



Imperial Challenges in Austro-Hungarian Multicultural Cities

Catherine Horel

► **To cite this version:**

Catherine Horel. Imperial Challenges in Austro-Hungarian Multicultural Cities. Österreich-Ungarns imperiale Herausforderungen. Nationalismen und Rivalitäten im Habsburgerreich um 1900, 2020. halshs-03090267

HAL Id: halshs-03090267

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-03090267>

Submitted on 4 Jan 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Imperial Challenges in Austro-Hungarian Multicultural Cities¹

The terms of ‘multiculturalism’ or ‘pluriculturalism’ were not used by the contemporaries of the Habsburg Monarchy. The concept of the Empire was framed by its territorial definition and by the ruling dynasty. Its inhabitants were to become citizens only after the enactment of the Constitutional laws of December 1867. The territories of the Empire were either hereditary possessions of the Crown (*Kronländer*) with their historical rights or provinces ruled by Vienna or Budapest. The diversity of tongues and confessions was considered under the terms of ‘peoples’ (*Völker*) or ‘ethnic group’ (*Völkstamm*); the whole was conceived as a ‘multinational state’ (*Vielvölkerstaat*). In his recent book about the Habsburg Empire Pieter Judson discusses the use of the term ‘nationality’ by historians and suggests that we should keep on speaking of ‘groups’. Indeed the ‘nationality’ was not a category but a commodity of language and of course an element of the political discourse at the same time. It was thus a construction and was not relevant for the daily practice. In this respect he is right in pointing to the fact that conflicts broke between nationalists and not between ‘nationalities’ thus not involving an entire people.² The mobility of some groups was very characteristic: military, bureaucrats, merchants, students, and thus enabled transfers and exchanges. Before 1867, self-identification was defined by religion and territorial belonging, what is generally called the ‘patriotism of the land’ (*Landespatriotismus*) that is the attachment to ‘small homelands’. The culture that characterized the Empire was thus fragmented, moving and fluid between groups and territories.³ People had multiple identities that were superseded by dynastic loyalty composed of shared symbols and historical references. The

1 This contribution is part of a book project on twelve multicultural cities (Arad, Brünn/Brno, Czernowitz/Černivci, Fiume/Rijeka, Lemberg/L’viv, Nagyvárad/Oradea, Pressburg/Bratislava, Sarajevo, Szabadka/Subotica, Temesvár/Timișoara, Trieste, Zagreb) of the Habsburg Empire that will be published by Central European University Press.

2 Pieter M. Judson, *The Habsburg Empire. A New History*, Cambridge 2016, p. 270.

3 For a recent analysis of this question, see Johannes Feichtinger/Gary B. Cohen (ed.), *Understanding Multiculturalism. The Habsburg Central European Experience*, New York 2014.

Emperor and king addressed them as ‘My peoples’, ignoring the category of ‘citizens’ that would have been a recognition of the political nature of society.

The central authorities emphasized the diversity as a positive particularity of the monarchy. The endeavor of Crown Prince Rudolf to publish the series called *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild* was clearly the expression of the wish to show unity through diversity.⁴ Journalists, academics and scientists were commissioned to write about the peculiarities, beauties and productions of the Empire and its populations. The concept lying behind this enterprise was obvious: Austria-Hungary exists thanks to the dynasty, the peoples and the institutions (army, bureaucracy, churches). The collection was supposed to illustrate these abstractions and to enhance the qualities of each territory. Most volumes appeared actually after Rudolph’s death in 1889; the last one came out in 1902. One or several volumes were dedicated to each land according to its size and historical signification for the monarchy. Following the *Zeitgeist*, the ethnographical approach played a great part and this had also the advantage of insisting of the ethnic plurality of the Empire by showing each nationality on equal terms. The backward provinces were considered with a paternalist tone and colonialism is certainly not absent from the volumes dealing with Bucovina and Bosnia-Herzegovina.⁵ But on insisting on diversity the volumes also contributed to reify the differences and justify national identification. The Austrian initiative led to the publication by the Hungarian government of a similar collection at the occasion of the Millenary celebration of 1896.⁶ The direction of the work was provided by the Hungarian academy of sciences. The celebration of Francis Joseph’s jubilee in 1898 gave the opportunity to launch a new publication aimed at putting forward the unity of the monarchy. It was sold through subscription and advertised in the press as “literary memorial to our Emperor” (*literarisches Kaiser-Denkmal*). Titled *Unsere Monarchie*,⁷ the series edited by Julius Laurenčić was more popular and less scientific than the *Kronprinzenwerk*; it was translated into Czech (*Naše monarchie*), Polish (*Nasza monarchia*) and Italian (*La nostra monarchia*). Since the Hungarians were at the same time publishing their own collection regarding only Transleithania, this one focused only on Cisleithania. On the eve of World War One, another popular edition was launched in the same spirit by Sigmund Schneider where the term

4 See Christiane Zintzen, *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild: aus dem Kronprinzenwerk Erzherzog Rudolf*, Wien 1999.

5 *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild, Die Bukowina*, Bd. 8, Wien 1899; *Bosnien und Herzegovina*, Bd. 22, Wien 1901.

6 *Magyarország vármegye és városai [Counties and Cities of Hungary]*, Budapest, 1896–1902.

7 Julius Laurenčić (ed.), *Unsere Monarchie. Die österreichischen Kronländer zur Zeit des 50 Jährigen Regierungsjubiläums Sr. k. u. Apost. Maj. Franz Joseph I.*, Wien 1897–1898.

Vaterland explicitly referred to Austria as a dynastic entity supposed to infuse patriotism to everyone.⁸

Considering that most territories were crown lands with historical rights and representation (diets) the Empire could indeed foster national definition together with dynastic loyalty; furthermore it recognized other peoples making of the concept of nationhood an element of identification that was not incompatible with Austrian patriotism. Moreover the new form of constitutional imperial rule found its justification in the ability to promote the development of the constituent nations.⁹ A dialogue was thus established that gave each of the protagonists their coherence.

The cities were the places where these activities came to being: schools, associations, libraries, theatre and press became increasingly multicultural which means that the offer was no more centered on the language of the majority and/or dominant group. The identification with the territory was increasingly challenged by the identification to a nationality that went beyond it. Here the difference between Austria and Hungary is of a particular relevance: Austria was conceived as a dynastical state made of territories 'belonging' to it; Hungary on the contrary was from its medieval origins on a centralized state that did not recognize provincial autonomy except for the Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia with which it was united since 1102 and for Transylvania that was considered part of the Hungarian kingdom but composed of three nations represented at the diet (Hungarians, *Székely*, Saxons). This explains partly why the Hungarians had less difficulty defining and imposing the Hungarian identity to the whole country, than the Austrians whose identity was subsumed in the dynastic loyalty.¹⁰ Many cities acquired a national symbolic signification for one of its components and this led naturally to competition and conflict in the public space. But polyethnic cities were more or less spared this identification as shows the example of Czernowitz.¹¹

Multiculturalism in the Habsburg cities is also very much linked to discourses of identity. We will try to determine if the citizens, perceiving indeed their city as multicultural, identified themselves with one or more cultures. Perceptions and reception are the most difficult elements to be defined by historians because we lack enough sources to determine how the people perceived the messages send by

8 Sigmund Schneider (ed.), *Mein Österreich, mein Heimatland. Illustrierte Volks- und Vaterlandskunde des Österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, Wien 1914.

9 Judson, *The Habsburg Empire* (see note 2), p. 270.

10 On the meaning of the allegories of 'Austria', see Selma Krasa-Florian, *Die Allegorie der Austria. Die Entstehung des Gesamtstaatsgedankens in der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie und die bildende Kunst*, Wien 2007.

11 Harald Heppner, *Hauptstadt im südöstlichen Europa. Eine Zusammenfassung in: id. (ed.), Hauptstädte zwischen Save, Bosphorus und Dnjepr*, Wien 1998, p. 217.

national groups on one side, and by the central authorities and the dynasty on the other side. It is not easy to prove if they reacted according to these perceptions. Attendance at celebrations, demonstrations, signing of petitions, letters to the press and electoral participation are indications of how people interpreted the messages.

Memory is a key component in discourses of identity that were constructed after the demise of the Habsburg monarchy. Already before 1918 there was a competition between memories of national pasts and Habsburg memories. But the latter were also constructed. The memorials erected in the cities bear witness to this competition and reveal the coexistence of dynastic loyalty along with national pride. Hence it seems that both perspectives did not necessarily exclude each other. National discourse was adopted neither spontaneously nor quickly, people could not immediately adhere to imagined and distant historical moments; the essentialism of nation as diffused by the nationalist leaders at the end of the 19th century must not mislead our analysis of the perceptions of the contemporaries. More than 'imagined', the community that was to become a nation was constructed using historical memories and symbols of a mythic past. This past was shown as static but leading to a glorious future, whereas the society of the last decades of the 19th century was extremely mobile and dynamic. Multiple identities could coexist without generating conflict, and they cannot be ascribed to national categories only. In this respect the multicultural city is a paradigm of this evolution and an analytical tool as well. It offers a concentration of actors and institutions that are the vectors of discourses and the animators of society. Each town becomes thus a laboratory for historical inquiry.

The loyal city: Memorializing the Habsburg

As demonstrated by the Poles in Lemberg, the dimension of Habsburg loyalty was crucial in the definition of city patriotism. This is not surprising in the context of Galicia where the Poles enjoyed not only a better situation compared to their compatriots in Germany and Russia but also hegemony over the Ruthenians. In the absence of alternative to the reconstitution of the Polish kingdom their faithfulness to the Habsburg Empire was not questionable. No Polish irredentism could thus exist and the only contestation possible was against measures considered too favorable to the Ruthenians. The latter were accordingly seen by Vienna as *gens fidelissima* notwithstanding the attraction of Russia for some of them. On the whole they had very good reasons to expect everything from the intervention of the emperor and that is why his visits or the ones paid by members of his family were occasions to demonstrate loyalty. Here again the irredentist temptation was not a serious alternative. The same could be said for

Slovenes and Slovaks but the first had to struggle against Italian nationalism and the second against Hungarian domination. Therefore the visits of the sovereign in the cities were often interpreted by the minorities as a support for their claims and they saw here the opportunity to make them loud. Indeed Francis Joseph gave audiences to everyone: religious leaders, associations, interest groups, but not explicitly to linguistic minorities since this would have been contrary to the state policy; he attended services in churches, temples and synagogues. The audiences were the occasion for the minorities not only to show their faithfulness but in doing that also to appeal to the intervention of the sovereign against the dominant group. There was something like a competition over loyalty, each group being eager to present its credentials. The emperor was seen as a warrant of religious tolerance, a characteristic inherited from Joseph II. So, as Peter Urbanitsch remarks, religion was instrumentalized both by the dynasty – for example Francis Joseph leading the Corpus Christi procession bare-headed – and by some national movements claiming religion as a basis of their identity.¹²

Francis Joseph travelled extensively in both parts of the empire so that many citizens have had the opportunity to see the sovereign at least once. Each year in September the maneuvers took place in another place of the territory thus giving the possibility to visit the neighboring cities. When the choice of the place was announced there was considerable excitement over which city was going to host the emperor or the king. As soon as the route was known, the chosen city mobilized in order to welcome the sovereign in the best way possible. Apart from these yearly visits Francis Joseph also travelled when there was a particular event or commemoration.¹³ The inauguration of an important building or memorial was one criterion and so was also the commemoration of historical dates like the 500th anniversary of Trieste's belonging to the Habsburg monarchy. As seen for Lemberg the combination of commemoration with exhibition made the coming of the emperor nearly an obligation. Hence there seem to have been no 'distance dependency' in the agenda of the visits: the emperor was concerned not to advantage any of his lands (apart from residence cities like Vienna and Budapest) and as king of Hungary he did not neglect Transleithania either. Yet he never visited Szabadka although he travelled relatively often to Southern Hungary but the town had no relevance in terms of strategy so that maneuvers did not take place nearby; it did not organize any meaningful event that would have necessitated royal attendance. In general Francis Joseph tended to travel less in his old

12 Peter Urbanitsch, *Pluralist Myth and Nationalist Realities: The Dynastic Myth of the Habsburg Monarchy – a Futile Exercise in the Creation of Identity?*, in: *Austrian History Yearbook* 35 (2004), p. 108.

13 Urbanitsch, *Pluralist Myth and Nationalist Realities* (see note 12), p. 122.

age and concentrated his visits to absolute necessary objectives like Sarajevo in 1910 or to places nearer to Vienna.

To palliate the aging sovereign, an alternative were visits of archdukes who were either residing in the cities or travelling to them when there was an occasion requiring the presence of the dynasty. In this respect there was a noticeable difference between Austria and Hungary: there resided the Palatine family and Archduke Joseph had the advantage of representing at the same time his grandfather whose memory was cherished by the Hungarians and the royal family. This was considered a sufficient reason for the other archdukes not to travel to Hungary where they would not necessarily be welcome. The respect due to the king did not extend to the whole family. Exceptions were his son Rudolf as long as he lived, his mother Elisabeth 'Sissi,' and Archduke Friedrich who lived permanently in Pozsony (Pressburg, Bratislava). The latter was a significant personality of the town until his death in 1902 and so was his wife, Isabella, who played a considerable role in the city's life by sponsoring many associations – indeed most Catholic ones – and attending public events. These 'local' Habsburg could thus replace the sovereign and be also elements of city patriotism: their palace and social life would make the citizens proud and feeling privileged in front of other cities having 'only' aristocrats or civil elite.

In this respect Pozsony was certainly a particular place: it was very near to Vienna and historically linked to Austria as well as to Hungary for having been coronation site from the 16th to the beginning of the 19th century. The coronation hill still existed on the Danube bank but it was neglected and threatened by the progress of the urban planning: at the beginning of the 1890s there were initiatives to perpetuate the site as a place of memory.¹⁴ A project was finally made to create a square and to erect a statue of Maria Theresia. Commemorating the 'king' was an adequate way to associate Habsburg loyalty with Hungarian collective memory. Maria Theresia was perceived as an incarnation of the *Gesamtmonarchie* and thus combined both Austrian and dynastic patriotism.¹⁵ Sculptor János Fadrusz (1858–1903) was commissioned to create a monument that would celebrate Maria Theresia as well as Hungarian faithfulness towards her.¹⁶ It was thus supposed to deliver the message that Hungary was still belonging to the empire. The city's pride was based on that historical memory and the importance of the monument needed not to be demonstrated. The inauguration was planned for 16 May 1897 in the presence of the king. Actually the

14 Von unserem Krönungshügel, in: Pressburger Zeitung 316 (17. 11. 1891, Morgenausgabe), S. 2.

15 Krasa-Florian, Die Allegorie der Austria (see note 10), p. 154.

16 It was to be Fadrusz's first significant work. He was then famous for his statue of King Mátyás that was inaugurated on Kolozsvár's (Cluj) main square in 1902, thus shifting from Austro-Hungarian to Hungarian patriotism.

statue was already finished during the winter but bad weather made its unveiling impossible under good conditions. The festivities took an exceptional dimension and arose great agitation in the town where a year before the Millennium celebrations had already attracted many visitors. The affluence of guests was so considerable that the municipality had to ask the inhabitants to provide lodging for them.¹⁷ The visit of Francis Joseph lasted for the whole day and ended with a gala performance at the theatre for which Archduchess Isabella and Count Géza Zichy were the patrons: the systematic alliance of Austrian and Hungarian personalities during the ceremonies was of course remarkable. The theatre performance was an evocation of Maria Theresa's coronation in Pozsony as well as her later visit to the Diet to ask for the support of the representatives: the text was written by Count Zichy and recitation was to be performed among others by the star actress of the Hungarian national theatre, Mari Jászai.¹⁸ The inauguration was to be a great moment associating local pride with dynastic loyalty. The *Pressburger Zeitung* devoted a twenty-page special issue to the event. Upon his arrival Francis Joseph was welcomed at Archduke Friedrich's palace and attended open-air mass on the spot of the celebration; the Hungarian anthem was played (there is no mention of the imperial anthem); mayor Gustav Dröxler delivered a speech inviting the king to unveil the monument.¹⁹

The special edition issued on the next day relates the impressions of the king. As usual Francis Joseph refrained from any critic but in this case he could not hide his preference for the modeling of the horse! The king was ecstatic about the atmosphere of the city: "I always come with pleasure in this town that is so dear to my heart." He was accompanied by the heir to the throne Francis Ferdinand and his brother Otto as well as by other members of the royal family: the considerable presence of the dynasty was exceptional and resented as such by the town.²⁰ From the Hungarian side the local landed aristocracy was represented by Prince Miklós Pálffy and Count Zichy. Francis Joseph complimented the sculptor on his ability to model the horse and was also eulogistic on the Hungarian magnate standing on the side of Maria Theresa, but he did not utter a single word about his ancestor.²¹ From there the king proceeded to the Franciscan Church to commemorate the 600th anniversary of its foundation. In the afternoon he gave audiences among which to the municipal council and the religious communities before attending the gala evening at the theatre and going back to Vienna. On the

17 *Pressburger Zeitung* 124 (05.05.1897), S. 2.

18 *Pressburger Zeitung* 130 (11.05.1897), S. 2.

19 *Pressburger Zeitung* 135 (16.05.1897, Sonntagmorgen, Sonderausgabe), S. 6.

20 *Der Enthüllungstag*, in: *Pressburger Zeitung* 136 (17.05.1897, Abendausgabe), S. 2.

21 The monument was destroyed as a symbol of Habsburg rule by the Czechoslovak army as soon as it took possession of the town. Moritz Csáky, *Das Gedächtnis der Städte. Kulturelle Verflechtungen – Wien und die urbanen Milieus in Zentraleuropa*, Wien 2010, p. 308.

way to the station he had the opportunity to see ‘Pozsony by night’ for the city was illuminated in his honor. During the week following the inauguration the press continued to report on various aspects thus maintaining the interest of the public and celebrating local pride. However it was certainly easier to commemorate a personality about whom there was a consensus in Hungary than to celebrate the present ruler. Indeed only one relevant statue of Francis Joseph was erected on the Hungarian territory (a bust of him was put up in the arcades surrounding Szeged cathedral): he was one of the Habsburg rulers figuring on the colonnade of the Millennium monument in Budapest. There were not so many in Austria either because of the difficulty to portray someone who was still alive.²² His wife, Elisabeth, who had shown sympathy for the Magyars before 1867 was more willingly commemorated after she was assassinated in 1898: statues of her are still standing in Budapest, Esztergom and Makó.²³

The same could be said for Trieste where apart from the monument dedicated to Maximilian, no other Habsburg ruler was honored there except Elisabeth. The creation of the memorial was not consensual either for already at the news of the assassination there had been some troubles in the city. The information that the murderer was an Italian caused spontaneous demonstrations of hostility against irredentism. The press insisted on the fact that Luigi Luccheni was an anarchist born in Paris and living in Switzerland but the Italian newspapers were uncomfortable about the possible identification in the public opinion. *Il Piccolo* tried to put the blame on the Slovenes by mentioning that another anti-Italian demonstration had taken place in Laibach. In Trieste a crowd of some 200–300 persons shouted “abasso” (down) and marched in the streets. The paper was outraged at the apparent passivity of the police.²⁴ In the end some thirty people were indeed arrested but the troubles went on for a few days. *Il Piccolo* noted with some perfidy that the arrested persons bore German and Slavic names.²⁵

The project of erecting a monument to Empress Elisabeth was first mentioned in 1900: it emanated from an initiative of workers shocked by the fact that the murderer was presented as a worker. They wanted to unite in their project the populations of the littoral but as was expected, they could not find enough financial support. In 1902 a committee was constituted with prominent names susceptible to attract donations.²⁶ One of the leaders was Mario Morpurgo, member of one of the wealthiest Jewish families of Trieste. Finally a considerable

22 Urbanitsch, *Pluralist Myth and Nationalist Realities* (see note 12), p. 121.

23 In other places as well she was spared the *damnatio memoriae* that befell her husband: she had played no part in the ruling system and was somehow ‘sanctified’ by her tragic death.

24 *Il Piccolo*, 6091 (12.09.1898) S. 1.

25 *Il Piccolo*, 6092 (13.09.1898) S. 1.

26 *Festschrift aus Anlass der Enthüllung des Kaiserin Elisabeth Denkmals in Triest. Separat-Ausgabe des Triester Tagblatt, Triest 1912*, p. 36.

amount of money was raised and the committee started with the call for projects in 1906. The competition was successful; 58 applications were received and displayed in the main hall of the stock exchange (*Borsa*) in 1908.²⁷ The date marked the 10th anniversary of the assassination as well as the celebration of the emperor's jubilee. There is very little mention about that in the Italian press that seems to have shown less interest for the monument. Yet the location chosen was significant: the square in front of the southern railway station. The Viennese sculptor Franz Seifert was commissioned to build the monument representing Elisabeth standing in front of an armchair and flanked with art-nouveau reliefs of female allegories and people paying homage to her. Seifert was already known for having designed funerary monuments and memorials such as the one dedicated to Strauss and Lanner in the park of the Viennese town hall (*Rathauspark*).²⁸ The inauguration was first planned for 1911 and finally took place on 15 December 1912:²⁹ it was not a major event, barely mentioned in the local press, the emperor was represented by his son-in-law Archduke Francis Salvator, a mass was served by the Trieste bishop and the chorals – among them the Elisabeth-anthem – were performed by the *Triester Männergesang-Verein* thus giving the ceremony an entirely Habsburg character.

The dynastic commemorations were another moment of identification meant to unite all citizens regardless of language or faith. Two major celebrations were organized all over the empire for Francis Joseph jubilees in 1898 and 1908. The former was overshadowed in Hungary by the success of the Millennium festivities of 1896 and there was less enthusiasm and money to glorify the sovereign; but it also was burdened by Elisabeth's death in September: most of the festivities that were to take place at year's end had to be cancelled. In Hungary 1898 proved to be problematic because of the planned commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the 1848 Revolution. Following the Compromise and the subsequent coronation of Francis Joseph, the Hungarians had developed their own dynastic agenda: they celebrated in 1892 the 25 years of this event and planned to organize the 50th jubilee in 1917. They therefore engaged in what Péter Hanák called – paraphrasing Robert Musil's *Man without Qualities* – a “parallel action” to commemorate the Revolution but the debate was fierce at the Parliament over which date to choose: March 15 was already unofficially celebrated but sensible whereas April 11 (the day on which king Ferdinand ratified the existence of an independent government) was seen by the government of Baron Dezső Bánffy as

27 Die Entwürfe für das Kaiserin-Elisabeth Denkmal in Triest, in: *Triester Zeitung* 57 (09.03.1908), S. 2.

28 Festschrift aus Anlass der Enthüllung des Kaiserin Elisabeth Denkmals in Triest (see note 26), p. 38.

29 Il monumento all'Imperatrice Elisabetta per Trieste, in: *La Monarchia* 25 (01.11.1910) S. 1.

respecting dynastic loyalty. After much quarrelling, April 11 was maintained but many cities and schools organized their own festivities on March 15.³⁰

Following this, the 1908 jubilee was deemed to be particularly significant: politically it was marked by the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina seen as a 'present' made to the emperor. On the level of public commemoration all cities emulated in preparing programs to honor the sovereign. Actually the main part of the celebrations was held in Cisleithania; Hungarian cities did commemorate but the government did want the jubilee to be a particular event. In the press the dates related to the king (his birthday on August 18th, name day on October 4th, and date of access to the throne on December 2nd) never occupied the front page; the celebrations held in Vienna were merely mentioned in the news; the local festivities were of course reported but they concerned mostly the civil and military authorities without conferring a significant role to the citizens. Since many of the minorities of the Hungarian kingdom were contesting the national agenda imposed by the government they made regular appeals to the king to intervene: thus there was no zeal to celebrate the dynasty. Francis Joseph was respected but not completely forgiven for his role in the suppression of the 1848 Revolution. The subordination of Hungary to Austria was therefore not willingly recalled. Hungarians preferred to insist on their own achievements inside of the monarchy. Only in towns where the German minority was still meaningful did the attachment for the dynasty play an important role: on the first place in Pozsony, but also in Temesvár. The Hungarian authorities had to cope with this and complied by doing their duty but they organized at the same time enough events exalting Hungarian historical memory. The municipalities composed of Germans and Hungarians functioned along this balanced policy.

In other cities the minority was often more faithful or at least eager to demonstrate its loyalty: it was the case with Slovenes in Trieste and Ruthenians in Lemberg. Francis Joseph's visit to Lemberg in 1880 coincided with two 'parallel' celebrations, if we accept Hanák's terms: Ruthenians commemorated the centenary of Joseph II's accession to the throne and the subsequent abolition of serfdom; Poles had their own agenda with the commemoration of the 1830 Revolution. The latter wanted to combine "loyalism and promotion of Polish national interests."³¹ However neither Poles nor Ruthenians managed to speak in

30 Péter Hanák, 1898. A nemzeti és az állampatrióta értékrend frontális ütközése a Monarchiában [1898. Brutal confrontation of national and state patriotism values in the monarchy], in: id., *Akertés a műhely* Budapest 1999, p. 91. Published in German: *Die Parallellaktion von 1898. Fünfzig Jahre ungarische Revolution und fünfzigjähriges Regierungsjubiläum Franz Josephs*, in: *Österreichische Osthefte* 1985, p. 366–380.

31 Daniel Unowsky, *Celebrating two Emperors and a Revolution. The Public Contest to Represent the Polish and Ruthenian Nations in 1880*, in: Laurence Cole/Daniel L. Unowsky

one voice: the Poles did not succeed in making the celebration (it was a regular event taking place every year) something particularly impressive; the Ruthenians were divided: Russophiles wanted to use the occasion to petition the sovereign whereas Ukrainophiles persisted in seeing Francis Joseph as Joseph II's heir; in the end they preferred to show the picture of unity.³²

In Brünn on the contrary Germans were of course considered by the Czechs as objective allies of Vienna and there was a reluctance to participate in ceremonies that were seen as instrumented by the majority. However there were practically no examples of demonstration of hostility or refusal to attend dynastic ceremonies. The authorities were cautious to avoid any movement of contestation: on both sides of the monarchy town halls and public buildings were decked with flags, streets were illuminated, services were held by all religious leaders, the military music marched and entertained the public. Everybody was concerned and celebrated together. Cases of separate festivities did not occur in the cities we are concerned with but nevertheless this could happen: in December 1908 in Laibach the unveiling of a statue of Francis Joseph was the occasion of a considerable celebration of city patriotism but it was interpreted by the Germans as a demonstration of Slovene nationalism (the town had by then become largely Slovene) and therefore they organized their own commemoration at the city theatre.³³ It was not less patriotic and loyal than the Slovene celebration, but it was undoubtedly distinct thus meaning that the transnational aspect of dynastic loyalty was somehow lost.

Just as in Laibach the jubilees were the occasion to build new infrastructures and also to create foundations mainly for schools and charity. In this respect each group put its initiative under the aegis of Francis Joseph: this was not only symbolic because the sovereign had to give permission to use his name for these various initiatives. The foundations multiplied in 1898 as well as in 1908 providing scholarships and assistance to needy pupils and students. The phenomenon was particularly remarkable in Brünn where Germans and Czechs competed in founding new charity institutions 'marketed' with the jubilee. The same could be said to some extent for Lemberg where the Ruthenians also claimed their attachment to the emperor by naming many of their foundations by his name as soon as 1888 for the 40-years jubilee. In Trieste the celebrations of the jubilees reflected the political situation: the Italians were divided between lib-

(ed.), *The Limits of Loyalty. Imperial symbolism, popular allegiances, and state patriotism in the late Habsburg Monarchy*, New York 2007, p. 116.

32 Unowsky, *Celebrating two Emperors and a Revolution* (see note 31), p. 124.

33 Egon Pelikan, *Laibach/Ljubljana: nationale und politische Selbstdarstellung im öffentlichen Raum um die Jahrhundertwende*, in: Heidemarie Uhl/Christian Gerbel/Reinhard Kannonier/Helmut Konrad/Axel Körner (ed.), *Urbane Eliten und kultureller Wandel*, Bologna 1996, p. 183–184.

erals sincerely faithful and eager to demonstrate city patriotism, and irredentist who ignored the festivities; the Slovenes on the contrary were unanimous in their adhesion to the commemorations. Most press organs reported on the local festivities as well as on the Viennese celebrations: the emperor's portrait adorned the front page on his birthday as well as on 2 December, the date of his access to the throne in 1848. Special issues were published recalling the major events of his reign as well as his personal tragedies (the violent deaths of his brother Maximilian, his son Rudolph, and his wife Elisabeth). The leitmotiv was his fatherly figure enhanced by his old age (78 in 1908); he was thus depicted as the 'father' of the peoples regardless of language and confession. Beyond city patriotism Francis Joseph was the main element of transnational identification.

Two cases of 'constructed' Habsburg cities: Czernowitz and Sarajevo. A colonial project?

In order to affirm the domination of the Habsburg Empire over Bucovina, Czernowitz was transformed in a showcase where the achievements of the monarchy were displayed. Facing Russia and Romania eastwards, Czernowitz and Bucovina were assigned the mission of representing the west towards eastern 'barbaric' lands. Although the press never ceased to lament about the 'backwardness' of the province, in fact Czernowitz was given institutions and infrastructures that were disproportionate with respect to its real signification. They were undeniably more 'modern' than their counterparts in the neighboring countries (where some of them did simply not exist) and served precisely the purpose of displaying *Kultur* and development.³⁴ The 'colonial' attitude of the monarchy toward Bucovina can be debated but there was a real intention of developing the province. But Czernowitz was also seen as a Potemkin village in comparison to the sad realities of the countryside where underdevelopment was obvious. The absence of industry reflected the lack of dynamism of the province. As a means to hide these problems, the monarchy insisted on showing its benevolent presence in town. The road to progress was particularly obvious after the foundation of the university in 1875. Before that Francis Joseph had already visited the town on two occasions. Initiatives had started in 1873 for the coming commemoration of Bucovina's integration into the Habsburg lands. Not only was the opening of the university to be the major event planned for 1875 but also

34 Michael John, 'Schmelztiegel' – 'Mosaik' – regionales Zentrum 1880–1914: Stadttypus im Vergleich. Migration, Integration und Ethnizität, in: Brno Vidni, Viděn Brnu. Zemskémetropole a centrumříše v 19. Století [Brünn – Wien, Wien – Brünn. Landesmetropolen und Zentrum des Reiches im 19. Jahrhundert], Brno 2008, p. 221–241, here p. 230.

the erection of a monument dedicated to Austria (*Austria-Denkmal*). This monument was to become the only example of allegorical representation of Austria in this context. Its message could not have been clearer: it was a tribute to the genius of Austria that had come to rule over Bucovina. The sculptor was a professor at the local school for applied arts (*Gewerbeschule*), Karl Pekary.³⁵ The Diet organized the unveiling of the statue on 12 May 1875; the prominent guest from Vienna was minister for Cults and Instruction Karl von Stremayr representing the Austrian government as well as the emperor. The monument was placed on the Criminalplatz (named so because of the tribunal that was located there) that was now baptized Austria-Platz.³⁶ The celebration began in the morning by a religious service in all churches and synagogues followed by a march (*Huldigungsfestzug*) towards the square where the monument was standing. After the unveiling of the statue all participants gathered in the hall of the university for the festive opening.³⁷

In the following years Czernowitz was visited not only by the emperor but also by his son Rudolph, heir to the throne, in July 1887,³⁸ as well as by other Archdukes thus showing interest and concern of the dynasty who did not want to appear neglecting the remote province. At the occasion of Francis Joseph third visit in September 1880 the city built a triumphal arch (*Triumphpforte*) surmounted by the emperor's motto *Viribus unitis*. But the town was still lacking significant memorials: an article of the *Czernowitzer Presse* in January 1897 regrets that the city has no other prestigious monument than the *Austria-Denkmal*. The author suggests that the municipal council should take the initiative of building a statue of late Rudolph to commemorate the 10th anniversary

35 Raimund Friedrich Kaindl, *Geschichte von Czernowitz von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*. Festschrift zum 60. jähr. Regierungsjubiläum [...] Kaiser Franz Joseph I., Czernowitz 1908, p. 76.

36 See the Urban Image Database (UID) of Lviv Centre for Urban History of East Central Europe, URL: <<http://www.lvivcenter.org/en/uid/picture/?pictureid=3834>> (last access September 14, 2015).

37 Die Franz-Josephs Universität in Czernowitz im ersten Vierteljahrhundert ihres Bestandes, Czernowitz 1900, p. XXXVII. In 1918 the Romanian authorities removed the statue and for nearly one hundred years it was lost. But in 2003, during canalization works below the former Industrial Museum, the beheaded 'Austria' was discovered. The monument became a symbol for friendship between Ukraine, Austria and Western Europe. Ten copies of the statue were manufactured and given to international artists for creative adaptation. During the year 2006 these 'Austria' replicas travelled through Europe and finally found their way back to Czernowitz, taking residence in the Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University. URL: <<https://ehpepesto.wordpress.com/2011/03/03/the-austria-of-czernowitz-then-and-now/>> (last access April 16, 2017).

38 Carl A. Romstorfer, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der k.k. Staats-Gewerbeschule in Czernowitz. 1873–1898*, Czernowitz 1898, p. 101.

of his death (1889). This would not only decorate the town but also give a proof of “unwavering patriotism.”³⁹

Finally it was his mother Elisabeth who was to benefit from the erection of a memorial. During the discussion in 1905 at the municipal council Counselor Onciul showed a model realized by Julius Zlamal, professor at the Orthodox *Oberrealschule*, and said that it was now time to decide where to erect the statue. Obviously it would have to stand on the eponym new square but this should be done before the square be asphalted. At the same time German counselors projected to build a Schiller statue and there was obviously a competition between two messages: Schiller represented German culture and Elisabeth Habsburg dynastic ideology. The project was indeed slow to come to concretization: the discussion about the location lasted for years. In the meantime the imposing statue (eight meters high) was finished. The affair was in the hands of the association for the embellishing of the town (*Verschönerungsverein*) who proposed now to put the statue in the Franz Josef-garden. There was a fierce debate in the press in January 1908 between the members of the association, the members of the committee in charge of the monument, and the town counselors. The case was complicated by the existence of a statue of Francis Joseph that had been created for the celebration of his jubilee in 1898 so that a proper location had to be found for it too. The city architect Friedrich Haberlandt expressed his opinion in the *Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung* saying that there was no need to relegate Elisabeth in the garden in order to put Francis Joseph on Elisabeth square because it was easy to find another appropriate location for the emperor. The empress should stay on the planned location for the square is the most beautiful of the town.⁴⁰ Professor Matthias Friedwagner who belonged to the *Verschönerungsverein* justified in an article published on the next day why the committee proposed the garden: this would suit more the personality of the deceased empress. In the end the costs for the two monuments were constantly growing with no result in sight. The statue of the emperor finally stayed in the *Volks-garten*.⁴¹

On 9 October 1911 the members of the committee for the erection of the monument to Elisabeth were given an audience by the emperor: the inauguration was planned for the following week and they asked who was going to represent

39 Ein Denkmal, in: Czernowitzer Presse 152/153 (15.01.1897), S. 1.

40 Czernowitzer Allgemeine Zeitung 12001 (02.01.1908), S. 1.

41 This monument was logically destroyed after 1918. Recently, thanks to funding raised by a politician, Arsenyi Jatsenyuk, a new statue of Francis Joseph was erected in the park next to former Herz-Jesu-Kirche. The work by sculptor Vladimir Tsisarik was unveiled on 03.10.2009.

the monarch at the ceremony.⁴² Francis Joseph was satisfied – as usual but here the subject was his own wife – by the statue and said to sculptor Zlamal: “Already the photography of the memorial pleased me very much; now I see the model and I have to say that I like the realization as well as the figures that give a very powerful effect.” The personality chosen to inaugurate the monument was Archduke Leopold Salvator.⁴³ The inauguration took place on 15 October; there was also a delegation sent by King Carol of Romania. The report of the *Czernowitzer Tagblatt* shows pictures of the unveiling: Elisabeth is sitting on a sort of throne emerging from a rock, her head slightly bent and her hands lay in her lap.⁴⁴ The ceremony was again a moment of city patriotism combined with dynastic loyalty for every group participated to honor the empress who was regarded of course as a non-political figure transcending all differences. These events were unifying the peoples and they were thus privileged in a city like Czernowitz.

A last example of identification with the monarchy was the erection of another monument that took place a few years before. A memorial was planned to celebrate the Austrian army by commemorating the 200th anniversary of the creation of the Infantry regiment No. 41 *Archduke Eugene* stationed in Czernowitz since 1882. The so-called Soldier’s memorial (*Kriegerdenkmal*) was erected at the junction of Siebenbürgerstrasse and Rathausstrasse. The laying of the first stone was performed by the archduke in person on 26 April 1901 and the inauguration took place on December 2nd to mark the date of Francis Joseph’s access to the throne.⁴⁵ It represented an obelisk surmounted by an eagle; the basis bore an inscription in German, Romanian and Ruthenian: “The grateful Bukovina to the members of the infantry regiment Archduke Eugene Nr. 41 who fell on the fields of honor.”⁴⁶

Another crucial element of the patriotism of the land linked to Habsburg rule over Bucovina was undoubtedly the existence of the university. The festivities commemorating the 25th anniversary of its creation in 1900 were the occasion to affirm the ‘civilizing’ mission of Austria in the province and to justify the choice of German as the language of the university. It was furthermore an argument in

42 Audienz des Kaiserin Elisabeth-Denkmalkomitees beim Kaiser, *Czernowitzer Tagblatt* 2590 (13. 10. 1911), S. 3–4.

43 Archduke Leopold Salvator (1863–1931) was a member of the Toscana branch of the Habsburg family. He was *General-Artillerieinspektor* of the k. u. k. Army.

44 *Czernowitzer Tagblatt* 2593 (17. 10. 1911), S. 1.

45 *Bukowinaer Post* 1355 (23. 09. 1902), S. 9.

46 The monument was taken down in 1949. The pedestal survived and was brought back to its historic location in the 1990s. See URL: <<http://www.lvivcenter.org/en/uid/picture/?pictureid=3807>> (last access September 14, 2015).

the competition with Lemberg where the university was considered to serve only one community. As stated in the commemorative brochure:

“Significant parts of the population of the East make this need [German language] obvious. First of all the German, Ruthenian and Romanian inhabitants of Bucovina would have to go too far away to Vienna or the even less appropriate Lemberg and that is why they demanded a local institution of higher education. In the same situation are the Germans living dispersed but in great number all over Galicia together with the Jewish population who expressed the same necessity for German teaching. Finally the same thought animated the Ruthenian nationality in Galicia who accepts with satisfaction the transmission of science through German language and literature.”⁴⁷

Again the celebration took place on the symbolic date of Francis Joseph access to the throne, December 2nd. It had of course a transnational character moreover due to the fact that the main hall being too small, the ceremony was performed in the new residence of the Orthodox bishop.⁴⁸ Governor Baron Bourguignon as well as the minister for Cults and public Instruction Wilhelm von Hartel were the leading personalities of the celebration together with Bishop Repta. The German, Romanian and Russian consuls attended the festivities. A mass was held at the Catholic as well as at the Orthodox cathedrals. The religious authorities underlined at this occasion the “ecumenical” spirit of the university.⁴⁹

The heritage of Habsburg governance was transmitted after the First World War by a considerable amount of literary works stressing the multiculturalism of Czernowitz; they created the myth of peaceful coexistence between the communities and minimized the conflicts. It was largely a retrospective view even accentuated after the traumatic experiences of the Second World War. Nevertheless the myth was already present in the discourse of the contemporaries. Behind the ‘construction’ of the myth laid an undeniable intention of the authorities to represent Bucovina as a success of Habsburg enlightened rule preserving the balance between the various components.⁵⁰ The concept of civilizing mission was the basis of state ideology in Bucovina and it was deeply rooted in the mentalities of the local elite despite the national struggle.

The same project characterized the Austro-Hungarian administration in Bosnia and Herzegovina but the result is far from being comparable. The colonial

47 Die Franz-Josephs Universität in Czernowitz im ersten Vierteljahrhundert ihres Bestandes (see note 37), p. XXIV.

48 Rudolf Wagner (ed.), *Alma Mater Francisco Josephina. Die deutschsprachige Nationalitäten-Universität in Czernowitz. Festschrift zum 100. Jahrestag ihrer Eröffnung 1875*, München 1979, p. 78.

49 Ekkehart Lebouton, *Der ökumenische Geist an der Czernowitzer Universität*, in: Wagner (ed.), *Alma Mater Francisco Josephina* (see note 48), p. 136–144.

50 A similar discussion unfolds in Larry Wolff’s latest book, *The Idea of Galicia. History and Fantasy in Habsburg Political Culture*, Stanford 2010.

dimension of the occupation and then annexation of the provinces was obvious but yet not identical to what the colonial powers undertook overseas. First of all the populations of Bosnia and Herzegovina were not really foreign to the monarchy because Serbs and Croats lived elsewhere on the territory and neither their languages nor religions were unknown to the dynasty; even the Muslims, foreign as far as the religion was concerned, spoke Serbo-Croatian and were therefore able to communicate directly with the authorities.⁵¹ Economic priorities were not put forward but there was indeed a will to modernize and develop the provinces by linking them to the rest of the monarchy by rail, starting their industrialization and exploiting their agricultural resources. The military dimension of the occupation remained a key element of the Austro-Hungarian administration and was resented as such by many. All these initiatives were hindered until the annexation of 1908 by the statute of Bosnia and Herzegovina that were still under formal domination of the Sultan. That is also why the emperor could not visit a territory not yet belonging to his lands. The movement toward greater integration and one could say 'colonization' of the provinces started really in 1908 and was stopped by the outbreak of the war.

One of the instruments of this discourse was the *Landesmuseum (Zemaljski muzej)* created in order to show the diversity of the provinces and their common cultural heritage linked to archeological and historical past of the entire region. A museographical Society for Bosnia and Herzegovina (*Muzejskog društva Bosnu I Hercegovinu*) was founded as soon as 1884 with the aim of collecting objects for the future museum. It was an individual initiative of local doctor Julije Makanec around whom gathered some civil servants and the mayor joined as well. The elite of the town was enthusiastic about the endeavor and participated actively in the search for material to enrich the museum. In 1886 the association had nearly 400 members.⁵² The chairman of the association was Kosta Hörmann, a doctor and also civil servant of the local government. He served as the museum first director until 1904. The museum was put in 1888 under the control of the local government for it was the only possibility to finance its activities with the perspective of building an appropriate edifice to accommodate the collections. Ćiro Truhelka (1865–1942) who was a local scholar and a trained archeologist quickly became the person in charge of the concretization of the project on the scientific level. He was logically appointed director of the museum in 1905. The aim of the museum was to enhance the archeological resources of the provinces by showing a transnational heritage anterior to the Ottoman invasion; but it

51 On the process of identification in Bosnia-Herzegovina, see Edin Hajdarpasić, *Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840–1914*, Ithaca 2015.

52 Oliver Bagarić, *Museum und nationale Identitäten: eine Geschichte des Landesmuseums Sarajevo*, in: *Südost-Forschungen* 67 (2008), p. 144–167, here p. 151.

looked also at the Turkish artifacts in order to present a narrative where all confessions would be equally treated. A sign of Kállay's will to demonstrate the role played in this new field of research by both provinces was the organization in 1894 of the congress of archeology and anthropology in Sarajevo:⁵³ it was the occasion to affirm *bošnjaštvo* transnational identity. Yet there was not a proper building for the museum which collections were accumulating and badly housed in the Pension fund building. Since the museum was also supposed to fulfill a pedagogical duty by welcoming the school children, the need for a vast building was obvious and this would also serve the discourse over development of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The commission was given to Karel Pařík at the occasion of the new urban planning in 1906. The building was finished in 1909: it shows an undeniable historicist style similar to many other museums built elsewhere in the empire which Pařík had extensively studied during a field trip that took him also abroad.⁵⁴ A botanical garden was created in the atrium of the museum that is divided into four pavilions (Prehistory, Antiquity, Ethnography, and Natural History). In the end the Muslim presence in the museum was limited to very few elements. The same can be said about the museum's journal, *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja*, edited by Truhelka that was sent to all the schools of the territory.⁵⁵

Francis Joseph had only one occasion to visit Bosnia and Herzegovina and he did it for the inauguration of the Diet in May 1910. He travelled to both capital cities of Sarajevo and Mostar. He arrived in Sarajevo on May 30th and stayed until June 3rd when he departed for Mostar. The announcement of the visit caused an incredible agitation in town: Mayor Essad Kulović asked the inhabitants to decorate their houses and deck them with flags. The *Sarajevoer Tagblatt* devoted a special issue entitled *Kaisernummer* on 31 May to report on the first steps of the visit. The emperor was welcomed by the mayor to whom he answered in his usual polite and neutral tone expressing his satisfaction:

“With joyful heart do I come here to visit for the first time My provincial capital and to spend a few days among the inhabitants of this dynamic city as well as with the citizens of this beautiful country. Decades of civilization work (*Kulturarbeit*) have created solid links between the most recent inhabitants of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and its other parts; the feelings that are expressed to Me are a valuable sign that the loyalty towards the ruling house has deep roots.”

53 Srećko M. Džaja, *Politički okviri kulturne i znanstvene djelatnosti u Bosni i Hercegovini u austro-ugarskom razdoblju (1878–1918)* [The political framework of cultural and scientific activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina at the time of Austria-Hungary], in: *Ciro Truhelka, Zbornik*, Zagreb 1994, p. 13–14.

54 Jiří Kuděla/Branka Dimitrijević/Ivo Vacík (ed.), *Arhitekt Karel Pařík 1857–1942. Čeh koji je gradio evropsko Sarajevo* [A Czech who built European Sarajevo], Sarajevo 2007, p. 122–123.

55 Bagarić, *Museum und nationale Identitäten* (see note 52), p. 155.

The sovereign gave audience to all communities; he visited the Ashkenazi synagogue and the *Gazi Hrusev Bey* mosque; he received all associations and constitutive bodies. The consuls from Italy (Count Giacchi whom Francis Joseph addressed in Italian), Great Britain, Germany, France and Russia attended the ceremony. Before leaving, the emperor went to the Ilidža thermal baths resort.⁵⁶ The press was of course silent about the protests and polemics that the visit caused among Serbs outraged at the 1908 annexation. The visit was even considered risky for the emperor could have been victim of an assassination attempt. Even the Croats tried to use the occasion to make their claims against Hungary heard.

All these reasons may explain why the initiative launched in 1908 to erect a statue of the emperor never concretized. The idea was proposed by local architect Ignaz Langer who found immediately support; a committee was constituted on 22 October at the house of associations (*Vereinshaus*).⁵⁷ On the next day the municipality joined the project: Vice-mayor Nikola Mandić wrote an editorial on that topic in the *Sarajevoer Tagblatt* and it was later announced that mayor Kulović would be the chairman of the committee.⁵⁸ So everything seemed to proceed under the best auspices. But in 1909 nothing had happened: the *Sarajevoer Tagblatt* was regularly appealing to make donations to the committee. In September a fund-raising concert was organized in Ilidža in order to accelerate the process but after that there was no other mention of the monument. In the meantime the state ideology promoted by former Finance minister Kállay had proven a failure: the constructed local identity based on the adhesion of the Muslims did not rally all of them and alienated Croats as well as Serbs who neither wanted to be assimilated to them nor to be deprived of their already elaborated national discourse. The Habsburg architecture of Sarajevo combining modernity with 'oriental' patterns remains as a mute witness of this project. But no specific Habsburg memorial was built in the town before the 1914 assassination. On the following days an initiative was taken to commemorate the deaths of Francis Ferdinand and Sophie. The idea came from Major Hugo Piffel who was a teacher at the boys' military boarding school (*Militärknabenspensionat*). His appeal to build an expiatory monument (*Sühnedenkmal*) was published in the press and the first funds were immediately collected.⁵⁹ There was no debate about the location: the memorial was to be erected on the corner of the Latin bridge (*Latinski most*) in front of the sidewalk where Gavrilo Princip had stood and fired at the car. Eugen Bori was commissioned to build the monument that

56 *Sarajevoer Tagblatt*, Kaisernummer (31.05.1910), S. 1.

57 *Sarajevoer Tagblatt* 123 (23.10.1908), S. 2.

58 Das Kaiser Franz Josef-Denkmal, in: *Sarajevoer Tagblatt* 124 (24.10.1908), S. 1.

59 *Bosnische Post* 147 (02.07.1914), S. 1.

was inaugurated in 1917 on the third anniversary of the assassination. The memorial was composed of two columns 12 meters high united by a plaque where the portraits of both victims were engraved; a niche provided space for candles and flowers. The passers-by were invited to stop for a prayer.⁶⁰ So the last element of Habsburg collective memory was built as the monarchy was already at war. Francis Joseph had died in 1916; the model of multinational empire was contested in many of its territories. The last attempt at creating dynastic loyalty in multicultural Sarajevo had been ruined by the shots of 28 June 1914.

Conclusion

In many cities inhabitants were no more willing to share the urban space with fellow citizens they considered 'others' in terms of language, culture, and religion. Sometimes even the dynastic events caused problems because they were interpreted by local protagonists in a national way thus alienating one part of the populace. Provinces were being redefined following national lines such as in Moravia and Bucovina: this had consequences in the cities where people now tended to separate. Most celebrations that were still transnational were religious ceremonies to some extent, and dynastic festivities. The city turned into a contested space where people who felt excluded pretended to be visible while the leading group built a narrative of besieged fortress. In front of that the discourse conveyed by the state was that both models were possible: dynastic patriotism was not incompatible with national affirmation; indeed this is what city patriotism was about. Identification with both levels was the rule and not the exception for regardless of the group they belonged too, people professed their loyalty to the monarchy. The spontaneous demonstrations erupting in many towns at the news of the Sarajevo assassination were a proof of this attachment and this was to remain so until the end of the coming war.

60 Holm Sundhaussen, *Sarajevo. Geschichte einer Stadt*, Wien 2013, p. 246. The monument was destroyed at the end of the war and the plaque put in the deposit of the local art gallery. There are projects nowadays to rebuild the memorial.