

Images of Peoples: Two 19th-Century “Ethnographies” of the Habsburg Empire

Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik

ZRC SAZU, Institute of Slovenian Ethnology, Slovenia

ingrid.slavec-gradisnik@zrc-sazu.si

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8281-4638>

In large-scale book editions on peoples and nations of the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire in the 19th century, attention was paid to ethnographic topics linked to state administration’s pragmatic needs. Some works followed the “land and people” descriptions and presented them from the perspective of “diversity in unity”. The same ideology was underpinned by “statistical ethnography” (exemplified by the works of Karl v. Czoernig and Adolf Ficker, discussed in this article), which dealt most explicitly with the issue of (multiple) nationalities within a single state and closely linked science and politics.

▪ **Keywords:** ethnography, lands and people, Habsburg Empire, 19th century, Karl von Czoernig, Adolf Ficker, history of the discipline

Pozornost na etnografske teme v obsežnih knjižnih izdajah o ljudstvih in narodih več-etničnega habsburškega cesarstva v 19. stoletju je bila povezana s pragmatičnimi potrebami državne uprave. Nekatera dela so sledila opisom »dežel in ljudi« ter jih predstavljala z vidika različnosti v enotnosti. Enako nazorsko podlago je imela »statistična etnografija« (zglede so v tem prispevku obravnavana dela Karla v. Czoerniga in Adolfa Fickerja), ki je najeksplicitneje obravnavala vprašanje (več) narodnosti v eni državi ter tesno povezovala znanost in politiko.

▪ **Ključne besede:** etnografija, dežele in ljudje, habsburški imperij, 19. stoletje, Karl von Czoernig, Adolf Ficker, zgodovina discipline

Introduction

The discussion of “ethnographic” writing on the peoples and nations of the multi-ethnic Austrian and Austro-Hungarian monarchies in the 19th century complements reflections on the “in-between” identities and identifications of the various populations in the Alps-Adriatic region. Ethnographic content can be found in a variety of sources, including both shorter writings and voluminous books and book collections. These were produced in various formats, including popular, professional, and scholarly. The monographs are primarily the product of an academic discourse rooted in the description of peoples (*Völkerbeschreibung*) and shaped by the philosophical and scientific spirit of the Enlightenment. The scholarship was based on empirical evidence and systematic analysis, employing a developmental and comparative approach to interpret existing and emerging knowledge about human society and groups. Conversely, it was situated within contemporary socio-political developments. An interplay between scholarly and pragmatic (political) objectives distinguished the works produced at the time of the emergence of *ethnos-sciences*.¹

¹ The term *ethnos-sciences* (also *éthnos-names* or *ethnos-terms*) was introduced by Justin Stagl (1995: 234, 1998: 521) as a generic label for disciplines that discuss *ethnos* (people, nation, *Volk*), i.e. ethnography, ethnology, *Völkerkunde*, *Volkskunde*.

In the 19th century, the legacy of describing peoples, or “land and people” (*Land und Leute*), developed in Enlightenment historiography, geography, statistics, and political or state science (*Staatskunde, Staatswissenschaft*), represented a comprehensive approach to understanding living conditions. This comprehensive approach, a hallmark of the era, included various forms of ethnographic interest oriented toward the domestic environment, providing a wealth of knowledge and insight.

The term ‘ethnography’ is placed between quotation marks in the article’s title because the usage of the term during the 18th and 19th centuries did not align precisely with its contemporary meaning in European ethnology and socio-cultural anthropology. The quotation marks indicate the (pre)disciplinary status of ethnography’s subject matter, the lack of clarity surrounding the designation of specific disciplines, and the delineation of particular topics, methods, and genres.

The ethnography of the monarchy invites comparison with several ethnographic genres. One such genre is the extensive monographic work on the empire. These works, in conjunction with other expert and popular texts, represent a significant source of insight into the society of the period, where the term ‘society’ aligns with Central Europe’s national (monarchical, imperial) context at the time. It is understood as comprising diverse populations – clans (*Gens*), tribes (of people) (*Stämme, Völkerstämme*), peoples (*Völker*), nations (*Nationen*) – which inhabited the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation until the early years of the 19th century. In addition to these group designations, various ethnic and regional names were utilised in the 19th-century monarchy to represent a heterogeneous population.

Despite myriad differences, the state discourse of “unity in diversity” (Fikfak, Johler, 2008b: 14) is evident in these works. This narrative, which was a key aspect of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy’s political ideology, emphasized the coexistence of diverse ethnic and national groups within a unified political entity. The narrative is comprehensible because, until the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, despite internal tensions, the assumption persisted that ethnic or national differences did not jeopardise political unity. It is evidenced by the publication of collections on the population and territories of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The collection *Die Völker Österreichs-Ungarns: Ethnographische und culturhistorische Schilderungen* (Prochaska, 1881–1885) was published in 12 volumes, each signed by a different author and each devoted to one nation under the Austrian or Hungarian crown. The *Landeskunde* collection, *Die Länder Österreichs-Ungarns in Wort und Bild* (Umlauft, 1881–1889, 15 volumes), was organised according to the crown lands, similar to the monumental collection *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild* (ÖUMWB, 1884–1902), The Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in Word and Picture, more commonly known as the *Kronprinzenwerk*.

This contribution presents a comprehensive analysis of monarchy studies, with a particular focus on the works of two prominent authors: Karl von Czoernig (*Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie*, 1857a, and *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs*, 1857b)

and Adolf Ficker (*Die Völkerstämme der österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie, ihre Gebiete, Gränzen und Inseln*, 1869). Their work, particularly that of Czoernig, can be classified within a specific subfield of ethnography, namely “statistical ethnography”. In comparison to the other two works on the monarchy (Blumenbach, 1832–1835, 2nd ed. 1837; Umlauf, 1876, 2nd ed. 1897), which are the subject of a separate study (Katschnig, 2024), statistical ethnography forecasts a more explicit disciplinary framework, evident in both the exposition and argumentation of the subjects dealt with, and in the method of their elaboration. Czoernig characterised his contributions as “ethnographic”, while Ficker described his work as “historical-geographical-statistical”.

These authors, who were academically educated and engaged in the Austrian intellectual milieu, provided a “view from above” perspective. Some even held influential roles in state politics. Notably, all the works were written in German. It’s important to note that there are no comparable works in Italy and Slovenia for the entirety of the monarchy, underscoring the unique contributions of these authors.

These works convey a descriptive overview of natural, living, linguistic, and cultural conditions and their respective populations. What disciplinary tools (regarding terminology, the organisation of material, and narrative) did the authors employ to distinguish, identify, and potentially compare the differences? It would be interesting to ascertain whether their representations can discern any bias. To what extent did they reflect the processes of nationalisation that shaped collective identifications in the 19th century, which occurred with varying dynamics in the nations of the monarchy under disparate conditions? In this context, an important question is whether, alongside the ascribed ethnic and national identities, it is also possible to identify in this genre identities characterised by the concepts of in-between, hybridity, and multiplicity (Fikfak, Schönberger, 2024; Schemmer, Schönberger, 2024), and if so, at which levels?

Given that the portrayals of the monarchy do not align with contemporary ethnographic, ethnological, or anthropological standards, it is not feasible to ascertain the nuances of belonging and identification experienced by individuals in a multi-ethnic setting. Moreover, this topic has only recently become a subject of explicit reflection and interpretation in ethnology and anthropology, coinciding with disciplinary reflexivity that has seen epistemological and methodological biases subjected to scrutiny. These writings are conceived within a distinct conceptual framework: exhaustive description of a vast body of knowledge intended for a narrow academic or broader readership. The texts situate their subjects historically and geographically, positioning them as distant “subjects”. They present specific features of everyday life and occasionally offer commentary and comparison, including (folk) characters. The descriptions are organised following a comprehensive and systematic approach, adhering to scientific standards and aligning with the principles of political correctness. Notably, the authors were affiliated with official institutions and have explicitly committed to the monarchy and disseminating knowledge to promote its stability.



With their encyclopaedic ambition, they testify to the changing social and intellectual climate of the 19th century. Other discourses and genres, e.g. travel accounts (Holfelder et al., 2024), that existed concurrently may present alternative accounts of a polyphonic process of collective and individual identifications and identity practices that transcend ascribed ethnic or national markers. In the 19th century, society underwent a radical restructuring and differentiation. Consequently, alongside ethnic, linguistic, and regional identities, state and national affiliations, and more fluid, strategic, pragmatic, and situational identifications, could be generated simultaneously. From the perspective of interest in the everyday agency and the nuances of identification practices, or what has been termed “everyday ethnicity” (cf. Schemmer, Schönberger, 2024), publications on the monarchy are of interest regarding the official conceptions of the state and problems of nation-building since the processes of nationalisation were essentially a project of elites.

Accordingly, this article will substantiate its contribution through cross-reading and analysis of other sources and genres.

“Ethnography” of the 19th century Habsburg Empire

Indivisibiliter ac inseparabiliter

The genesis of the ethnos-sciences in the last decades of the 18th century indicates that they were an outcome of the scientific need to “organise” the existing knowledge about the peoples of the world, on the one hand, and the complex population compositions of multiethnic state entities, on the other.² They offered a tool for addressing and interpreting diversity, exploring the fundamental characteristics of peoples (tribes) and nations and their relations with the state while enriching themselves empirically with a wealth of facts about foreign and native peoples. Their interpretations were based primarily on two elements: the relationship between environment (nature) and human activities (culture), which was central to explaining human action, and the belief in progress, which was thematised in the development of civilisation(s), while both were also elements of collective characterisations. This ideological underpinning and empirical material have provided the basis for a large body of writing on world history and geography and more geographically circumscribed contributions on lands and peoples, both of which had, in principle, comparative ambitions. Alongside this has

² A large body of research on this topic has been carried out over the last few decades, examining the emergence of individual disciplines and their coexistence with the current political situation. See, e.g.: Lutz, 1958, 1973, 1980, 1983; Möller, 1964; Fischer, 1970; Bausinger, 1971; Harris, 1971 [1968]; Stagl, 1974, 1995, 1998, 2006; Rassem, Stagl, 1980; Urbancová, 1980–1981; Weber-Kellermann, Bimmer, 1985; Hartmann, 1988; Könnkamp, 1988a, 1988b; Belaj, 1989; Harbsmeier, 1995; Vermeulen, Roldán, 1995; Fikfak, 1999; Kaschuba, 2012 [1999]; Vermeulen, 2015.

been “the shift from biblical and patriotic genealogies of nations to the comparative study of languages as an auxiliary discipline of history” and “the shift from the study of ‘morals’ or manners and customs to a comprehensive study of peoples and nations” (Vermeulen, 2015: 452).

Similar to the situation in the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, the Habsburg Empire in the 19th century could also be characterised by the apt metaphor of a “patched carpet” (*Flickenteppich*), given its multi-ethnic composition and the government’s commitment to the overall development and stability of the state (Kaschuba, 2012 [1999]: 23–24). The genre of *Landes- und Volkskunde* matched state centralism (Narr, Bausinger, 1964: 238) and was one of two “ethnographic” currents from the last decades of the 18th century onwards, the other being travel accounts based on the *ars apodemica*. The former was marked by history and geography and, above all, by the flowering of statistics or *Staatswissenschaft* in the service of enlightened absolutism. The pragmatic task of state science was to “conclude how to govern the state wisely” (Schneider, 2011: 19). Originally, statistics was not a science of numbers but a comprehensive inventory of the basis of life and the living conditions of the population in particular areas: in addition to the characteristics of climate, geography, and economy, knowledge of the population was informed by the facts of everyday life (settlements, housing, clothing, food, habits and customs, religion, etc.) (ibid.; cf. Labbé, 2011: 156).

In the 19th century, Romanticism strongly influenced the scholarly interest in human communities. In its perspective, the *Volk*, in the reception of the scholars (and politicians), was no longer considered with all the attributes of everyday life. It was idealised in folk or national spirit and lost the “neutral” or taxonomic meaning of the label “population”. However, there were many parallels between the Romantic collecting and scientific enthusiasm and the Enlightenment tradition; in Austrian *Volkskunde*, they are illustrated by a series of topographical, regional, and folkloristic contributions that are an important source for regional ethnography (for more on this, see Schneider, 2011: 26–29).

In addition to these publications, encyclopaedic descriptions of lands and peoples were produced for the entire Habsburg territory. In keeping with the genre tradition, these descriptions combined geographical, historical, and statistical data with ethnographic content, varying the proportions of these components across different works. A substantial corpus of literature on the subject, including voluminous books by Wenzel Karl Wolfgang Blumenbach (1832–1833, 1837), Czoernig (1857a), Ficker (1869), and Friedrich Umlauf (1876, 1897), and three comprehensive collections (Prochaska, 1881–1885; Umlauf, 1881–1889; ÖUMWB, 1884–1902) exhibited differences in their scope, content and approach (e. g. homeland descriptions or *Heimatkunde*, and statistics). The content of these works is centred on place, time, and people; however, the specific emphases varied somewhat depending on the authors’ orientation, their expertise in particular fields, their social position or affiliation with the institutions that supported their work, the purposes of the works, and the intended audience. The titles

of the publications in question indicate the different approaches, but even more so do the scope and arrangement of the material and the style (descriptive or problematic) of presentation. All of the works mentioned above are, whether implicitly or explicitly, regarded as belonging to the realm of scholarship, thereby distinguishing them from the equally comprehensive curiosity of the typically more popular homeland descriptions, their magnum opus being the *Kronprinzenwerk*.

Compared to Blumenbach's distinctly geographical presentation, which he described as "a collection of interesting facts about the lands and peoples" (*Wissenswürdigkeiten aus der Länder- und Völkerkunde*) of the vast empire (Blumenbach, 1833 III: p. p.), and Umlauf's geo-statistical handbook, in which the status of ethnography and its political use is already evident,³ Czoernig and Ficker were the explicit spokesmen of the official discourse on the relation between (multi)nationality and the state, addressing the political issues of the time in their work.

"Statistical ethnography" by Karl von Czoernig

Karl von Czoernig (1805-1889) is considered the leading Austrian statistician of the 19th century. Born in Bohemia, he worked in Vienna, Milan, and Trieste and spent his last three decades in Gorizia. He was trained as a lawyer and is described in biographical handbooks as a "statistician" (ÖBL) and a "historian, statistician, ethnographer" (Kralj, 1976).⁴ Alongside his broad professional and governmental activities, we are interested in his ethnographic work, which is most closely related to the work of the Vienna Statistical Office. In 1857, the *Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie* was published in three volumes with an accompanying ethnographic map (Czoernig, 1857a); of particular importance is the commentary *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs* (1857b).

Introduction⁵

The Ethnography of the Monarchy is accompanied by a Preface (*Vorrede*, pp. v-xviii) with a comprehensive account of the meaning and subject of the work. A characteristic observation of the colourful character of the monarchy and the significant internal civilisational differences introduces it:

³ Especially Umlauf, who Czoernig inspired, focused not on environmental determinism but more explicitly on history (the chapter on political and territorial history comes first), multi-ethnic composition, mixed areas, and different religions. However, the fatherland remains a geographical and political entity. He mentioned the threats to which Austria was exposed in the light of the awakened principle of nationality but did not elaborate on them.

⁴ See also his autobiography *Biographische Notizen* (Czoernig, 1879).

⁵ He published an extended introduction to the *Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie* in his treatise *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs* (Czoernig, 1857b), as a report for the Academy's philosophical-historical department. See more on this below in the section On Austria's Ethnography.

The Austrian Empire is characterised by a great diversity of conditions across its vast territory. [...] The main tribes [*Hauptstämme*] of the dominant population of Europe meet in the territory of the empire, form compact masses, merge into each other in various shades of nationality, and form ethnographic groups and islands which, in the most colourful mixture, express the peculiar composition of the population in Austria as nowhere else. However, this uniqueness is not only due to the ethnic mixture; it is primarily due to the conditions in which the main tribes of the people are found so that they are interdependent with the number and internal strength of the individual peoples, as well as with the stages of civilisation; they maintain the balance of association, not of subordination, on which the structure of the state rests. (Czoernig, 1857a: i)

The interdependence, the intrinsic strength of each people, the interconnectedness between them, and their equality – not subordination – emerge as new categories and qualities of the population, all of which form the basis of the state structure. Natural geographical conditions are very much in the background.

According to Czoernig, the composition of the population is a consequence of the historical development of the state, is the basis of its present existence, and is an element among the “natural forces of the imperial state”. In a situation where “it is important to know what conditions give strength to the state”, such a study is also “of the utmost importance from the point of view of the state” (Czoernig, 1857a: i). Czoernig’s work was politically pragmatic. From 1841, he carried it out as head of the Directorate of Administrative Statistics, when he planned the collection of material and the production of an ethnographic map and three books.

In terms of material, it was necessary to start from scratch, as he had no models and no tools: “Even ethnographic science was still in the early stages of its development, as ethnographic maps were not yet distinguished from linguistic maps and the two were interchanged” (ibid.: vi).⁶ For the ethnographic map, special preparations were necessary to collect detailed data on the nationality (*Nationalität*) of the population in the field. However, this was not feasible and methodologically comparable due to the different situations in the crown lands. First, a detailed map (*Detaille-Karte*) of 306 colour maps was created, which required corrections and additions, especially for nationally transitional or mixed areas. In 1848, it was possible to map the “ethnographic situation of

⁶ An exception was Šafařík’s *Slowanský Národopis* (1842) with material on Slavic linguistic tribes (*Slavische Sprachstämme*). In *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs*, he also mentioned Csaplovics’ map of Hungary, Bernhardt’s linguistic map of Germany, and the ethnographic map of Russia (Peter v. Koppen, *Ethnographische Karte des St. Peterburgischen Gouvernements*, 1848), which, however, could not be compared with his map because of the particular conditions in the Russian Empire (Czoernig, 1857b: 6).

the monarchy” with the representation of the main groups of the tribes of peoples (*die Hauptgruppen der Völkerstämme*). Before publication, the data for the mixed areas and the “ethnographic islands” had to be revised, as it turned out that the markings of the linguistic and national boundaries did not correspond, which required further on-the-spot verification. As an example of a particularly complex area, Czoernig cited Istria:

In no other part of the Monarchy, in proportion to its size, have so many remnants of different nationalities and of their gradations been preserved, more clearly recognisable than in language, dress, and customs, as in the small peninsula of Istria, the land where the earliest culture of our part of the world (Pola with the Adriatic is perhaps the oldest known settlement there) met with the lowest level of civilisation within the empire. (Czoernig, 1857a: viii)

In this case, it was the 13 ethnographic shades (*ethnographische Nuancen*) and the various population mixtures: some do not know writing, some have particular dialects, and some have even forgotten their mother tongue. He mentioned the Croatianized Slovenians and the Sloveneized Croats, the Croatianized Vlachs, the Italianized Croats, etc.; the Croatianized Italians are a mixed people with Italian costume, Slavic customs, and a linguistic mixture of Serbian and Italian.

It was, therefore, necessary to find an expert in Istrian dialects who visited places on the peninsula and

unravel this tangle of ethnographic-linguistic mixtures through precise research. This was done, and thus, the ethnographic character of this part of the region was established, and only the main outlines can now be seen on the map. (Czoernig, 1857a: ix)

This illustrates Czoernig’s accuracy in mapmaking; the mass of empirical data had to be constantly compared and verified, also in the field. For each place, i.e. the 100,000 points on the map, he wanted to establish a precise ethnographic definition and “to indicate the nationality of each place in the monarchy” (Czoernig, 1857a: ix). The help of the Imperial Institute of Military Geography geographers was invaluable in producing and publishing the map.

Czoernig used the adjective “ethnographic” to refer to ethnic or national attributions, evident from the distinction between an ethnographic map and a linguistic map. He illustrated this with the situation in the Bohemian parts of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia, where German was also spoken (in the towns also predominantly): on a linguistic map, they would be indicated as German-Czech, “whereas this cannot happen on an ethnographic map, which indicates the ethnicity of the population” (Czoernig, 1857a: x).

The preparation of the ethnographic map completed or realised the “statistical part of the ethnography of Austria, i.e., the presentation of the ethnographic situation in space” (Czoernig, 1857a: xi). This did not exhaust the view of the ethnographic situation (*ethnographische Verhältnisse*), which is deeply rooted in the past, has had an impact on the fate of peoples and countries, on the spread of culture and prosperity, and shows the past of the tribes under the present-day crown. “In short, to gain this insight, the presentation of ethnographic relationships in chronological order or the historical part of ethnography [*historisches Theil der Ethnographie*] is required” (ibid.). In the absence of material, the historical part of the work was an even more demanding task: facts about the ethnographic situation had to be extracted from older historical works, and hitherto unused sources had to be found and used. The ethnographic history of the Hungarian lands is the subject of this work’s second and third volumes.⁷

The first volume presents the monarchy as a whole from a general historical-ethnographic point of view and the crown lands (primarily German) in a separate part, with a historical-ethnographic and geographical-statistical overview. The structure of Czoernig’s work differs markedly from that of Blumenbach and Umlauf, especially in that the historical part is nominally and in scope the main focus. The geographical section, or physical-geographical description, is given space at the end of the first volume of about 60 pages.

The general part is divided into the chapters General Ethnology (*Allgemeine Ethnologie*) and General Ethnography (*Allgemeine Ethnographie*): the former provides an overview of the population history of the monarchy with data on the origins of the linguistic borders and linguistic islands (up to the Middle Ages), while the latter gives an overview description of the linguistic borders and islands of the monarchy, with a statistical-ethnographic overview of all the vernacular tribes in the empire. Apart from the titles, the terms *ethnology* and *ethnography* do not appear anywhere: one can only think of the distinction that ethnology includes the study of several peoples in Czoernig’s text, partly also general and comparative findings, while ethnography includes research of a single people.

Not all the crown lands are treated in the special section; only the Germanic ones (Upper Austria, Lower Austria, Salzburg, Styria, Carinthia, and Tyrol) are listed in the title, de facto only Lower Austria (*Oesterreich unter der Enns*) is presented, both historic-ethnographically and geographically-statistically. Czoernig argued at length for this choice: Lower Austria is the original homeland of the ruling dynasty, with Vienna as its capital and residential city and as the seat of the central government and the whole empire (Czoernig, 1857a: xiv).

⁷ *Historische Skizze der Völkerstämme und Colonien in Ungern, Kroatien und Slavonien, in der serbischen Wojwodschafft sammt dem Temeser Banate, dann in Siebenbürger und in der Militär-Gränze*, discussed according to the three significant periods from the earliest traces of the settlement of the area before the arrival of the Ogres.



In the historical-geographical survey (ibid.: 87–223), Czoernig traced developments in the area in a historical-ethnographical overview from the Proto-Celtic period onwards: the age of migrations, with historical turning points and migrations in the area, the legal system, the cultural situation (*Cultur-Zustand*) (the development of poetry and other arts, religion, law, dress, music, education), agriculture, industry, crafts, trade. He advocated the extension of the historical part to the most recent period with a chapter on the New Organisation of Austria (*Österreich's Neugestaltung*, ibid.: 224–616). He announced a discussion of the changes in the constitution, the legal order, and the government after 1848:

No epoch in the history of Austria is more instructive in ethnographic terms than that of the mighty movement of 1848 and 1849, which shook the empire, threatened its existence, and, under the protection of providence and with the help of its own power, led to the restoration of law and order, to the establishment of a new state life, the equality of all citizens and material development, the beginnings of which, visible everywhere, point to its future expansion. The principle of nationality, within the bounds of its justification, the basis of culture, and the source of spiritual and material progress, had freed itself from all bonds in and outside Austria, and a ferment had developed that threatened to undermine historical law and destroy the existence of states. As in the religious war, nationality was now elevated to the banner of rebellion, which would have resulted in general anarchy if the overflowing river had not been contained within its solid banks. While in other states where one nationality is predominant, the movement of one led to a revolutionary transformation, in Austria, a racial struggle [*Racenkampf*] flared up, which was not only directed against the government but aimed at the mutual oppression of the tribes living in the same country. History has drawn a vivid picture of where the abuse of the principle of nationality fostered by brute force can lead and how nationality, the leader of spiritual development, like every other element of state power, cannot shake the existence of the state with impunity and supplant historical law by its mandate. (Czoernig, 1857a: xv)

Czoernig saw the national movement or the principle of nationality (*das Princip der Nationalität*) primarily as a force threatening the solidity of the state structure. However, he considered its legitimacy to be “the basis of culture, the source of spiritual and material progress”. In general, he considered the new situation as a step “in the history of civilization alone [that] awakens in the patriot the desire to be able to see the great reforms of the reorganization” (Czoernig, 1857a: xvi), on which the wellbeing of the

citizens depended. Although state organization may not be part of ethnographic work, it is essential for understanding ethnographic conditions (ibid.: xvii).

At the end of the Preface, he touched on the last chapter of the first volume, the geographical-statistical survey of Lower Austria (Czoernig, 1857a: 617ff.) – a section that is otherwise highly comprehensive and extensive in 19th-century geographic-statistical works. He listed general facts, the characteristics of the surface and its fertility, the climate, the extraction of metals, their sources, valuable plants, animal husbandry, industry, and trade. He explained the links between the surface and natural resources, between the inhabitants and the feedback effect of surface cultivation and natural products, and between crafts and commercial activity. The interconnectedness of “the natural and the cultural” is explicit: “nature” determines human activity, but human activity reverses and changes it.

Right at the end of this section is an “ethnographic statistic”, which, according to Czoernig, is “very simple” for Lower Austria since there are few places where the members of the Germanic folk tribe do not predominate. Vienna is discussed in detail from this point of view.

To conclude, he thanked all his collaborators and supporters, and finally, Emperor Franz Joseph I, who also financially supported the publication of the author’s 16-year efforts, thus confirming a critical aspect of this work, which was both scientific and political and which was ultimately initiated by the highest administration in charge of administrative statistics (Czoernig, 1857b: 4).

General ethnography

In the chapter General Ethnology (1857a: 5–19), Czoernig traced the settlement of the area up to the Middle Ages and concluded that between the 11th and 13th centuries, the tribes of people (*Völkerstämme*) were arranged in much the same way as they are today, with linguistic borders and islands. He described the borders of all the tribes of people.⁸ However, the location or roughly marked borders alone do not provide a detailed picture. Here, language is the most appropriate indicator, as it shows the internal linguistic subdivision of the large tribes. In some cases, language is not sufficient either; there are marked differences in characteristics between individual peoples (*Volkstümlichkeit*), e.g. between Czechs, Moravians, and Slovaks, or between Serbs and Croats. Even among the southern Slavs, the Slovenians (*Slovenen, Krainer oder Winden*) are distinct from the Croats and Serbs; the latter are separate tribes of people despite their similarities in language. There are many more examples of this in the monarchy. Czoernig listed 38 linguistic boundaries.

⁸ The Germanic tribe shares borders with Western Romans (Italians, Ladins, and Friulians) and the Western-Southern Slavs (Slovenians); the Slavic tribes are Northern and Southern; the Roman tribes are Western and Eastern and border on the Germanic tribe, the Southern and Northern Slavs; the Hungarian tribe borders on the Germans, the Northern and Southern Slavs and the Eastern Romans (Czoernig, 1857a: 23–24).

He referred to German as the language of the imperial house, of the central government, and finally as of “the general culture, understood and spoken by the educated of almost all other nationalities” (Czoernig, 1857a: 26). He went on to describe in great detail the Germanic-Italian, Germanic-Ladin, and Germanic-Friulian borders, the Germanic-Slovenian border (in Carinthia, Styria, and the Iron County with the Hungarian border; here, Monošter (St. Gotthard) is the hub of the three frontiers) (ibid.: 27–28). The German language islands south of the Slovenian border are Predil, Trbiž, Bela Peč, Bovec, Zgornje Rute, and Goggau in Carinthia; otherwise, German can be heard in several places in Carinthia, part of Carniola, and southern Styria, also in Gorizia and the Iron County in Hungary.⁹

In the section on Slavic linguistic boundaries, he mentioned the Slovenian-Friulian border, along with the distinctly mixed Gorizia, where Friulian, Slovenian, German, and Italian are spoken. This border follows the Soča River to Gradišče ob Soči (Gradisca d’Isonzo) and merges with the Slovenian-Italian linguistic line and continues to Štivan (San Giovanni al Timavo) in the most northern bay of the Adriatic Sea (Czoernig, 1857a: 54). The Slovenians also have a Slovenian-Serbian, Slovenian-Serbocroatian, and Slovenian-Slavocroatian (*slovenisch-slovenokroatische*) linguistic border. The first two run in continental Istria, separating the Šavrini, the Serbo-Croatian Fučki, Čiči and Brkinci. The Slovenian-Serbocroatian border also separates Carniola from Croatia (in the area of the Rijeka/Fiume Comitatus). The Slovenian-Slavocroatian border overlaps with the regional borders between Carniola, southern Styria, Hungary, and Croatia. The immigration of Serbo-Croats in the 17th century created linguistic islands in Istria.

This illustrates a topographical picture of the distribution of ethnic groups by language, which runs like a journey on a geographical map. It introduces the readers to the ethnically named inhabitants and the areas and places where they live. Finally, numerical data collected during the last census in 1851 were given to all the tribes of peoples of the monarchy.

As mentioned in the preface to the Historical-Ethnographic Survey, Czoernig gave a central place to the extensive chapter on the reorganisation of the state (*Österreich’s Neugestaltung*), the legislation for which had been in preparation for years and which he had promoted with numerous administrative proposals (Johler, 2020: 593).¹⁰ He listed in detail the elements of new laws and acts for all areas of national life (administration, security, law, finance, trade, industry and shipping, roads, rivers, railways, telegraphs and postal services, agriculture, education, religion, the military, the navy),¹¹ which set the framework for everyday life. The chapter testifies to the state’s efforts, while respecting the ethnographic element and conditions, to consolidate the post-feudal state

⁹ The real German-language island is the “Land of the Gottsheers” (*Göttscheer Ländchen*), with 34 exclusively German and several mixed German-Slovenian localities.

¹⁰ He devoted special attention to them in a separate edition of *Österreich’s Neugestaltung 1848–1858* (1858).

¹¹ Detailed numerical and topographical data of particular historical interest are given for all the areas listed.

and to balance as far as possible the significant differences in the culture of the various crown lands and provinces, bringing them as close as possible to the level achieved, above all, by the Germanic part of the monarchy.

Without going into the extent and details of this national project, the primary intention can be illustrated by the example of the organisation of education (from primary to university level), in which, in addition to defining all organisational forms, language plays a central role. Czoernig understood education as the cornerstone of the spiritual life of citizens, with an “ethnographic element” at the forefront. In Austria, “where different tribes of people meet, not so different in number as in culture and scientific education”, it must receive multifaceted attention (Czoernig, 1857a: 565).

He stated that in the history of Austria, there have been many attempts to do justice to “ethnographic claims” in the various crown lands. The authorities legally recognised the right of each folk tribe to claim general (including religious) education in their mother tongue. Primary education is provided in the language spoken by the majority of the local population, or two or even three if there are several languages. The language of the dominant tribe is also used at higher levels (lower secondary schools, even gymnasiums), but once scientific education (*wissenschaftliche Ausbildung*) begins, ethnographic requirements step into the background.

A modification of the basic principle is determined by whether the language of the folk tribe in question is a cultural language and a suitable tool in the sciences; if it is not, the teaching is fruitless, and the sciences are treated superficially. In the Italian crown lands, education is carried out in the regional language because Italian is the cultural language, while in the Slavic and Hungarian lands, this requires other measures. German must be a compulsory subject in grammar schools with a regional language (e.g., Czech, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Slovakian, Hungarian, and Romanian).¹² In the upper grades, classes must be taught exclusively in German so that high school students can follow German lectures at the university: “The sciences are taught in German because the other languages of the country in most cases do not reach the level required for scientific contributions” (Czoernig, 1857a: 566).¹³

Without these measures, the government would have given up its higher mission of promoting culture and carrying it to the East in particular if it wanted to use the most suitable means of doing so, which is to ensure that academically educated men from those lands are thoroughly familiar with the German language and science and are enabled by the former to spread the latter in their domestic circles. (Czoernig, 1857a: 566)

¹² It has also been introduced in the Italian lands (Czoernig, 1857a: 576).

¹³ He gave the example of how, before 1848, special sciences (e.g. chemistry) were taught in an “underdeveloped language” that had no terms for them at all.

In his preference for the German language and culture, Czoernig was unaware of the bias of privileging German nor of the consequences of diglossia for the public life of other nations. He took it for granted that German was the *lingua franca* of the empire – in transportation, commerce, and correspondence. He was convinced that the priority of German also reflected a concern for the citizens: knowledge of the language brought advantages, but not by force, and ultimately did not deprive them of cultivating their own language.

Finally, Czoernig's work contains the interesting category of *Land und Leute* (land and people),¹⁴ which he defined at the end of the first volume of his geographic-statistical survey of Lower Austria.

The land and the people are the fundamental strength of a country and the main determinants of its cultural situation. They are inextricably linked and, although in different ways, have the most lasting influence on each other. If man, through the development of civilisation, imprints on the land he inhabits the characteristic stamp of his activity, he awakens the innate fertility of the soil and exploits its suitability for industry and commerce [...] The influence of the natural characteristics of the surface of the soil on the individual and social development of the tribe that inhabits it over time is unconditional and is everywhere asserted, albeit in varying degrees. (Czoernig, 1857a: 617)

By “land”, he meant geographical features, while “people” were the cultivators engaged in livelihood activities: “nature” and working people create the wealth and strength of a country.

On Austria's ethnography

In *Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie*, the author's focus was undoubtedly on ethnographic statistics – ethnography was part of it, rather than broadly conceived in the sense of a rounded picture of everyday life phenomena. This was confirmed in his text *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs*, which he presented as “an introduction and commentary from a scientific point of view” (Czoernig, 1957b: 4). He went on to describe the material and method presented in the Preface in even greater detail, his guiding principles were the completeness in the material collected, the accuracy of detail, and the clear presentation of the material covered (ibid.: 5); all of these conferred the work a scientific status.

The challenges for his ethnography stemmed from the fact that, except for the aforementioned linguistic and Russian ethnographic maps, he had no precedent.

¹⁴ Between the mid-18th and 19th centuries, it was used in quite several different meanings (for more on this, see e.g. Könnkamp, 1988a).

Ethnography as a science at the time he began his work was “content with collecting ethnographic notes” (Czoernig, 1857b: 5). Information on contemporary conditions had to be sought in statistical and geographical handbooks, in depictions of the customs and characters of peoples (*Sitten- und Charaktergemälden der Völker*), while in the past context, political history offered little information on how political events had affected the peculiarities of peoples. In short: “What was missing was the unified treatment of ethnography in space and time, that statistics and history presuppose and whose results are to be incorporated into their presentation” (ibid.).

For “ethnography in space”, cartography has proven to be the most excellent instrument, “as it provides the most effective tool for criticism and because it presents clearly and concisely the overall results of research regarding the distribution, delimitation, and mixing of individual tribes” (ibid.). We have mentioned that the cartographic material was collected in a planned manner – data were collected with questionnaires, and often further verified in the field.

He added observations from *Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie* that reflected the category of the national with which the ethnographer must grapple in the contemporary situation. Czoernig used the term *Nationalität-Prinzip*. He avoided the term *Nation*,¹⁵ and mainly used *Nationalität* and the adjectival form *national* in a variety of conjugations (e.g. *n. Eigenheiten, Eigenthümlichkeiten, Charakter, Literatur, Einfluss, Zeitgeschmack, Wohlstand, Industrie, etc.*).

He introduced the debate on the principle of nationality with the question of the relationship between nationality and the other foundations of human society at a particular time: the principle of nationality, he believed, had been “carried to extremes and misunderstood” and “from the shores of a calibrated movement had plunged half the world into agitation and turmoil”. Notwithstanding the conflicting views on the Spring of Nations, he considered it indisputable that “nationality [*Nationalität*] is not the only form of human society, nor is it the most important” (Czoernig, 1857b: 15). Nationality is respected by the main pillars of public life – the state and the church: the church has rules concerning religion, and the state has to guarantee the legal status of the individual and public life so that it can “harvest the seeds of culture and develop abundant fruits” (ibid.).

In the past, too, nationality absorbed all other communities, e.g. in the migration of peoples and the formation of states, giving them stability and continuity. With this statement, Czoernig explicitly identified nationality with ethnicity. In his time, this was the case in large states, where statehood was the expression of the ruling nationality and its material interests; because it controlled all material interests, others were subordinated to it and disappeared.

¹⁵ In the first volume of *Ethnographie Österreichs*, with more than 450 occurrences of terms with the root “nation”, *Nation* is written only 13 times, mostly *Nationalität*, *Nation* rarely replacing *Volk* (e.g. *ungarische, serbische, sächsische Nation*), but seven times in the present text (e.g. *herrschende, italienische Nation*), or again in the meaning of *Volk*.

According to Czoernig, the ultimate goal of human activity is “the religious, intellectual, and material development of culture” so that “as many earthlings as possible may reach perfection and come closer to the Creator”. For this to happen, the security of life and property must be guaranteed; only the state, the most secure form of human community for culture, can achieve this in the long run. To do so, it needs spiritual strength, which is offered in particular by nationality as a guide to spiritual development on the path to culture (Czoernig, 1857b: 16). The state, therefore, draws on two sources – material resources, and spiritual development guided by nationality. Progress is harmonious the more the efforts of the two directions are attuned to each other. In this formulation, nationality is a spiritual rather than a social aspect.

Czoernig was interested in a state composed of several tribes of people: when one dominates in numbers and power, the state does not renounce its dominant element of power and material interests – today, we would say that these interests appropriate the state – and the subordinate tribes are left to participate by assimilation. When several tribes of people are roughly balanced in numbers and power, the state must show justice and provide each with the means to exist and advance – these are the foundations of the equality of nationalities (Czoernig, 1857b: 16–17). From the ethnographic map and the *Ethnography of the Austrian Monarchy*, he concluded that “powerful tribes of people in compact masses occupy isolated areas in the monarchy, but none is so predominant in number and importance that others would be in a relationship of subordination to it” (Czoernig, 1857b: 17). He did not define subordination; however, his perspective is reflected in the descriptions of the major peoples as the carriers, advocates and diffusers of culture or civilisation.

In the western part of the monarchy, two peoples with a centuries-old culture live side by side, the Germans north of the Alps and the Italians south of the Alps, who are called upon to carry and spread civilisation and education (*Civilization und Bildung*). The ethnographic facts in time and space show which peoples initiated and promoted the development of culture in the eastern tribes of people and to which peoples, predominantly in the northern part of the monarchy, fell the task of spreading their cultures among the other peoples. For centuries, colonisation was the most effective means of transmitting culture from west to east, which sowed prosperity, habits, and education. The second and most significant aspect of Austria’s ethnographic composition is the remarkable number of mixed groups and ethnographic islands spreading from the west to the east. Austria is, above all, a country of equality of nationalities (*Nationalitäten*), which results from the nature of the circumstances since the tribes and their interests are not in conflict with each other. Still, each is a fundamental pillar for the preservation and prosperity of the state, where they all contribute to the building and successful development of the state through their synergic efforts.

Czoernig emphasised the mutual influences in the neighbourhood and the contacts between several tribes of peoples, which have shaped the character and customs of the

individual folk tribes throughout history. He tried to outline the characteristics of the nationalities in broad strokes.

The Germans lived in concentrated and dispersed areas of settlement throughout the empire. The importance of the German language goes far back: north of the Alps, German is the language of the army, the language of administration, the higher estates, and spiritual education in general, of the sciences and the arts, industry, commerce, and transport. Germans learn a foreign language easily, are adaptable to foreign idiosyncrasies, and are excellent cultural pioneers. They are diligent in education and science, rational and industrious in agriculture, active in industry and commerce, and generally prosperous. In closer contact with other tribes of people, they are flexible, skilful, and enterprising. Still, they may lose their national character, quickly adopting foreign customs and dress, even a foreign language, without losing other characteristics. They do not resist contact with different nationalities: they mix most easily with Hungarians and northern Slavs (Czechs, Poles), and many have become Slovaks. They have been in close contact with the Slavs since they settled in Carinthia and Styria; in southern Styria, Slovenians often have a German name, “a sign of their origin” (Czoernig, 1857b: 24). Contact between Germans and Croats and Serbs is minimal due to the Germans’ greater affinity for neighbouring Hungarians. There is a big gap between the Romance peoples: in Italy, Germanness has never taken root, they do not mix with the Vlachs either, and the Saxons in Transylvania insist on their tradition.

The Italian nation (*die italienische Nation*) was formed by tribes of people of different origins with few common characteristics, united only by the Italian language. The development was rapid, and they became the first cultured people in Europe, surpassing all others in science, poetry, and the fine arts. A clear and incisive mind and marvellous personal skills helped them to achieve their goals. However, Czoernig believed that the time was not far off when there would be a greater fusion of cultural peoples. As a cultural people, the Italians in the south had taken on a mission similar to that of the Germans in the north. Through colonisation, they had brought the populations on the eastern shores of the Adriatic into civilisation. They are closely related to the Slavic populations, especially in Istria, where there are Italianized Slavs and Slavized Italians (Czoernig, 1857b: 24–26).

The largest settlement area in the monarchy is occupied by the tribal family of the Slavs (*die Völkerfamilie der Slaven*), which is not endowed by nature with brilliant qualities. However, its members are spread over the entire cultural spectrum. Their agility, which does not tire with happiness and does not despair in adversity, has always made them a bulwark of the empire and a solid pillar of order. He wrote of the Slovenians, saying that they had lived longest in the present territory and remained long confined and in “earlier conditions” until there had been a vigorous life and a marked expansion of national education in recent times. Compared to other Slavic tribes, they have retained less resilience and have lost territories to the Germans in the north and

even more to the Croats in the east. Now, German culture has a “beneficial influence” on the Slovenians when Slovenian writers transmit its fruits in the national language (Czoernig, 1857b: 29).

In conclusion, Czoernig dwelt on another vital characteristic, the defensive capacity of the monarchy, which guarantees the integrity of the state and the people. He did not associate the defensive strength with some exclusive characteristic of nationality but with the merging of all the peoples, which in the army permeate into a great and distinct whole, displaying the virtues of the individual peoples, united for the glory and independence of the fatherland (Czoernig, 1857b: 32–33). He did not consider the shares of people in terms of competition (cf. Narr, Bausinger, 1964: 238) but in terms of synergy.

The summarised second part of *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs*, consisting of condensed and generalised characterisations of the tribes of people of the monarchy, is perhaps the most “ethnographic” contribution of Czoernig’s work. He goes beyond descriptive numerical and other measurable data on individual peoples; however, these images are essayistic, without references to authors and works otherwise found in *Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie*.

Czoernig’s ethnography of the monarchy is overtly politically engaged, produced at a time when it was intended to depict the strengthened Habsburg Empire after the watershed year of 1848. It is first and foremost symbolised by the ethnographic map, which resonated domestically and internationally (Labbé, 2011: 149). Publishing maps was not an Austrian peculiarity (Johler, 2020), as several maps were produced in the years before and after the March Revolution; only the Austrian and Russian ones have “ethnographic” in their title, others are “linguistic” or “national”, and they are unique in that they graphically depict multi-ethnic states, compared to the German maps in which the country is matched with the nation (and language). For this reason, Czoernig had to pay so much methodological attention to produce an illustrative colour map that can be seen as a painting, an aesthetic product of overlapping colour gradients¹⁶ in a harmonious whole that nevertheless concealed the turbulent political situation of the time (Labbé, 2011: 151; cf. Johler, 2020: 596). In other words, he created order out of chaos to show, above all, that plurinationality does not preclude political unity, provided that each people or nation maintains equality and contributes its share to the stability and strength of the state. The ethnographic map was a map of nations and an unambiguously political map that crossed “ethnographic” data with cartography as an auxiliary science of statistics.

Another critical issue that Czoernig had to deal with, especially in comparison with other maps where language was the criterion for mapping, was the correspondence between nationality and language. The language was for him only one criterion, but not an exclusive or critical one; he pointed out Armenians and Jews, who do not speak

¹⁶ In both texts presented here, Czoernig described in detail the implementation of the coloring of the map – the main peoples, the mixed areas and localities, and the ethnographic islands (e.g., 1857b: 8–10).

their language but understand themselves as a nation, or Czechs, who use German extensively: they would be indicated on a language map by German and Czech, but on an ethnographic map – when it comes to nationality – this is not possible.

However, Czoernig did not resolve this question unequivocally. Morgane Labbé, who researched the issue of nationality and censuses¹⁷ and has analysed his cartography in detail, has pointed out that, in methodological terms, the language-population/nationality relationship must take into account a characteristic feature of censuses in Austria: with the exceptions of 1846 and 1856, they did not ask for nationality or language until 1880 (Labbé, 2011: 154). Czoernig’s surveys and other field inquiries tried to compensate for this gap. Still, they asked for the dominant language (*Umgangssprache*) spoken by the majority of the inhabitants, and for a second language if it was spoken by at least a quarter of the speakers. This data came into his “statistical ethnography”, while the criterion for the map was nationality. Because of the discrepancies between languages and national affiliations, many audits were needed directly on the ground. For the data on these, Czoernig – in contrast to the statistics of the first half of the 19th century, for which only official inquiries were reliable (and these, as said, did not ask for language and nationality) – relied on that Enlightenment flag of statistics, which was more “literary” and also consider other sources (e.g., travel accounts). In this sense, it was methodologically inconsistent, and presented a transition between Enlightenment descriptive and narrative statistics along the lines of Schlözer and 19th-century administrative statistics (ibid.: 157, 160).¹⁸

Schlözer’s legacy is also reflected in Czoernig’s twofold project: ethnographic features in space (statistical ethnography), which corresponded to the representation on the map, i.e. the contemporary ethnic distribution of peoples, and ethnographic features in time (historical ethnography), i.e. the chronological sequence of events, for which he needed a book. This expresses Schlözer’s view that “[h]istoriography [is] continuous Statistics and Statistics is stationary historiography” (Vermeulen, 2015: 302).¹⁹

Czoernig’s “statistical ethnography” remains an ethnography between quotation marks; it is primarily a product of the spirit of state science and its interest in “ethnographic conditions”, reduced to basic facts about tribes, peoples, nations and attempts at more or less essayistic characterisations of them, in which elements of a psychosocial

¹⁷ Comprehensively in *La Nationalité, une Histoire de Chiffres: Politique et Statistiques en Europe Centrale (1848-1919)*, 2019.

¹⁸ It was characteristic of Austrian statistics that it was integrated into the study of law at the university level (Labbé, 2011: 160); however, Czoernig referred in the Introduction to *Regierungswissenschaft*: “In our time, in which public administrations have accepted the general conviction of the necessity of acquiring the most penetrating knowledge of the conditions affecting the forces of the state in order to take the welfare of the people, such an investigation also appears to be of greater importance from the point of view of the state” (Czoernig, 1857a: i).

¹⁹ Schlözer’s understanding and Czoernig’s practice testify to the multiple and vaguely defined status of statistics in the disciplinary fields of ethnos-sciences, history, geography, and state science (for more on this, see Möller, 1964; Narr, Bausinger, 1964).

nature were at the foreground, shedding light on the level of civilisation achieved and the character of peoples; both *Cultur-Völker* or *Kulturträger* (Germans, Italians) and other peoples, were at the centre of attention. In Czoernig's work, the primacy and mission he attributed to the German people cannot be overlooked.

Ficker's historical, geographical, and statistical presentation of the Dual Monarchy

Adolf Ficker (1816-1880), born in Olomouc in Moravia, earned doctorates in philosophy (1835) and law (1842) from the University of Vienna and is identified in biographical handbooks as a statistician (ÖBL, 1957: 309). He first worked as a teacher (e.g. at the Lyceum in Ljubljana between 1840–1843). From 1853, he was ministerial secretary and Czoernig's direct collaborator in the Directorate for Administrative Statistics, which he took over in 1864. From 1873, he was president of the Central Statistical Commission; in 1875, he founded the *Wiener Statistische Monatsschrift*. He represented Austria at the international statistical congresses in Berlin (1863), Den Haag (1869), St. Petersburg (1872) and Pest (1876). In 1870, he became a member of the Academy of Sciences in Vienna.

He opened his book *Die Völkerstämme der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie, ihre Gebiete, Gränzen und Inseln: Historisch, geographisch, statistisch dargestellt: Mit 4 Karten* (Ficker, 1869) with *Sine ira et studio, quorum causas procul habeo*, thus marking an unbiased scientific – historical, geographical, and statistical – presentation of the territories, borders, and islands of the tribes of people of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. It is clear from the note on the second title page that it is based on the stenographic transcripts of the “statistical-administrative” lectures.

The book has no introductory text or table of contents (it is a sequence of chapters marked with Roman numerals), but it has some keywords in the margins to guide the reader through the text. The first third of the book describes the settlement history of the monarchy's territory from the Ice Age to the present day. As in Czoernig's work, the introductory part is historical: it focuses on migratory flows, the occupation of territories, contacts between tribes (*Stämme*), their subgroups (*Völkerschaften*), their growth, the change of their settlement territories, and their disappearance. Ficker's commentary on the encounter between the stronger and the weaker, in which the “ethnographic element” plays a decisive role in addition to the superiority itself, is interesting, but he does not make it explicit:

A tribe that is deprived of its previous land ownership by another does not, therefore, disappear completely. Many, however, and mostly the higher-ranking ones, meet the iron fate of war; others leave their previous

homeland to found a new one among relatives or strangers; most, however, finally renounce the unsuccessful resistance, subordinate themselves to the new masters of the country, and gradually merge with them to form a nation, to which the spiritual and physical superiority of the invaders increasingly imprints their character. Even the neighbouring tribes who did not succumb to the new rule were seldom able to resist entirely the influence of a vigorous ethnographic element on their whole peculiarity, however hostile as they were to it. (Ficker, 1869: 2)

During migration and permanent settlement, the tribes advanced culturally so that by the first century BC, “they were no longer savages” (Ficker, 1869: 4).

During the medieval migrations, Ficker noted the westward penetration of the Slavs into areas settled by the Germans. He made special mention of the Pannonian and Noric Slavs, called Slovenians (*Slovenen*):

The mountainous branches soon adopted the name Korutans [*Korutaner*], from which the more recent name of Carinthians emerged. Their settlements stretched as far as the Upper Austrian lakes and the Pinzgau, as far as the Inn and the sources of the Drau, as far as Istria and Friuli [...] even today it is not only the names of localities – such as Gratz, Leoben, Zlap im Möllthale and very many along the river Isel and its tributaries – but also the addition of the word “Windisch” to place names in areas where Slavs are no longer to be found, e.g. Windisch-Matrei, Windisch-Bleiberg, Windisch-Garsten, Windischdorf near Haag, Windischhueb im Innkreise and others. (Ficker, 1869: 11)

At the time of Charlemagne, Slovenians “lived from the upper Sava and Kolpa rivers northward along the upper Drava, at a somewhat uncertain distance from the Germans, who were responsible for the supreme administration of all secular and spiritual affairs in the country” (Ficker, 1869: 14). From the end of the first millennium, the ethnographic formation of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy was influenced by the “rejuvenated Roman Empire of the German nation” (ibid.: 15). The bishops of Brixen and Freising, as well as powerful nobles, settled German farmers, craftsmen, and miners, mainly from the surrounding areas, on the Carniolian estates; they were “mostly lost among the Slovenians”. At the end of the 12th century, the “land of the Gootsheer” was settled in the wooded valleys; these were of Bavarian-Austrian origin, with a few Swabians and Franks. In the 14th century, Italian rule prevailed on the western border. The Counter-Reformation also had a substantial impact on the demography of the area, with migration from Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola: the Slovenians mainly remained Catholic, while nobles and townspeople of German nationality made up the bulk of the emigrants, who were

among the most educated and wealthy in the area. The Turkish invasions led to the settlement of Serbian refugees, known as *Uskokeni*, on the Croatian-Carniolian border.

After a historical overview of the various groups' settlement, distribution, and borders, Ficker found that the different population groups in the monarchy occupied their positions later than in other European countries. He attributed to the state the concern "to keep the foreign elements under the balancing influence of a higher material, intellectual and political culture". He was referring to the national ferment that shook the foundations of the empire in the 19th century. For this reason, following Czoernig, he stressed that it was inevitable to monitor the existence of the national edifice to "recognise and appreciate the demands of the present and the future" (Ficker, 1869: 29). And he went straight to the heart of the matter, i.e. nationality as a category linked to censuses.

Czoernig mentioned the 1851 census only once as one of the sources for the map,²⁰ but Ficker stopped at this administrative record with the question of determining nationality. Thus, at the International Statistical Congress in Vienna in 1857, he also put on the agenda "ethnographic-statistical moments" (Johler, 2020: 599) and the importance of ethnography in multinational states (Russia, Turkey, Austria):

But in those countries [...] which consist of only one nationality or only one dominant element, not only does the "ethnographic element fall into the background" and ultimately dissolve into a single nation, but also the "value of ethnography" turns out to be "very insignificant and disappears". (Johler, 2020: 599)

The question of determining nationality has not been conclusively answered, and the principle of the (mother tongue) language has finally been established in the international framework for population censuses. Like Czoernig, Ficker wondered: "Can an individual's nationality be determined by a tangible criterion, one which at the same time allows the census taker to assess the correctness or incorrectness of the information given by the enumerated individual?" (Ficker, 1869: 30). This was possible in French statistics because nationality and citizenship overlapped, but not in Austria.

Is this not a territory of a varied mix of peoples, a territory where the four major European peoples, Romans, Germans, Slavs, and Finns meet, not only in individual branches but in great masses, on which the state structure is based? (Ficker, 1869: 30)

²⁰ According to Morgane Labbé, Czoernig's ethnographic mapping survey 1846 can be considered a census; it included a question about the majority language and a second language if at least a quarter of the inhabitants spoke it. In preparing the official census of 1850–1851, Czoernig also sought to collect data on nationality; however, interviewers in the field asked about the language spoken in the family; this data then appeared in the statistical tables (Labbé, 2011: 155–156).

Regarding nationality, citizenship and regional or local belonging must be excluded as much as nationality, especially in the case of rapid mobility, when people often find themselves in a different national environment. They cannot, therefore, be counted among the majority in terms of nationality, which is particularly characteristic of large cities and industrial towns.

Ficker then wondered whether it would be possible to find a tangible criterion of nationality in “the totality or greater number of the outstanding characteristics of the external life of the people” (*herforragende Eigentümlichkeiten des äusseren Volkslebens*) (Ficker, 1869: 31). Based on this consideration, and given the ever-increasing turnover of peoples and countries, no nation could completely dissociate itself from others in the development of its forms of life; it made daily progress by adapting and adopting. Among the “external forms of life”, he could find no unmistakable sign of nationality hidden.

The forms of political existence and rights, the organisation of estates, the division into estates or social classes, the manner of family life, the expressions of legal consciousness, the folk customs and habits of the people regarding residence, dress, and food, the directions of material and intellectual activity, are subject not only to national influences but also to many other, often relatively local and temporary influences which are not national in character. (Ficker, 1869: 31)

Other characteristics, such as folk customs, diet, materials, and how houses are built, often vary from area to area, following old customs that are markedly local and preserved by different ethnic groups. This is even more evident in urban habits. The relevance of nationality was relativised by the greater importance of other characteristics, e.g. soil fertility, water availability, industrial equipment, and authorities’ promotion or restriction of education, all of which tended to have a stronger material and spiritual impact than nationality. Physical characteristics, with frequent intermingling of people, cannot be an adequate measure either.

He finally settled on “the language commonly spoken in the family” or “the mother tongue of the enumerator” (Ficker, 1869: 32) as a possible way out of the maze of commonplace situations that might reflect the subjective aspect of the interviewer or respondent.²¹ Ultimately, he concluded that language was a good approximation of a meaningful criterion but did not resolve the nationality question fully (*ibid.*: 32–33).

He then mentioned some facts: 1) Even such particular peoples as the Israelites or the Armenians adapt themselves linguistically to the environment in which they live. 2)

²¹ It has been observed that even high school students have avoided filling out the nationality section or that information about German, Slavic, or Hungarian students from the same grammar school has varied over the years depending on the nationality of the census official.

If one language has a more significant political weight (predominance) in a nationally mixed country, if it is the language of the schools, of the judiciary, it is “quite natural” for members of other nations to bring it into their homes and to recognise it in the census. There are many cases where it is spoken interchangeably with the mother tongue (Polish, Hungarian, Ruthenian) or even preferred (in Bohemia, Moravia, southern Styria, and Carniola) without renouncing their Slavic nationality (Ficker, 1869: 33). For individuals and families along linguistic borders and in linguistically mixed areas, Ficker introduced the category of *sujets mixtes*, *utraquists* (*Utraquisten*), who did not adopt a third category of nationality created from a mixture of the two. He provided an example: the children exchange between German and Slavic families, when “the second language also becomes their mother tongue, and not merely a learned one alongside their mother tongue” (ibid.: 34).

Ficker concluded that language was not the required criterion either. Nevertheless – and on this point he echoed Czoernig – he used the terms “linguistic area” (*Sprach-Gebiet*), “linguistic border” (*Sprach-Gränze*), “linguistic island” (*Sprach-Insel*) in the same sense as “ethnographic area”, “ethnographic border”, “ethnographic island”; in this case they are a shorthand based on the most characteristic feature of the whole (Ficker, 1869: 34).

Ficker closed his discussion of nationality in censuses by stating that nationality is not a factor from which an individual statement or nationality can be derived or sought in the individual; it cannot be determined by the mechanical means of a census. Nevertheless, it has to be “the object of scientific investigation”²² to show – using a kind of average (as in the case of fertility and mortality) – “the true diversity of nations” (*die wirkliche Verschiedenheit der Nationen*) (Ficker, 1869: 34).

In the next section, Section VI (ibid.: 37ff.), Ficker, following Czoernig, summarised the map of linguistic borders, mixed areas, and islands. The introductory and most extensive section deals with the Germans:

Not only because of the historical importance of the creation and development of the Empire but also for statistical reasons, the Germans must be placed first in the analysis of its ethnographic elements. Although the Germanic population is not the most outstanding in terms of numbers, it is the only one that is spread throughout all the countries of the monarchy; at the same time, it has the most points of contact with the others of all the tribes, so that a systematic survey of the national situation of the Empire can only begin by looking at the German areas. (Ficker, 1869: 37)

²² He included ethnographic maps in this research and favorably summarized Czoernig’s work: the ethnographic map and its supplementation with historical-statistical work. The result was an encyclopedic work (Ficker, 1869: 35).

Without repeating the journey through the map of borders and mixed territories, let us mention the highlights of the Germanic-Italian-Slovenian borders: in the west, for example, the Germanic-Friulian border, the *triplex confinium* between Friulians, Germans, and Slovenians, the Germanic-Slovenian border in Carinthia, where Germans and Slovenians often live together. For them, he wrote:

Since Germans and Slovenians live together almost continuously in a friendly relationship along the entire language divide, the rising waves of political excitement for two decades have hardly brought about any other change than that in individual outposts of the German sound, which had been heard more frequently there, gradually faded away and made way for the sole dominance of the old native Slovenian. (Ficker, 1869: 39)

There is also a distinctly mixed German-Slovenian area in Lower Styria, except in some Slovenian towns (Ljubljana, Kamnik, Krško, Novo Mesto), where Germans are in decline, Germans and Slovenians meet in Gorizia and Trieste where the Germans are more resistant to the agitation of the “Italianissimi” (Ficker, 1869: 48).

Among the three South Slavic tribes, the Slovenians are characterised by living in the most compact territory (Carniola, part of Carinthia, Gorizia, Istria, Trieste, southern Styria, parts of the Iron and Zala counties). They border on Friulians, Italians – he mentioned for Gorizia that Slovenian and Friulian, Italian and German are spoken in the city (Ficker, 1869: 69). The distinctly mixed – Slovenian-Italian-Croatian-Serbian – area is Istria, the Slovenian-Croatian area is the White Carniola, and the linguistic interference is also strong on the eastern Slovenian-Croatian border. The density of the Slovenian population is highest in Carniola and around Maribor, with two-thirds of the population in Gorizia, half in Trieste, and about one-third in Carinthia. They are often called *Winden*, especially in Lower Styria, and the Latinized term *Vandalen* is used for Hungarian Slovenians (ibid.: 69–71).

Regarding the Italians, he noted that Trieste was predominantly Italian as a centre of shipping and trade and that its language was also understood and spoken mainly by Germans and Slovenians. In Istria, the Italianized towns were on the west coast between Muggia and Pula, where Venetian is spoken in Muggia, Koper, Isola, and Piran, and a slightly different dialect is spoken south of there. Italian and Friulian merchants settled inland.

In the last section (ibid.: 90–97), Ficker published tabulated statistics by crown lands and population (German, North Slavs, South Slavs, West Romans, East Romans, Hungarians, and other tribes), the number of individual peoples in the tribes, the relative percentages of the peoples with the total population of the monarchy, under the Hungarian crown, and in the war zone, by individual crown lands and their districts.



On the last two pages, Ficker summarised some of his findings. The first is about merging the weak with the strong as a natural process, mainly due to mobility. The various smaller tribes are

unmistakably already in the process of merging with stronger and more vital ones. As little as streams can resist turning into rivers and rivers into streams, just as little can any ethnographic fraction in our times of daily growing traffic, especially in the heart of Europe, separate itself so completely from all others, especially from the influence of higher developments, that it would be able to resist natural absorption in the long run. (Ficker, 1869: 97)

Following Czoernig, he reiterated that the primary culture bearers were the Romance tribe in the south and the Germanic tribe in the north, which

have had the most beneficial effect on the development of public life and all economic and intellectual activity. It is of great importance that this intellectual supremacy, for by far the largest part of the Empire belongs to a tribe that is inferior in number to other nationalities and has the least resistance to contact with foreign nationalities, is the easiest to merge with them, and is therefore also the furthest removed from striving to denationalise them. Only then will the connection of the other fellow countrymen to German education find its natural solution when the culture of those peoples has developed sufficiently to become an independent lever for their further development. (Ficker, 1869: 97–98)

Ficker did not see the unification of the four major European tribes into one empire in the heart of the continent as a mere coincidence:

the millennia of history have created countless points of contact between its tribes, intertwining all the ties of their lives in different ways. It would also seem that such a country, and in this geographical situation, has had to be created over and over again so that these tribes, even politically divided, do not have to fight each other in battles of annihilation. (Ficker, 1869: 98)

A look at the map of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, especially considering the youth of the country, which only a century and a half ago freed itself from the violence of the Ottomans hostile to all Christian-European civilisation,

shows that the state of the Holy Crown of St. Stephen can only be based on the union of Magyars, Germans, Slavs, and Romans. Such a territory, in which the equality of peoples seems to be a natural gift, can find security for its further development only in close annexation to a state in which none of the four main tribes predominates, but all four live side by side on an equal footing. (Ficker, 1869: 98)

Ficker’s text is not comparable in scope to Czoernig’s, but it follows it in a condensed, handy form in many respects. At first glance, it is distinguished by its title: Czoernig’s was an “ethnography of the monarchy”, and Ficker’s was a geography, history, and statistics of the tribes of people. He did not mention ethnography at all, using only the adjective *ethnographisch* to denote the problem of the population and the relations between the groups.²³ In the title, he referred to them as *Völkerstämme* in the case of the four main groups and to their subgroups without any clear distinction between *Volk* and *Nation*. The most common use of the term *Nationalität* refers to nationality or national identification in ethnographic statistics or censuses of peoples. However, as mentioned above, this question has not been conclusively answered.

Partial conclusion: Diversity and coherence

There is no “society” or “culture” prior to its ideological unity (or the effect of such unity), which is provided by the state, and at the same time, the elements of sociability (e.g. language) are necessary to achieve such unity.

(Lešnik, 1997: 316)

As the conceptual interest in the history of the ethnos-sciences shows, the origin of ethnographic interest in the 18th century was not national; it emerged in imperial contexts (mainly the Russian and German empires). In response to the needs of these empires, a comprehensive collection of knowledge about the ethnic groups that inhabited their territories was assembled.

Whether scholars of the time were concerned with *historia naturalis* or *historia gentium*, their research was conducted following the tenets of Enlightenment science (empirically exhaustive, systematic), guided by Leibniz’s precept that knowledge should serve social needs and facilitate progress. Knowledge for the interests of the state was provided, for example, in the fields of historiography and geography, in which the ethnos-sciences, i.e., the sciences of populations and their differences, were established as specialisations. They mapped human groups according to ethnicity,

²³ Specifically, 32 occurrences, e.g. *ethnographische Gestaltung, Umgestaltung, Verhältnisse, Zustand, Mischung, Gränze, Insel, Gruppe, Einheit, Karte, Element*.

languages, customs and habits, and social organisation and also drew on older patterns of “ethnographic performances”.²⁴

The Habsburg Empire in the 19th century was a patched fabric of crown lands and ethnically diverse populations. Especially after the Spring of Nations, the Viennese court addressed this complex situation by asserting that a multi-ethnic composition under a single authority was a “natural fact” that would endure with an appropriate and effective state system. From this perspective, the 19th-century works on the entire monarchy exhibited a common thread: uniting differences, or “diversity in unity”. How these differences were characterised is significant for a historically and anthropologically informed discussion of identities and identifications.

In representations of the monarchy, the environment or geographical space was initially regarded as the primary identity marker, viewed as a “natural fact”:

No European state possesses such extraordinary and manifold sources of essential, lasting, independent wealth as the Austrian; blessed provinces of this empire are not characterised by temporary splendour, by rapidly growing and equally rapidly sinking prosperity, but by a wealth based on the physical structure, the fertility of the soil, its culture and the products it produces; the provinces of this empire are so variable and varied in climate, soil and products that no storm of war can cause lasting devastation, and so excellent in the quality of their products that their usefulness is universally acknowledged. (Blumenbach, 1937 I: 17)

Later, Friedrich Umlauf linked the excellence of location to the element of political mediation:

The Austro-Hungarian Empire, which encompasses a large area richly blessed by nature, occupies a unique position among all the states of Europe due to its physical characteristics and national composition. Countries with the most diverse landforms, land cultures, and populations united for centuries to form a great Central European power, which seems to have been assigned the mediation between Occident and Orient, North and South of Europe. (Umlauf, 1897: 1)

This reproduces Enlightenment geographers’ characteristic notion of the primacy of the natural environment: geographical space is also the political space that allows a

²⁴ Michael Harbsmeier (quoting Fredrik Barth) has used the term ‘ethnographic performances’ to refer to “acts of telling stories about how ‘real’ life is different elsewhere in the world (or the other world)”, i.e. a tradition of knowledge that goes far back into human history (Harbsmeier, 1995: 20; cf. Hodgen, 1964; De Waal Maljefit, 1974).

state to exist and survive. Although geographical determinism in favour of historical and other features (e.g. the multi-ethnic composition of the population, modern migration to cities and industrial sites, trade, transport, interactions, different religions) has receded into the background – Czoernig, Ficker, and Umlauf wrote about lands and peoples and their interactions, which are slightly different everywhere depending on the circumstances – the description of the empire’s territory persisted until the last hymn to the monarchy, exemplified by Archduke Rudolf’s Introduction to the collection *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*. He invited his “readership to journey through a vast land, among multilingual peoples, amidst ever-changing images”, and wandered from Vienna southwards and in all other directions to the Bay of Kotor (Erzherzog Rudolf, 1887).

In attempting to answer the question of the characterisations of the inhabitants of a vast area, it can first be stated that these are collective labels applicable to the groups and their lands: At the first level, the inhabitants (*Bevölkerung*) are distinguished by ethnicity; these are the large communities of Germans, Romans, Slavs, Hungarians, and a few other peoples (*Nebenvölker*), e.g. Armenians, Israelites, Gypsies. For large groups, throughout the century, all writers from Blumenbach to Archduke Rudolf most often used the term *Volkstamm* or *Völkerstämme*, i.e. *Hauptstämme*, the main tribes, or *Hauptvölker*, the main peoples, *Hauptvölkerstämme*, the main folk tribes, *Hauptvölkergruppen*, the main groups of peoples, exceptionally *Völkerfamilie* (Ficker), *Hauptnationen* (Blumenbach), or *Nationalitäten* (Umlauf) and *Volksrassen* (Prochaska). *Volk* or *Völker*, people, denoted their sub-groups. The designations of ethnic, regional, and local populations in texts written in German are frequently inconsistent and, at times, indicative of a lack of familiarity with the local terms. However, even otherwise, the names of the population at the beginning of the 19th century were “still largely undeveloped, used differently in different languages, and the notions of the belonging of particular provincial groups to a nation were also unclear” (Novak, 1986: 91).

In the middle of the century, Czoernig and Ficker’s labels appeared with the root “nation”, rarely written in the form *Nation*. The term *Nationalität*, primarily synonymous with *Volk*, prevailed. We posit a potential distinction between the state (civil) *Nation* (nation overlaps with the state) and *Nationalität*,²⁵ which was presented as a controversial (and disturbing) category of statistics and statistical ethnography in the multinational state.

Umlauf was also aware that Austria was exposed to the dangers posed by “not insignificant elements of the population who are too sanguine in their hopes or too bold in their aspirations” (Umlauf, 1897: 3), yet he chose to refrain from elaborating on them, although his work was published at a time when these issues were widely discussed. In the introductory chapter on political and territorial history, he briefly

²⁵ The Slovenian language marks this distinction with two words: *nacija* and *narod(nost)* which are generally translated into English in the same way; the appropriate solution would be ‘nation-state’ and ‘nation’.



mentioned the Spring of Nations that stimulated the aspirations of Italians, Hungarians, and Slavs for national independence (ibid.: 13).

Czoernig and Ficker, however, made a special effort to find the determinant of *Nationalität*, given the statistical orientation. The statistical tasks reduced “ethnography” to precisely describable ethnographic facts (territorial borders of ethnic groups, ethnically mixed areas, and islands) and quantifiable ones (numbers, proportions by country, etc.). The ethnographic conditions (*ethnographische Verhältnisse*) were a truncation of the breadth set out in the ethnoscience, and ultimately also in Blumenbach’s geography and the “homeland ethnography” in *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild*.

Ethnographic conditions, the main subject of ethnography, were conceived in the second half of the century in at least two directions: statistical and homeland-oriented. As a tool of the statistics of the time – at the intersection of law, state policy, and geography – ethnography was a kind of political description of the population and simultaneously engaged in preserving and strengthening the multiethnic state. In this context, Ficker’s point that ethnographic elements in nation-states are background elements, and thus the value of ethnography is irrelevant and disappears, is interesting. Ethnography has its *raison d’être* as long as there are “ethnographic conditions”, i.e. ethnic differences in space and time.

In the introduction to a book collection on people of the Dual Monarchy, Karl Prochaska offered a different perspective on ethnography by highlighting the abundance of geographical, zoological, botanical, and mineralogical works on Austria-Hungary, and by pointing to the significant gap in research within the field of ethnography and cultural history as “almost completely neglected” (Prochaska, 1881: [2]).

Similarly, Archduke Rudolf held a comparable perspective on the subject of ethnography. He advocated for ethnographic work at “the level of modern scientific research”, which he believed would stimulate and educate readers, strengthen the sense of solidarity, and unite “all the peoples of our fatherland” (Erzherzog Rudolf, 1887: 5).

Umlauft offered a broader reflection on the scope of ethnography in the concluding remarks in the chapter *Man (Der Mensch)*:

The relation between man and the physical conditions of the earth’s surface, his relation to the nature surrounding him, as it is expressed in his physical prosperity and well-being, in his food, his clothing and dwelling, in his weapons and implements, in his means of transportation; his relation to his fellow men, as it appears in marriage, in the family, in the tribe, in the form of government, and is conveyed by language; his relation to supernatural power, as it appears in the various religions: these are the subjects of ethnography. (Umlauft, 1897: 612)

However, he included discussions of “ethnographic” topics in the section Statistics (Umlauft, 1897: 656–842), the science of the vital aspects of the state (Umlauft, 1897: 656). What is significant by Umlauft is less how to conceptualise the relationship between statistics and ethnography – both of which have different problematic emphases and themes – but the claim that “The life of mankind [...] nowhere and never presents itself as a disordered sum of phenomena” (ibid.: 656); instead, it is a coherent organism fully expressed in the state. Here, we can discern traces of theories of the development of human societies conceived during the Enlightenment, positing a natural progression of civilisation completed in state-organized societies. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the state to develop the tools of social homeostasis within the framework of the crown lands, considering the differences between populations.

It is common for descriptions to refrain from addressing conflicts, except national ones, acknowledged in statistical ethnography. In Czoernig, who was unsuccessful in his attempt to identify an unambiguous qualifier of nationality for the purposes of statistics, the national, which was closely aligned with the notion of ethnicity, was finally recognised as the foundation of cultural, spiritual, and material advancement and the driving force behind spiritual development on the journey to cultural enlightenment. In this vein, he undertook the characterisation of the peoples of the monarchy, which had been shaped by historical processes and were predominantly of a psycho-social nature (Czoernig, 1857b: 22–32). The characterisations were developed following the significant question of the contribution of individual people to cultural progress and the unique ways in which each contributes to the well-being of the monarchy. The synergy of these features is one of the pillars of the strength of the state, which, for example, Umlauft almost copied from Czoernig:

But it is not only the mixture of peoples [*Völkermischung*] that establishes this uniqueness; it is mainly due to the excellent conditions in which the main tribes of peoples [*Hauptvölkerstämme*] appear so that they keep the balance between each other through the number and inner strength of the individual peoples [*Völker*], as well as through the gradations of civilisation, and in their union, not their subordination, form the foundations on which the state building rests. This characteristic composition of the population of Austria-Hungary has not only had a decisive influence on the course and development of the history of the state but also forms the foundations of its present existence and comes to the fore among the natural state forces of the monarchy. (Umlauft, 1897: 13)

In the latter half of the century, the monarchy is depicted to emphasise the equality and equivalence of all population groups (all peoples are described according to the same

conceptual scheme).²⁶ A coexistence under one state authority is portrayed despite the “most colourful mixture” of populations, the multitude of conditions, and the various levels of civilisation achieved. Czoernig asserted that the monarchy was so glorious that it would have to be invented if it did not exist (Stagl, 2008: 29).

In addition to the geographical, “natural” ethnic and linguistic differences, the most pronounced were the civilisational ones, which were sometimes expressed in ethnic or common-sense biases: contrasts between the north and west and the south and east, between rural and urban populations, and between those with higher and lower levels of education. They also encompassed differences in work and food habits, care for cleanliness, etc. The level of civilisation and culture attained also supported the mission attributed by Czoernig, Ficker, and Umlauf to the two major groups – Germanic and West Romanic – and especially to the leading Germanic people, whereby the civilisational/cultural and ethnic/national criteria overlapped (Bendix, 2003).

After an eventful history of migrations, colonisation of territories, and encounters between peoples of unequal strength and different living conditions, Czoernig and Ficker foresaw a civilisational convergence, i.e. an increasing blurring of differences, precisely under the influence of the leading German element (e.g. through the universalisation of the German language among all citizens, which did not exclude the preservation of other national particularities). This process was supposed to contribute to the even greater internal cohesion and indivisibility of the monarchy, as enshrined in the motto of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy: *Indivisible and inseparable*.

The idealised images of the monarchy are records of a desired balance. They are evident in the more “scientific” statistical ethnography and the more popular, poetic, and essayistic forms of homeland descriptions. The ideal of the fusion of all the best characteristics of peoples and their unity was the basis for official government discourse and instrumentalised academic contributions.

Consequently, this discourse prompts research on its scope and impact on the subjects of these works, on possible comparative parallels in homeland-oriented and local accounts, and on real-life data from other sources. At another level, it requires reflection on the relationship between monarchical ideology and the ideologies of individual peoples.²⁷

The genre of presented writings had the function of attributing characteristics to collectives from the outside, from afar, and from above. There was no room in their horizon for individuals’ (self-)identifying characteristics; individuals were interesting as

²⁶ Justin Stagl (2008: 28) commented on the “equivalence” approach as follows: “By placing them next to each other, the smaller, less important ones were upgraded compared to the larger, more important ones. This is because a universal power necessarily protects the smaller ones, which are not so dangerous to it, against the larger ones. Thus, the seemingly impartial humanistic principle of description harbored a political point.”

²⁷ At the level of collectivities, they are exemplified by the reception of the *Kronprinzenwerk* in the various nations of the monarchy (Fikfak, Johler, 2008a).

collective producers of goods and loyal citizens. Identifications, created and recreated according to the principle of difference in the spaces of everyday encounters and contacts, were mapped historically by borders, mixed zones, and linguistic or ethnographic islands. A few factual hints, e.g. on contemporary migration, increasing communication, education, and “cultural” adaptations, draw the researcher’s attention in the future to nodes or crossroads of “in-betweens” that transcend the linguistic *sujets mixtes*.

Acknowledgements

The article is a result of the Austrian-Slovenian bilateral project Discourses and Practices of the In-Between in the Alpine-Adriatic Region: Klagenfurt, Ljubljana and Trieste 1815–1914 (N6-0294), funded by the Österreichische Wissenschaftsfond (FWF) and the Slovenian Research Agency (ARIS) (2023–2026), and the research program Ethnological, Anthropological and Folklore Studies Research on Everyday Life (P6-0088, 2022–2027), financed by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency.

References

- Bausinger, Hermann. 1971. *Volkskunde: Von der Altertumsforschung zur Kulturanalyse*. Berlin: Carl Hebel.
- Belaj, Vitomir. 1989. Plaidoyer za etnologiju kao historijsku znanost o etničkim skupinama [An Argument for Ethnology as a Historical Science Concerning Ethnic Groups]. *Studia ethnologica* 1: 9–17.
- Bendix, Regina. 2003. Ethnology, Cultural Reification, and the Dynamics of Difference in the Kronprinzenwerk. In *Creating the Other: Ethnic Conflict and Nationalism in the Habsburg Central Europe*, ed. Nancy M. Wingfield, 149–165. London: Berghahn.
- Blumenbach, Wenzel Karl Wolfgang. 1837 [1832–1833]. *Neuestes Gemälde der Oesterreichischen Monarchie, oder Beschreibung der Lage, des Klimas, der Naturprodukte, Landeskultur, merkwürdigsten Städte, Gegenden, Kunstwerke, Ruinen und Denkmäler; dann der Einwohner, deren Lebensart, Kleidung, Handel, Künste, Wissenschaften, Religion und Staatsverfassung*. 3 Vols. Wien: R. Sammer.
- Czoernig, Karl F. v. 1857a. *Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie von Karl Freiherrn v. Czoernig: Mit einer ethnographischen Karte in vier Blättern*. 3 Vols. Wien: Kaiserlich-Koeniglichen Hof- und Staatsdruckerei.
- Czoernig, Karl F. v. 1857b. *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs*. In: *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft, Sitzung vom 2. Dezember*. Wien: Aus der k. k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei in Commission bei Karl Gerold’s Sohn, Buchhändler der Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften, [3]–33 (277–307).
- Czoernig, Karl F. v. 1879. *Biographische Notizen*. Wien: [Selbstverlag].
- De Waal Maljefit, Annemarie. 1974. *Images of Man: A History of Anthropological Thought*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.



- Erzherzog Rudolf. 1887. Einleitung. In *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild: Bd. 2. Übersichtsband, 1. Abteilung. Naturgeschichtliches Theil*, 5–17. Wien.
- Ficker, Adolf. 1869. *Die Völkerstämme der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie, ihre Gebiete, Grenzen und Inseln: Historisch, geographisch, statistisch dargestellt. Mit 4 Karten*. Wien: Überreuter'sche Buchdruckerei.
- Fikfak, Jurij. 1999. »Ljudstvo mora spoznati sebe«: *Podobe narodopisja v drugi polovici 19. stoletja*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, Forma 7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/9616182714>.
- Fikfak, Jurij and Reinhard Johler, eds. 2008a. *Ethnographie in Serie: Zu Produktion und Rezeption der „österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild“*. Wien: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie.
- Fikfak, Jurij and Reinhard Johler. 2008b. Einbegleitung. In *Ethnographie in Serie: Zu Produktion und Rezeption der „österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild“*, eds. Jurij Fikfak and Reinhard Johler, 7–28. Wien: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie.
- Fikfak, Jurij and Klaus Schönberger. 2024. Ethnographic Descriptions of “Land und Leute” in the Alps-Adriatic Region in the 19th Century. *Traditiones* 53 (3): 7–19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2024530301>.
- Fischer, Hans. 1970. „Völkerkunde“, „Ethnographie“, „Ethnologie“: Kritische Kontrolle der frühesten Belege. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 95 (2): 169–182.
- Harbsmeier, Michael. 1995. Towards a Prehistory of Ethnography: Early Modern German Travel Writing as Traditions of Knowledge. In *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, eds. Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán, 19–38. London, New York: Routledge.
- Harris, Marvin. 1971 [1968]. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory: A History of Theories of Culture*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Hartmann, Andreas. 1988. Die Anfänge der Volkskunde. In *Grundriß der Volkskunde*, ed. Rolf Wilhelm Brednich, 9–30. Berlin: D. Reimer.
- Hodgen, Margaret T. 1964. *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Holfelder, Ute, Janine Schemmer, Christian Frühwirth, and Gabriele Brunner. 2024. The Alps-Adriatic Region – an “Area of Transition”: Doing In-Between in Travel Literature of the 19th Century. *Traditiones* 53 (3): 45–71. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2024530303>.
- Johler, Reinhard. 2020. Die Karten der Ethnographen: Volkskunden, ethnographische Karten, volkskundliche Atlanten 1850–1980. In *Beschreiben und Vermessen: Raumwissenschaft in der östlichen Habsburgermonarchie im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*, eds. Reinhard Johler and Josef Wolf, 583–625. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Kaschuba, Wolfgang. 2012 [1999]. *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Katschnig, Gerhard. 2024. Indications of the In-Between in Works of W. Wabruschek-Blumenbach and F. Umlauf: A Case Study of Two Habsburg Ethnographers. *Traditiones* 53 (3): 73–98. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2024530304>.
- Könnekamp, Wolf-Dieter. 1988a. Natur und Nationalcharakter: Die Entwicklung der Ethnographie und die frühe Volkskunde. *Ethnologia Europaea* 18 (1): 25–52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.16995/ee.1353>.
- Könnekamp, Wolf-Dieter. 1988b. Volkskunde und Statistik: Eine wissenschaftliche Korrektur. *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 84 (1): 1–25.

- Kralj, Franc. 1976. Czoernig baron Czernhausen, Carl st. In *Primorski biografski leksikon: 3 snopič Bor – Čopič, 1 knjiga*. Gorica: Goriška Mohorjeva družba.
- Labbé, Morgane. 2011. Die „Ethnographische Karte der Oesterreichischen Monarchie“: Ein Abbild der Monarchie. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts* 25: 149–163.
- Lutz, Gerhard, ed. 1958. *Volkskunde: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte ihrer Probleme*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Lutz, Gerhard. 1973. Johann Ernst Fabri und die Anfänge der Volksforschung im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert. *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 69 (1): 19–42.
- Lutz, Gerhard. 1980. Geographie und Statistik im 18. Jahrhundert: Zu Neugliederung und Inhalten von „Fachern“ im Bereich der historischen Wissenschaften. In *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung in der Neuzeit vornehmlich im 16.-18. Jahrhundert*, eds. Mohamed Rassem and Justin Stagl, 249–263. Paderborn: F. Schöningh.
- Lutz, Gerhard. 1983. Die Entstehung der Ethnologie und das spätere Nebeneinander der Fächer Volkskunde und Völkerkunde in Deutschland. In *Europäische Ethnologie: Theorie- und Methodendiskussion aus ethnologischer und volkskundlicher Sicht*, eds. Heide Nixdorff and Thomas Hauschild, 29–46. Berlin: D. Reimer.
- Möller, Helmut. 1964. Aus der Anfängen der Volkskunde als Wissenschaft: A. Volkskunde, Statistik, Völkerkunde 1787. *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 60 (2): 218–232.
- Narr, Dieter and Hermann Bausinger. 1964. Aus der Anfängen der Volkskunde als Wissenschaft: B. „Volkskunde“ 1788. *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 60 (2): 232–241.
- Novak, Vilko. 1986. *Raziskovalci slovenskega življenja*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Prochaska, Karl. 1881. Prospect. In *Die Völker Österreichs-Ungarns: Ethnographische und Culturhistorische Schilderungen: Bd. 1*, ed. Karl Prochaska, [1–4]. Wien, Teschen: Verlag von Karl Prochaska.
- Prochaska, Karl, ed. 1881–1885. *Die Völker Österreichs-Ungarns: Ethnographische und Culturhistorische Schilderungen*. 12 Vols. Teschen: Verlag von Karl Prochaska.
- ÖBL. *Oesterreichisches Biographisches Lexicon*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- ÖUMWB. *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild* (1884–1902). 24 vols.
- Rassem, Mohamed in Justin Stagl, eds. 1980. *Statistik und Staatsbeschreibung in der Neuzeit, vornehmlich im 16.–18. Jahrhundert. Bericht über ein interdisziplinäres Symposium in Wolfenbüttel, 15.–17. September 1978*. Paderborn: F. Schöningh.
- Schemmer, Janine and Klaus Schönberger. 2024. Doing In-Between in the 19th Century in the Alps-Adriatic Region: Everyday Forms of Subjectivation Beyond Nationalising und Ethnicising Subjection. *Traditiones* 53 (3): 21–44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2024530302>.
- Schneider, Ingo. 2011. Erste Ansätze: Zur Frühgeschichte der österreichischen Volkskunde vom 15. bis zur Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts. In *Volkskunde in Österreich: Bausteine zu Geschichte, Methoden und Themenfeldern einer Ethnologia Austriaca*, eds. Olaf Bockhorn, Helmut Eberhart, and Dorothea Jo. Peter, 11–38. Innsbruck: Österreichischer Fachverband für Volkskunde c/o Fachbereich Europäische Ethnologie/Volkskunde Institut für Geschichtswissenschaften und Europäische Ethnologie.
- Stagl, Justin. 1974. August Ludwig Schlözers Entwurf einer „Völkerkunde“ oder „Ethnographie“ seit 1772. *Ethnologische Zeitschrift* 2: 73–91.
- Stagl, Justin. 1995. *A History of Curiosity*. London, New York: Routledge.



- Stagl, Justin. 1998. Rationalism and Irrationalism in Early German Ethnology: The Controversy between Schlözer and Herder, 1772–1773. *Anthropos* 93 (4–6): 521–536.
- Stagl, Justin. 2006. Universalismus und Partikularismus: Zu den sozialontologischen Grundlagen der österreichischen Ethnowissenschaften. In *Geschichte der österreichischen Humanwissenschaften 6. 2: Philosophie und Religion: Gott, Sein und Sollen*, ed. Karl Adam, 251–283. Wien: Passagen-Verlag.
- Stagl, Justin. 2008. Das „Kronprinzenwerk“ – Zür Einführung. In *Ethnographie in Serie: Zu Produktion und Rezeption der „österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie in Wort und Bild“*, eds. Jurij Fikfak and Reinhard Johler, 28–42. Wien: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie.
- Šafařík, Pawel Josef. 1842. *Slowanský národopis*. V Praze: Nákladem vydawatele.
- Umlauft, Friedrich, ed. 1881–1889. *Die Länder Oesterreich Ungarns in Wort und Bild*. 15 Vols. Wien: Carl Graeser.
- Umlauft, Friedrich. 1897 [1876]. *Die Österreichisch Ungarische Monarchie: Geographisch statistisches Handbuch für aller Stände*. 3rd ed. Wien, Peßt, Leipzig: Hartleben's Verlah.
- Urbancová, Viera. 1980–1981. The Beginnings of Ethnography in Slovakia. *Ethnologia Slavica* 12–13: 93–110.
- Vermeulen, Han. 1995. Origins and Institutionalization of Ethnography and Ethnology in Europe and the USA, 1771–1845. In *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, eds. Han F. Vermeulen and Arturo Alvarez Roldán, 39–59. London, New York: Routledge.
- Vermeulen, Han F. 2015. *Before Boas: The Genesis of Ethnography and Ethnology in the German Enlightenment*. Lincoln, London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Vermeulen, Han F. and Arturo Alvarez Roldán, eds. 1995. *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg. 1969. *Deutsche Volkskunde zwischen Germanistik und Sozialwissenschaften*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Weber-Kellermann, Ingeborg and Andreas Bimmer. 1985. *Einführung in die Volkskunde / Europäische Ethnologie: Eine Wissenschaftsgeschichte*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Podobe ljudstev: »etnografiji« habsburškega imperija v 19. stoletju

V prispevku so obravnavana besedila o ljudstvih in narodih multietničnega habsburškega imperija v 19. stoletju z vidika interesa za mnogotere in večplastne identifikacije skupin in posameznikov na alpsko-jadranskem območju med Celovcem, Trstom in Ljubljano. Posebne pozornosti so deležne identitetne karakterizacije, ki bi dopolnile, morebiti tudi relativizirale in/ali presegle pripisane etnične in narodne identitete, značilne za obravnave procesa graditve narodov, posebej od »pomladi narodov«.

Obravnavana besedila so med narekovajema označena kot etnografska v pomenu znanosti o etnosu, koncipiranih v drugi polovici 18. stoletja v historiografiji, geografiji, statistiki in državoznanstvu; v njih so bili definirani tudi etnografski interesi. Nastajali so znanstveni opisi ljudstev v obsežnih imperijih (npr. nemškem, ruskem, turškem), kjer so bila dejstva o etnični sestavi, kulturni ravni prebivalstva idr. značilnostih potrebna in uporabna za uspešno upravljanje državnih tvorb.

V avstrijski monarhiji 19. stoletja, ki je učinkovala kot krpana preproga dežel, ljudstev, jezikov, veroizpovedi idr. značilnosti, je ostala razsvetljenska tradicija opisovanja ljudstev eden pomembnih tokov v avstrijskem narodopisju, ki se je vsebinsko bogatilo še drugimi žanri pisanja (potopisje, domoznanstvo, topografije). Format obsežnih del, ki so jih izdajali v posamičnih knjigah ali v več zvezkih in tudi v monumentalnih knjižnih zbirkah (Prochaska, 1881–1885; Umlauf, 1881–1889; ÖMWB, 1884–1902), je ustrezal potrebi po nadvse podrobnih opisih dežele in ljudi. Vanje je bila vtisnjena imperialna ideologija upravljanja »različnosti v enotnosti«, razumljiva ob dejstvu, da je cesarski dvor vse so razpada avstro-ogrške monarhije kljub številnim notranjim napetostim vztrajal, da etnične ali narodne razlike ne ogrožajo politične enotnosti.

Pri delih o monarhiji kot celoti je osnovno vprašanje, ali je mogoče poleg pripisanih kolektivnih oznakah zaznati problematiko vmesnih ali več hkratnih, hibridnih identifikacij, razvidnih v »vsakdanji etničnosti«, in če, na katerih ravneh. S kakšnim disciplinarnim orodjem (terminologijo, organizacijo snovi, naracijo) so pisci označevali, identificirali razločke med etničnimi, narodnimi skupinami, jih morebiti primerjali? Je mogoče v teh predstavitvah razbrati pristranosti avtorjev? Ali in kako so dokumentirani nacionalizacijski procesi, ki so v 19. stoletju soustvarjali kolektivne identifikacije in so pri narodih monarhije potekali v različnih okoliščinah in z različno dinamiko?

Pregledna analiza je potrdila podmeno, da v teh delih ne gre pričakovati posebne pozornosti večplastnim identitetam. O njih je tu in tam prebrati kak drobec, saj so obravnave zastavljene drugače – kot znanstveno izčrpne in sistematične deskripcije na podlagi obsežnega znanja o deželah in njihovem prebivalstvu. Ljudi, ki so bolj ali manj odmaknjen »predmet«, locirajo zgodovinsko, geografsko, jih preštevajo, predstavljajo nekatere značilnosti vsakdanjega življenja, jih včasih komentirajo in primerjajo, tudi z njihovim (ljudskim) značajem.

Osrednji del besedila obravnava dela dveh avtorjev – Karla von Czoerniga *Ethnographie der österreichischen Monarchie* in *Über die Ethnographie Österreichs* (1857a, 1857b) in Adolfa Fickerja *Die Völkerstämme der österreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie, ihre Gebiete, Gränzen und Inseln* (1869). Posebej Czoernigovo delo je mogoče uvrstiti v poseben žanr etnografij, t. i. statistično etnografijo. V primerjavi z drugimi obsežnimi avtorskimi deli o

monarhiji (Blumenbach, 1832–1833, 2. izd. 1837; Umlauft 1876, 2. izd. 1897) ima Czoernigovo in Fickerjevo delo izostrenejši disciplinarni okvir, razviden v ekspliciranju in argumentaciji problematike kakor tudi načinu obravnave. Eksplicitno namreč reflektira kategorijo narodnosti – na eni strani kot kvantificirano dejstvo (statistični podatki, etnografski zemljevid), katerega glavno merilo je kljub nezadostnosti jezik, na drugi kot silo kulturnega in civilizacijskega razvoja, ki je najmočnejša pri nemškem elementu. Ficker je bil zvest Czoernigov naslednik in ga v premislekih o narodnosti, katere pomen je še nekoliko bolj relativiziral, o jeziku in kulturnem razvoju »močnejših« (Germani in zahodni Romani) in »šibkejših« ni presegel.

Po pestri zgodovini selitev, kolonizacije ozemelj, srečevanjih neenako močnih ljudstev, različnih življenjskih okoliščinah sta Czoernig in Ficker v prihodnosti predvidela civilizacijsko stapljanje, tj. vse večje poenotenje razlik, in to prav pod vplivom vodilnega nemškega elementa (npr. s splošno uveljavitvijo nemščine, ki bi jo morali obvladati vsi pripadniki monarhije, kar pa ne izključuje ohranjanja drugih narodnih posebnosti). V tem procesu sta videla še trdnejšo notranjo povezanost monarhije in vztrajala pri njeni nedeljivosti, zapisani v motu avstro-ogrske monarhije *Indivisibiliter ac inseparabiliter*.