ‘a more brute, inhuman people as the local Turks can hardly be imagined’. The starkly negative, stereotypical representations of the Bosnian Muslims arguably reached its peak during the occupation campaign and its aftermath (see the chapter by František Šístek in this volume for a related discussion on Czech perceptions following the occupation). Images of the Muslim populace, especially the Muslim insurgents, overemphasized their Islamic religious identity at the expense of social, national, economic, and other possible motives for their armed resistance. The depictions of Bosnian Muslim insurgents and bandits closely resembled, Gabriel reminds us, the old images of the cruel Turk based on the memories of the Habsburg–Ottoman wars transmitted through collective memory (see the chapter by Ladislav Hladký and Petr Stehlík in this volume on Bohemian/Czech and wider Central European conceptualizations of the Turkish threat). Such representations were, however, gradually replaced by more nuanced images, whose production was linked with a new state policy emphasizing the necessity of mutually advantageous cooperation with Muslim elites in the service of the smooth pacification and integration of the provinces into the Habsburg economic and political realm.

In his chapter, Clemens Ruthner provides a summary of the debates on the colonial or semi-colonial character of Habsburg rule over Bosnia and Herzegovina (1878–1918), and offers several plausible answers. Ruthner asks ‘to what extent the colonial paradigm is applicable to this particular historical case’, and summarizes the related discourses on the nature of Habsburg rule. The author underlines the ambivalent character of colonialism: military conquest, political domination and economic exploitation, as opposed to the modernization and growth of civil

society. The key question of how the four decades of Habsburg rule should be assessed, he claims, still remains. Is it in terms of the self-proclaimed civilizing mission, or within the paradigm of European colonialism at the turn of the twentieth century? Ruthner states his belief that ‘the k. u. k. intermezzo from 1878 to 1918 can be considered a kind of Austrian quasi colonialism’. He recommends the postcolonial approaches to Habsburg Central Europe as a middle way between the extremes of Habsburg myth and the nationalist discourses of self-victimization. ‘The only reason others hesitate to call Bosnia and Herzegovina a colony is that it is not separated from its “motherland” by a large body of saltwater but lies at the peripheries of Europe’, concludes Ruthner.

Education, especially the introduction of interconfessional education, which had no precedent in the modern history of the occupied lands, proved to be one of the most important early challenges of the self-proclaimed Habsburg civilizing mission in the newly acquired Balkan colony. In his chapter devoted to the portrayal of Muslims in Austro-Hungarian state primary school textbooks for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Oliver Pejić underlines the fact that Croatian models played a crucial role in the implementation of interconfessional education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In the first, pro-Croat phase of the occupation (1878–82), textbooks imported from neighbouring Croatia, which were written primarily for Croats and thus from a Roman Catholic perspective, proved offensive to many Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina for their perceived anti-Islamic and anti-Turkish content. Following the Magyarization of the provincial administration after 1882 under the supervision of the Austro-Hungarian joint minister of finance and chief administrator of the Condominium of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Benjámín Kállay, the provincial government again sought inspiration in Croatia, but this time in an experiment with interconfessional education, which was introduced in 1874 and aimed to integrate both the Roman Catholic Croats and Christian Orthodox Serbs. Both enterprises were burdened with similar concerns about fair representation and the removal of potentially offensive content in textbooks, and which was further complicated in the Bosnian case by the existence of three, rather than just two, major confessional groups. According to Pejić, the portrayal of Bosnian Muslims in provincial textbooks based on the previous Croatian model served the goal of encouraging ‘Muslim enrolment in state schools in order to promote their Westernization and integration into Habsburg society’. The introduction of the textbooks analysed by Pejić represents the first systematic attempt towards the formation of a newly interpreted Bosnian Muslim collective identity, and the dissemination of pro-Habsburg patriotism.

‘The history of Bosnia’s Muslims in a modern bureaucratic state is indeed among the longest in the Muslim world’, ascertains Zora Hesová in her chapter devoted to the formation of autonomous Bosnian Islamic institutions under the Austro-Hungarian administration, and its legacy in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The practical question of religious authority arose when the Habs-

burg occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina severed the previous administrative links with Istanbul. The Austro-Hungarian state de facto replaced the Ottoman Empire as it assumed the role of protector of Bosnian Muslims and their religious rights. In 1909, one year after the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Emperor Francis Joseph signed the Statute for Autonomous Administration of Islamic Religious Waqf and Educational Affairs in Bosnia and Herzegovina (*Štatut za autonomnu upravu islamskih vjerskih i vakufsko-mearifskih poslova u Bosni i Hercegovini*). The so-called *Štatut* paved the way for the constitution of an autonomous Islamic community of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a hierarchical self-administering structure that managed to survive not only the break-up of the empire and the establishment of the new Yugoslav state in 1918 but also all the subsequent regime changes, formations and collapses of successive state structures, wars, and modernization challenges to the present day (Poulton 1997: 22). The late Habsburg Empire became the first country that recognized and managed to integrate sharia law within a modern European judicial system. The challenges facing the contemporary Islamic Community of Bosnia and Herzegovina (the ICBH, or *Islamska zajednica Bosne i Hercegovine*), Hesová believes, still revolve around the fundamental question of leading a full-fledged Islamic life within a modern secular state. In her opinion, the institutionalization of the Islamic community arguably remains ‘the single most formative legacy of the Bosnian encounter with the Austro-Hungarian state’. The ICBH, itself a product of colonization by a modernizing empire, provided a level of religious autonomy and practice of self-administration unique in the Muslim world. The current representatives of the ICBH stress the continuity of the institution with the Habsburg era: the Austro-Hungarian legal acts of 1882, 1909 and 1912 are still hailed as formative documents in public discourse, and are also formally acknowledged as such in the contemporary status of the ICBH from 2014. The unique historical experience of the ICBH with democratic self-administration and coexistence with several successive incarnations of a secular state for over a century has received attention beyond the Balkans and Central Europe in recent years. As Hesová reminds us, ‘Bosnian Islam has been intensely debated as a possible model for a future Islam of Europe’. Perhaps the legacy of the Habsburg encounter with Bosnian Muslims from the belle époque of colonialism at the turn of the twentieth century could bear some brave new fruit in the globalized world of the twenty-first century.

The Czech national milieu of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with its characteristic mix of growing self-confidence in its own cultural and economic successes on the one hand, and dissatisfaction with the political position of the emerging Czech nation within the Habsburg Monarchy on the other, combined with the notions of Slavic solidarity that formed an integral part of the Czech national discourses of the time, produced a number of critical perspectives on Habsburg rule over Bosnia and Herzegovina, frequently stress-

ing the tropes of conquest, colonialism, economic exploitation, and the political subjugation of the local population rather than the official list of successes of the Austro-Hungarian civilizing mission. However, it would be too reductive to categorize the Czech perspective simply as a nationalist counter-discourse to official state propaganda. In Czech sources, representations of Bosnia and Herzegovina from 1878 until 1918 continued to be simultaneously influenced by the mainstream Habsburg discourse and the wider Western Orientalist stereotypes characteristic for the era. Due to linguistic proximity and Slavophile sympathies, sources in the Czech language also typically tried to capture and reflect some native South Slavic perspectives.

In his chapter, František Šístek focuses on the diversification and transformation of the representations of Bosnian Muslims during the Habsburg era in Czech literature, travelogues and memoirs. His contribution emphasizes the relative diversity of Czech images and stereotypes of Bosnian Muslims, and traces their development over several decades. The negative images of Bosnian Muslims as threatening, backward, and fanatical enemies from the initial period of military occupation and establishment of ‘civilized order’ are similar to those analysed by Martin Garbiel in his chapter on the ambivalent perceptions of the Bosnian Muslims during the occupation campaign through the eyes of the German-language press in the Habsburg Monarchy. In sections devoted to the classical ‘golden era’ of the Habsburg civilizing mission at the turn of the twentieth century, Šístek pays special attention to conceptualizations of Bosnian Muslim religious and national identity. While admitting that it is impossible to speak of a straightforward evolution towards more realistic (or even positive and emphatic) representations of the Bosnian Muslims (Ljuca 2006), he argues that the images of this Slavic group have been affected in Czech sources by marked secularization and nationalization throughout the observed period.

The relationship between Central European frontier Orientalism, Western Orientalism, and Balkanism, approached through a comparison between the novella *Maca* (1881) by Croatian writer Vjenceslav Novak, which is set in the period of Habsburg expansion into Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the travelogue *Black Lamb, Grey Falcon* (1942) by British author Rebecca West, is explored in the chapter by Charles Sabatos. While Novak no longer conceptualizes the Bosnian Muslims as Turks but rather as Croatian brothers of Islamic faith, West, with her strong pro-Serb sympathies and open support for the centralist regime of royal Yugoslavia of the 1930s, implicitly regards the Bosnian Muslims as misguided Serbs. Sabatos, among other things, makes the important observation that the Muslim identity of Slavic Bosnians has often been perceived as not quite real, and as relatively weak and superficial: ‘in the case of literary texts about Bosnia and Herzegovina by South Slavic and Western writers, Bosnian Muslim identity is frequently portrayed not just as an imagined one but as a temporary costume that can be replaced with more suitable garments (Croatian, Serbian, Yugoslav,

etc., depending on the author's particular use of historical myths)'. This perceived impermanence and alleged superficiality of Bosnian Muslim identity can in fact be encountered in many other sources dealing with this South Slavic group. Such feelings could, at certain times, manifest themselves in speculations about the return of the Bosnian Muslims to their ancestral faith, and in expressions of disbelief that such exotic and Oriental people continue to live at the threshold of civilized Europe. Curiously enough, many authors provided contrary evidence and represented the Bosnian Muslims as inherently conservative and largely defined by their religious identity: 'The Muslims were indeed confused and opportunistic in a national sense, but they remained steadfast when it came to religious and even wider cultural interests' (Velikonja 2003: 126). A similar notion of the Bosnian Muslim religious identity as weak and fragile, endangered by aggressive immediate neighbours on the one hand and Islamic radicals from afar on the other, appeared in a different context during the Bosnian war of the 1990s and its aftermath.

In the next chapter, Bojan Baskar bridges the late Habsburg, interwar and Cold War decades. In his reconstruction of the life and work of the Croatian anthropologist Vera Stein E(h)rlich (1897–1980), Baskar takes us not only to the expected and already familiar corners of Central Europe and the Balkans but also to North America, Mexico, and even late-medieval Al-Andalus. According to her own self-description, Erlich was a Yugoslav citizen, but a child of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. Baskar makes clear that her Austronostalgia developed rather late in life, fuelled by the booming literature celebrating the Habsburg myth at the turn of the 1960s. Nothing seems to suggest that she longed for the good old days during the interwar period while studying in Vienna, living in Zagreb, or conducting anthropological research in Bosnia and Herzegovina and elsewhere around Yugoslavia. Her fieldwork from the late 1930s, however, testified to widespread feelings of nostalgia for old Austria among the peasant population of Bosnia and Herzegovina (by Serbs, Croats and Muslims alike) on the brink of the Second World War. Erlich, who was of Jewish origin, managed to survive the war in occupied Yugoslavia. After the war, she relocated to the United States, where she earned a PhD in cultural anthropology, and continued to work there as an anthropologist until 1960, at which point she moved back to Yugoslavia and taught at Zagreb University until retirement. Her experiences in North America and especially Mexico, Baskar argues, decisively influenced her original and sophisticated, if admittedly somewhat eccentric, conceptualizations of the Bosnian Muslims and their perceived position in wider cultural and civilizational circles – or 'cultural styles', as she called them. In her view, Muslim Bosnia found itself at the crossroads of the Oriental and Central European styles of life in modern times. The traditional Bosnian Muslim cultural style represented a regional variety of a wider Oriental style, whose homeland she somewhat unexpectedly located in Medieval Muslim-dominated Spain. The idea of a historical

centrality of Al-Andalus in the development of the Oriental style allowed her to connect the perceived similarities between Muslim Bosnia and Mexico. As an Ashkenazi Jew, she was deeply attracted to the Sephardim culture. Her notion of the Oriental style of life, which allowed her to link Bosnia and Herzegovina with Mexico and Spain, turns out to be implicitly derived from her notions about the Sephardim culture.

The chapter by Marija Mandić focuses on the Serbian proverb *Poturica gori od Turčina* (A Turk-convert is worse than a Turk). Through her reconstruction of the proverb's genesis and her interpretations of its uses, both in the nineteenth century and the present, the author provides an original perspective that allows her to identify and explain the main long-term features of the stereotypical Serbian (and partly also wider South Slavic) discourse on the Slavic Muslims of the Western Balkans, and its instrumentalizations. The central figure of the *poturica* (Turk-convert) refers to local, colingual converts to Islam and their descendants, more precisely the Slavic Muslims of the Western Balkans, historically including not only Bosnian Muslims but also the Muslim inhabitants of modern Serbia, Montenegro and other areas affected by the process of Islamization during the Ottoman era. Analysing the broader historical and sociopolitical context in which the proverb emerged, Mandić links the stigmatization of Balkan Slavic Muslims with the wider process of repudiation and demonization of the Ottoman heritage, which was characteristic for Serbs and Serbia as well as for other Balkan nation states and ethnic groups throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Unlike in the case of Bulgaria and Macedonia, where an alternative trope of forced conversion achieved prominence in mainstream conceptualizations of local colingual Muslims, the Serbian discourse has instead been characterized by the predominance of the betrayal trope: the Balkan Slavic Muslims are regarded (and condemned) as renegades, traitors, and severed limbs of the national body. The betrayal trope, affirms Mandić, is strongly present in the nineteenth-century classical Serbian literary canon. The results of her research of contemporary discourses, including the increasingly influential e-discourse (electronic discourse available on the internet), testify to the fact that the proverb continues to perform the role of stigmatizer, and nowadays is especially used to belittle the Bosniaks and sometimes also Muslim Albanians. Considering the powerful Western discourse of Orientalism and the influence of the Habsburg Monarchy on the Serbian elites in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Mandić concludes that 'the Serbian case can be seen as leaning on Western and Central European traditions while adjusting them to the oral cultural patterns and the archetypal dichotomy of the "hero-betrayer"'.

The next chapter, by Alenka Bartulović, explores the changing perceptions of Bosnians, particularly Bosnian Muslims, in late Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav Slovenia from the 1980s until the present, with special focus on the transformation of social and cultural cleavages between the Slovene majority and Bosnian

migrants (as well as refugees) in the observed period. Her text highlights the continuities and discontinuities in the representations of Bosnian Muslims in Slovenia before and after the break-up of Yugoslavia. Under the socialist regime, Bartulović explains, Yugoslav Muslims were ascribed the same role in popular imagination as the peasants: both groups, linked primarily with their original rural environments, were depicted as obstacles to modernization, and stigmatized as an underdeveloped segment of the Yugoslav population. The urban–rural dichotomy managed to conceal the dormant Islamophobic attitudes already existent in socialist Slovenia. After the break-up of Yugoslavia, affirms Bartulović, ‘the interpretative frame in the post-Yugoslav space shifted radically’. After decades of official promotion of brotherhood and unity in the Yugoslav nations, the Bosnian Muslims were increasingly conceptualized as Others, primarily in reference to their Islamic religious identity, sometimes further reduced to a stereotypical vision of Muslims as representing a threat to European identity. The idea of a boundary between the Christian West and the Islamic East, as well as between Europe and the Balkans, played an important role in the wider process of the reconceptualization of Slovene identity and its place in Europe following independence; however, Bartulović makes the additional claim that the urban–rural dichotomy has managed to survive as well, and continues to affect the process of Othering.

The last two chapters take us beyond post-Habsburg Central Europe as they explore the position of Bosnian Muslims in Germany and in the wider context of contemporary European debates on immigration, integration, and the position of Islam in European society. The contribution by Aldina Čemernica is based upon her research on identity constructions and religious views among young people of Bosnian Muslim origin in Berlin. As a result of the war that followed the collapse of the Yugoslav federation, some 350,000 refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina, most of them Muslim, arrived in Germany in the first half of the 1990s. The public response at the time was overwhelmingly positive, not least due to the fact that the Bosnian Muslims were generally regarded as secular and white Europeans (similar positive stereotypes could be observed in other Central European countries that received Bosnian war refugees at the time). There are currently some 30,000 Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks) living in the German capital. The results of Čemernica’s research indicate that religion continues to serve as an important cohesive factor in the constructions of collective identity of young Bosniaks in Berlin, ‘because it functions as a feature through which these people are categorized and seen as a group’. Moreover, the war in Bosnia, accompanied by the genocide against the Bosnian Muslims on both ethnic and confessional grounds, ‘reduced them to their religion even more’; however, as Čemernica shows, their own interpretations of Islam, degrees of identification, and religious practice are in fact diverse and very individual. The contacts and friendships of young Bosnian Muslims with Muslims from other mostly non-European countries seem to strengthen their conviction that the Bosnian form of

Islam represents a kind of European Islam – one that is tolerant and able to thrive in a predominantly secular European society. (For a discussion on similar topics relating to the contemporary Islamic community of Bosnia and Herzegovina, see the chapter by Zora Hesová in this volume.)

The closing chapter, by Merima Šehagić, addresses the phenomenon, already discussed from different angles by Aldina Čemernica and Zora Hesová, that the Bosnian Muslims are often lauded as exemplary representatives of a European form of Islam (tolerant and domesticated rather than aggressive and foreign), and, by extension, as successful immigrants who have integrated well into their host societies in countries such as Germany, Austria and the Netherlands. Šehagić, however, problematizes this superficial success story. She confirms that governmental sources in Germany and other European countries do indeed often classify the Muslims from Bosnia and Herzegovina as European and unproblematic. When compared with most non-European migrant groups, Bosnian migrants experience lower levels of discrimination and stigmatization. As Šehagić tells us, the Bosniaks have even been considered as a white refugee elite in some receiving countries. It seems evident that the integration of Bosnian Muslims into Western countries, including in Central Europe, has been greatly facilitated by their European origin and physical appearance. Their inconspicuous presence could in fact be perceived as invisibility in the predominantly white host societies. Open embracement of a European or – even more explicitly – white identity, Šehagić maintains, can be interpreted as a mechanism of advantageous self-identification or self-inclusion. Her findings, based primarily on material from Germany and other European countries, correspond to similar conclusions on the issue of self-identification as whites discussed recently by authors who have conducted research among members of the Bosnian diaspora elsewhere, including the United States (notably Halilovich 2013). The identification with whiteness not only helps to downplay the importance of Islamic confessional identity but, as Šehagić notes, it simultaneously helps to shed the similarly unwelcome Balkan identity with its stereotypical, mostly violent, backward and barbarian connotations. The obvious need of the Bosnian Muslim diaspora in Central and Western European countries to emphasize their European and white identity, she concludes, is rooted in their perceived need to legitimize their place in Europe.

František Šístek is a research fellow at the Institute of History, Czech Academy of Sciences, and an associate professor at the Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague. He graduated in history from Central European University in Budapest and earned his PhD in social and cultural anthropology at the Faculty of Humanities, Charles University, Prague. He has focused on former Yugoslavia and representations of the South Slavs and the Balkans in Central Europe, national identities, images and stereotypes of the

Other, and competing interpretations of the past in South Eastern Europe. His monographs include *Narativi o identitetu: izabrane studije o crnogorskoj istoriji* [Narratives of identity: Selected studies in Montenegrin history] (Podgorica: Matica crnogorska, 2015) and *Dějiny Černé Hory* [A history of Montenegro] (Prague: NLN, 2017).

References

- Ančić, Mladen. 2015. 'Can Bosnia Do Without Herzegovina?', *Croatian Studies Review* 11: 13–80.
- Babuna Aydın. 2018. 'Österreich-Ungarn, die bosnisch-herzegowinischer Muslime und ihr Nationalismus', in Clemens Ruthner and Tamara Scheer (eds), *Bosnien-Herzegowina und Österreich-Ungarn, 1878–1918: Annäherungen an eine Kolonie*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, pp. 163–92.
- Bartulović, Alenka. 2010. "‘We Have an Old Debt with the Turk, and It Best Be Settled’": Ottoman Incursions through the Discursive Optics of Slovenian Historiography and Literature, and Their Applicability in the Twenty-First Century', in Božidar Jezernik (ed.), *Imaginary Turk*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 111–36.
- Baskar, Bojan. 2008. 'Small Ethnologies and Supranational Empires: The Case of the Habsburg Monarchy', in Máiréad Nic Craith, Ulrich Kockel and Reinhard Johler (eds), *Everyday Culture in Europe: Approaches and Methodologies*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, pp. 65–80.
- Bieber, Florian. 2006. *Post-War Bosnia: Ethnicity, Inequality and Public Sector Governance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bjelić, Dušan I., and Obrad Savić (eds). 2002. *Balkan As Metaphor: Between Globalization and Fragmentation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bougarel, Xavier. 2001. 'L'islam bosniaque, entre identité culturelle et idéologie politique', in Xavier Bougarel and Nathalie Clayer (eds), *Le Nouvel Islam balkanique: Les musulmanes, acteurs du post-communisme 1990–2000*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larosse, pp. 79–132.
- . 2015. *Survivre aux empires: Islam, identité nationale et allégeances politiques en Bosnie-Herzégovine*. Paris: Karthala.
- Bringa, Tone. 1995. *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way: Identity and Community in a Central Bosnian Village*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Detrez, Raymond. 2013. 'Pre-National Identities in the Balkans', in Roumen Daskalov and Tchavdar Marinov (eds), *Entangled Histories of the Balkans. Volume One: National Ideologies and Language Policies*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 13–66.
- Donia, Robert J. 1981. *Islam under the Double Eagle: The Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1878–1914*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.
- Džihic, Vedran. 2018. 'Ethnonationalism in der *longue durée*? Vermessungen der historischen und akuten Widersprüche Bosnien-Herzegowinas', in Clemens Ruthner and Tamara Scheer (eds), *Bosnien-Herzegowina und Österreich-Ungarn, 1878–1918: Annäherungen an eine Kolonie*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, pp. 495–528.
- Feichtinger, Johannes. 2018. 'Nach Said. Der k. und k. Orientalismus, seine Akteure, Praktiken und Diskursen', in Clemens Ruthner and Tamara Scheer (eds), *Bosnien-Herzegowina und Österreich-Ungarn, 1878–1918: Annäherungen an eine Kolonie*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, pp. 307–24.

- Fillafer, Franz Leander. 2016. 'Österreichislam', in Johannes Feichtinger and Heidermarie Uhl (eds), *Habsburg neue denken: Vielfalt und Ambivalenz in Zentraleuropa: 30 kulturwissenschaftlich Stichworte*. Vienna: Böhlau, pp. 163–70.
- Gingrich, Andre. 1998. 'Frontier Myths of Orientalism: The Muslim World in Public and Popular Cultures of Central Europe', in Bojan Baskar and Borut Brumen (eds), *Mediterranean Ethnological Summer School*. Piran: Institut za multikulturne raziskave, pp. 99–127.
- . 2016. 'Orientalismus', in Johannes Feichtinger and Heidermarie Uhl (eds), *Habsburg neue denken: Vielfalt und Ambivalenz in Zentraleuropa: 30 kulturwissenschaftlich Stichworte*. Vienna: Böhlau, pp. 153–62.
- Goldsworthy, Vesna. 1998. *Inventing Ruritania: The Imperialism of the Imagination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hadžiselimović, Omer. 2001. *At the Gates of the East: British Travel Writers on Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.
- Hafez, Farid. 2014. 'Gedenken in "islamischen Gedankenjahr": Zur diskursive Konstruktion des österreichischen Islams in Rahmen der Jubiläumsfeier zu 100 Jahren Islamgesetz', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 104: 63–85.
- Hajdarpašić, Edin. 2015. *Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840–1914*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Halilovich, Hariz. 2013. *Places of Pain: Forced Displacement, Popular Memory and Trans-local Identities in Bosnian War-Torn Communities*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Heiss, Johann, and Johannes Feichtinger. 2013. 'Uses of Orientalism in the Late Nineteenth-Century Austro-Hungarian Empire', in James Hodgkinson et al., *Deploying Orientalism in Culture and History: From Germany to Central and Eastern Europe*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, pp. 148–65.
- Heywood, Colin. 1994. 'Bosnia Under Ottoman Rule, 1463–1800', in Mark Pinson (ed.), *The Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina: Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 22–53.
- Hladký, Ladislav. 2005. *Bosenská otázka v 19. a 20. století*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Jezernik, Božidar. 2004. *Wild Europe: The Balkans in the Gaze of Western Travellers*. London: Saqi.
- Kraljačić, Tomislav. 1987. *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini (1882–1903)*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.
- Kropáček, Luboš. 2017. 'Rakouský Islamgesetz, mezník na cestách mezináboženského dialogu', *Marginalia Historica* 8(2): 81–94.
- Ljuca, Adin. 2006. 'Turci a Švabové, nebo slovanští bratři? Český pohled na bosenské muslimy v letech 1878–1918', in Mirjam Moravcová, David Svoboda and František Šístek (eds), *Pravda, láska a ti na 'Východě': Obrazy středoevropského a východoevropského prostoru z pohledu české společnosti*. Prague: Fakulta humanitních studií Univerzity Karlovy, pp. 122–34.
- Luketić, Katarina. 2013. *Balkan: od geografije do fantazije*. Zagreb: Algoritam.
- Malcolm, Noel. 1996. *Bosnia: A Short History*. London: Papermac.
- Malečková, Jitka. 2018. "'Our Turks" or "Real Turks"? Czech Perceptions of the Slavic Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina', in *World Literature Studies* 10(1): 15–26.
- Mujanović, Mihad. 2018. *Muslimové, a ne mohamedáni! Ke kořenům bosňáckého národního hnutí v letech 1878–1918*. Prague: Filozofická fakulta Karlovy Univerzity.

- Okey, Robin. 2007. *Taming Balkan Nationalism: The Habsburg 'Civilizing Mission' in Bosnia, 1878–1918*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. 'Overlapping National Historiographies in Bosnia-Herzegovina', in Tibor Frank and Frank Hadler (eds), *Disputed Territories and Shared Pasts: Overlapping National Histories in Modern Europe*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 349–372.
- Poulton, Hugh. 1997. 'Islam, Ethnicity and State in Contemporary Balkans', in Hugh Poulton and Suha Taji-Farouki (eds), *Muslim Identity and the Balkan State*. London: Hurst, pp. 13–32.
- Promitzer, Christian. 2015. 'Austria and the Balkans: Exploring the Role of Travelogues in the Construction of an Area', in Christian Promitzer, Siegreid Gruber and Harald Heppner (eds), *Southeast European Studies in a Globalizing World*. Berlin: LitVerlag, pp. 189–206.
- Rataj, Tomáš. 2002. *České země ve stínu púlměsíce: Obraz Turka v raně novověké literatuře z českých zemí*. Prague: Scriptorium.
- Rexhepi, Piro. 2019. 'Imperial Inventories, "Illegal Mosques" and Institutionalized Islam: Coloniality and the Islamic Community of Bosnia and Herzegovina', *History and Anthropology* 30(4): 477–89.
- Roksandić, Drago. 1991. *Srbi u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: Vjesnik.
- Ruthner, Clemens. 2018. *Habsburgs 'Dark Continent': Postkoloniale Lektüren zur österreichischen Literatur und Kultur im langen 19. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.
- Ruthner, Clemens, and Tamara Scheer (eds). 2018. *Bosnien-Herzegowina und Österreich-Ungarn, 1878–1918: Annäherungen an eine Kolonie*. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto.
- Sabatos, Charles D. 2020. *Frontier Orientalism and the Turkish Image in Central European Literature*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- . 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Šístek, František. 2016. 'Die nationalen Minderheiten in den internationalen Beziehungen und der Gesetzgebung Jugoslawiens', in Kateřina Králová, Jiří Kocian and Kamil Pikal (eds), *Minderheiten im sozialistischen Jugoslawien: Brüderlichkeit und Eigenheit*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, pp. 29–71.
- Skowron-Nalborczyk, Agata. 2016. 'A Study of the Official Legal Status of Islam in Austria: Between the Law on Islam of 1912 and the Law on Islam of 2015', in Robert Mason (ed.), *Muslim Minority-State Relations: Violence, Integration and Policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sutter Fichtner, Paula. 2008. *Terror and Toleration: The Habsburg Empire Confronts Islam, 1526–1850*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Stehlík, Petr. 2013. *Bosna v chorvatských národně-integračních ideologiích 19. století*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- . 2015. *Između hrvatstva i jugoslavenstva: Bosna u hrvatskim nacionalno-integracijskim ideologijama 1832–1878*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa.
- Todorova, Maria. 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Velikonja, Mitja. 2003. *Religious Separation and Intolerance in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University.