

[2–2021]

history – theory – criticism

dějiny–teorie–kritika

Obsah | Contents

Editorial – Alterity, Enmification, Orientalism and Other Issues	177
1. Studie a eseje Studies and Essays	
PETR ANDREAS – Není stále jasné, co jsou to protisocialistické síly. Resovětizace KSČ a jejího diskurzu o nepříteli v období československé krize <i>It is still not clear what the anti-socialist forces are. Re-Sovietization of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and its discourse on the enemy during the Czechoslovak crisis</i>	183
DAVOR PAVIČIČ – A Story Told Twice: Beda Dudík Accompanying Francis Joseph to the Opening of the Suez Canal (1869) <i>Dvakrát vyprávěný příběh: Beda Dudík doprovází Františka Josefa na otevření Suezského průplavu (1869)</i>	225
TOMÁŠ MALÝ – Rituály středověku a raného novověku v recentní české a polské historiografii <i>Medieval and Early Modern Rituals in Recent Czech and Polish Historiography</i>	245
JAN HORSKÝ – Discussing the ‘Grandmother Hypothesis’ <i>Diskuse o „hypotéze babiček“</i>	281
2. Diskuse a rozepře Discussions and Disputes	
STANISLAV KOKOŠKA – Jak to bylo s tábory pro takzvané darebáky, povaleče a cikány aneb odpověď na kritiku Pavla Balouna a Jaromíra Mrňky <i>The History of the Camps for so-called Scoundrels, Layabouts, and Gypsies, or a reaction to the critique by Pavel Baloun and Jaromír Mrňka</i>	311
ZHANG ZUOCHENG – West vis-à-vis East. Tradition, Question and Practice in Chinese Historiography <i>Západ versus Východ. Tradice, výzkumné otázky a praxe čínské historiografie</i>	333

3. Recenze a reflexe | Reviews and Reflections

GABRIELA DUDEKOVÁ KOVÁČOVÁ – <i>Človek vo vojne. Stratégie prežitia a sociálne dôsledky prvej svetovej vojny na Slovensku</i> (Jiří Hutečka)	351
VOJTĚCH KESSLER, JOSEF ŠRÁMEK (edd.) – <i>Tváře války: Velká válka 1914–1918 očima českých účastníků</i> (Martin Jemelka)	357
LENKA J. BUDILOVÁ – <i>Od krevní msty k postsocialismu. Vývoj antropologického zájmu o Balkán</i> (Jan Horský)	361
ZBYNĚK ZEMAN, RAINER KARLSCH – <i>Na uranu záležití. Středoevropský uran v mezinárodní politice 1900–1960</i> (Matěj Bílý)	370
JANA NDIAYE BERÁNKOVÁ, MICHAEL HAUSER, NICK NESBITT (edd.) – <i>Revolutions for the Future: May '68 and the Prague Spring</i> (Luboš Studený)	376
Editorial Note	385
Upozornění redakce	388

A STORY TOLD TWICE: BEDA DUDÍK ACCOMPANYING FRANCIS JOSEPH TO THE OPENING OF THE SUEZ CANAL (1869)¹

Davor Pavičić

One of the prominent guests at the opening ceremony of the Suez Canal in 1869 was the Austro-Hungarian Emperor Franz Joseph, in whose entourage was a Czech-born priest Beda Dudík, entrusted with writing an official travelogue about the Emperor's trip. Ten years later, his younger brother Antonín published his own version of the travelogue in Czech, based on his brother's travelogue and experience. This article compares and contextualizes the two travelogues which describe the same events but were written by two brothers in different languages, for different audiences and from different perspectives. In addition to giving a new insight into the lives of the two Dudík brothers and the Emperor's trip to the East, emphasizing personal experience and reflections of Austro-Hungarian citizens in a world different from their own, the article focuses on the so far largely unknown travelogue written by Antonín Dudík. Details and tools which distinguish the tone of Antonín's travelogue from that of his older brother Beda reveal nuanced differences in the two narratives, which convey different messages to their intended audiences.

Keywords: travel writing, nineteenth century, Ottoman Empire, Beda Dudík, Antonín Dudík

Davor Pavičić is a PhD student at Charles University, Faculty of Humanities, davor.pavicic@gmail.com

1 This article is an outcome of the project Sociálně antropologický výzkum – VS 260 607 01 realized at the Charles University, Faculty of Humanities.

The construction of the Suez Canal in 1869 was one of the major engineering achievements of the nineteenth century, significantly shortening distance and travel time of marine transport of passengers and goods between European empires and their colonies in Asia, while eliminating the need to navigate around the often dangerous Cape of Good Hope in the south of Africa. The Suez Canal took around ten years to construct, and its opening in November 1869 was attended by dignitaries of various ranks from all around Europe and beyond. One of the most prominent guests at the opening ceremony was the Austro-Hungarian Emperor Francis Joseph, accompanied by a large delegation whose member was also a Czech-born priest Beda Dudík (1815–1890). Dudík's main role was to serve as the chaplain of the Austrian delegation, as well as to write and publish a chronological report of the entire one-month voyage, which he did in the following year, titled *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*.² What is particularly interesting for the context of this paper is that the travelogue saw another edition, published a decade later in Czech by Beda Dudík's younger brother Antonín Dudík (1824–1892), under the title *East: Travel Pictures Published in Memory of the Pilgrimage of Emperor Francis Joseph I to the Grave of the Savior (Východ: obrázky cestopisné vydané na paměť pouti J. V. císaře Františka Josefa I. k hrobu Spasitele)*.³

Even though both travelogues describe the same events and follow the same structure and chronology, they were written for different audiences by two brothers with differing political views, in two languages, and with a ten-year difference which saw numerous changes in the relationship between Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire. Beda's account, commissioned by the Emperor to commemorate his first trip to the East as a guest of the Ottoman Sultan, provides a more official overview of the whole trip, uses neutral language and avoids direct criticism of the Ottoman rule over those lands. On the other hand, Antonín's travelogue was published shortly after the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878, when Austria-Hungary extended its rule over a territory with a significant Muslim population and under Ottoman control for four centuries, at the time when the Ottoman Empire was in decline, threatened by emerging nations and nation states and geopolitical interests of other great powers, particularly in the Balkans. Written for a Czech audience and not

2 BEDA DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, Vienna 1870.

3 ANTONÍN DUDÍK, *Východ: obrázky cestopisné vydané na paměť pouti J. V. císaře Františka Josefa I. k hrobu Spasitele* [East: travel pictures published in memory of the pilgrimage of Emperor Francis Joseph I to the grave of the Savior], Prague 1880.

restrained by diplomacy, Antonín's account offers a more subjective insight into the Oriental realm of the nineteenth century.

This article focuses on the so far relatively unknown travelogue of his younger brother Antonín who wrote his work based on the previously published Beda's travelogue, as well as stories he heard and various written material he received from his brother Beda. Whereas other works dealing with Beda Dudík's travelogue focus mainly on reconstructing the details of the Emperor's trip, or the differences in content between the two travelogues, I will focus in particular on the details which distinguish the tone of Antonín's travelogue from that of his older brother Beda, as well as the specific elements which cause the same story to have a different voice when retold. While we may consider Beda's travelogue to be an example of a travelogue written through 'imperial eyes' and in line with the nineteenth century views of the Orient, Antonín's travelogue reflects a different time perspective and a view which does not mirror the standard imperialist opinions of the time, which can also be considered as a 'people's view' not always representing the official policies of the government.

Former works

A systematic review of the two travelogues has not been carried out so far, and while Beda's travelogue was a subject of several studies focusing largely on its content, Antonín's travelogue remained mostly unnoticed. Available historiographical literature on Beda Dudík mostly relates to his general biography or his role as a historian of Moravia. The only work dealing specifically with Beda Dudík's trip to the East in 1869 is Anna Selander's article on Austrian travellers to the opening of the Suez Canal.⁴ In her article, Selander presents a day-by-day itinerary of the trip, mainly based on Beda's travelogue, but occasionally supplementing the details with notes by the Austrian journalist Wilhelm Wiener who accompanied the Austro-Hungarian delegation as a journalist and wrote a travelogue about it.⁵ Selander's article is a reconstruction of the trip, focusing on diplomatic protocol, the location of Beda's stay, and the festivities associated with the opening of the Suez Canal, but it omits any mention or analysis of Dudík's personal impressions of the trip or the rhetorical means which he used to describe his own experiences.

4 ANNA SELANDER, *Österreichische Reisende bei der Eröffnung des Suezkanals*, in: Egypt and Austria I. Proceedings of the Symposium Czech Institute of Egyptology, August 31st to September 2nd, 2004, Prague 2005, pp. 117–126.

5 WILHELM WIENER, *Nach dem Orient: Reiseskizzen*, Vienna 1870.

Contemporary Czech historians who have dealt with Beda Dudík include Richard Mahel, Ema Šimková, and Eva Ryšavá. In his extensive book on the biography of Beda Dudík, Mahel devotes eight pages to Dudík's journey to the East in 1869.⁶ Similarly to Selander, Mahel reconstructed the entire journey to the East. However, Mahel's work offers more context than Selander's as he provides an analysis of the geopolitical importance of the Emperor's visit to the Middle East as well as the circumstances surrounding Dudík's selection to be the official chaplain and chronographer of the journey. The only mention of Dudík's impressions of what he saw on the trip is a short reference and a quote related to the unequal status of women under the Ottoman rule.⁷ The same section also contains a brief reference to Antonín's travelogue⁸ and earlier in the book, a reference to Beda's trip to the East is found, mentioning that his brother later wrote another version of the travelogue for the Czech audience, omitting details of no interest to the common reader and 'adding events either not mentioned by Beda Dudík or mentioned only in their conversations'.⁹

Ema Šimková (née Tomášková) wrote her PhD dissertation on Beda Dudík's life as reflected through his journals,¹⁰ which was later published as a book.¹¹ Although not related to Beda's trip to the East, Šimková's work provides an overview of bibliography related to Beda Dudík in the Czech Republic and abroad, as well as an overview of the available archival materials. In an article on the 'other life' of Beda Dudík,¹² Šimková contrasts Beda Dudík's role as a priest to that as a historian and argues that during his lifetime, Dudík was mentioned more in the context of his professional work as a historian than as a priest, partly because he avoided wearing official attire and rarely performed religious ceremonies.¹³

6 RICHARD MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890): život a dílo rajhradského benediktína a moravského zemského historiografa ve světle jeho osobní pozůstalosti* [Beda Dudík (1815–1890): Life and Work of a Benedictine Monk from Rajhrad and a Historiographer of Moravia in the Light of his Personal Legacy], Prague 2015, pp. 407–415.

7 R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890)*, p. 410.

8 R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890)*, pp. 408–409.

9 R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890)*, pp. 84.

10 EMA TOMÁŠKOVÁ, *Život a osobnost Bedy Dudíka (1815–1890) pohledem jeho deníků* [Life and Personality of Beda Dudík (1815–1890) from the Perspective of his Diaries], PhD diss., Palacky University Olomouc 2016.

11 EMA ŠIMKOVÁ, *Život a osobnost Bedy Dudíka (1815–1890) pohledem jeho deníků* [Life and Personality of Beda Dudík (1815–1890) from the Perspective of his Diaries], Olomouc 2018.

12 EMA TOMÁŠKOVÁ, *K „druhému životu“ Bedy Dudíka* [The 'Other Life' of Beda Dudík], *Historica Olomucensia* 50/2016, pp. 69–85.

13 E. TOMÁŠKOVÁ, *K „druhému životu“ Bedy Dudíka* [The 'Other Life' of Beda Dudík], pp. 70–71.

Eva Ryšavá, who is also related to Beda Dudík through her father's side of the family, wrote several articles about him, however, they mostly concern his professional work or correspondence, not his travels. Ryšavá wrote two articles on Dudík's participation as a war correspondent during the Austro-Prussian war on the Italian front in 1866.¹⁴ However, given the specifics of his stay in Italy and the fact that Italy was considered part of the West, these are not relevant in the context of this article.

Literature on Beda's younger brother Antonín is scarce. It consists mostly of brief general biographies in Czech biographical dictionaries or encyclopaedias, or he is briefly referenced in the works about Beda Dudík, mostly in connection with his relationship to his older brother. The most detailed work on Antonín Dudík was published as an article in 1935 by Bohumír Bunža.¹⁵ What is particularly useful in the context of this article is that it was the first, and up to date the most detailed, comparative treatment of the two travelogues published by the Dudík brothers on Beda's trip to the East in 1869.¹⁶ Albeit longer than the mentions or comparisons of the two travelogues in the sources listed above, which mostly consist of only a few sentences, Bunža focuses on several key differences in the structure of the two travelogues, followed by two longer excerpts from Antonín's travelogue which are intended to show his 'talent as narrator and translator'.¹⁷ While his efforts to compare the two travelogues are definitely noteworthy, we must bear in mind that Bunža's work was written almost a century ago, hence does not include any references to Otherness, the study of which only became mainstream after the publication of Edward Said's pioneering work on Orientalism in 1978.¹⁸

- 14 See EVA RYŠAVÁ, *Moravský historiograf válečným zpravodajem (Beda Dudík na jižní frontě v Itálii roku 1866)* [Moravian Historiographer as a War Correspondent (Beda Dudík on the Southern Front in Italy in 1866)] *Studia Moravica. Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis Facultas Philosophica – Moravica* 3/2005, pp. 77–85; EVA RYŠAVÁ, *Dr. Beda Dudík: vzpomínky na válečné tažení v Itálii 1866* [Dr. Beda Dudík: Memories of the War Campaign in Italy in 1866], *Bellum 1866: časopis Komitétu pro udržování památek z války roku 1866* 2/2007, pp. 104–125.
- 15 BOHUMÍR BUNŽA, *Antonín Dudík – Spisovatel a buditel* [Antonin Dudík – Writer and Revivalist], *Archa – revue pro katolickou kulturu* 23/1935, no. 1–2, pp. 14–30.
- 16 B. BUNŽA, *Antonín Dudík – Spisovatel a buditel* [Antonin Dudík – Writer and Revivalist], pp. 19–22.
- 17 B. BUNŽA, *Antonín Dudík – Spisovatel a buditel* [Antonin Dudík – Writer and Revivalist], p. 20.
- 18 EDWARD SAID, *Orientalism*, New York 1978.

Orient and Otherness

Both Beda and Antonín acknowledge already in their introductions, albeit with different intentions, that the eastern region exists in stark contrast to the Occident/West. Beda hoped that his book would be ‘a testimony to the beloved heir of the Imperial Crown of the unlimited veneration with which the Orient and Occident welcomed and received the Emperor’,¹⁹ while Antonín stated that he intended to publish an account of ‘a journey to ‘the West’.²⁰ The geographical perception of ‘the Orient’ shifted more eastward over the course of the last century and even within Said’s framework did not include the Ottoman territories in Europe or the independent Balkan states visited during the trip, nor did it refer to a particular geographically defined territory for Beda Dudík other than as a designation for the East. Therefore, in order to avoid any ambiguity over the usage of the term, I have chosen to use the term ‘the East’ in this text to refer collectively to the territories visited in the Balkans and Middle East during the Emperor’s trip in 1869.

The word ‘Orient’ derives from Latin and was used in the nineteenth century and later synonymously with its translation ‘East’ in different languages to refer to the Ottoman Empire and the lands further east. An example is the selection of titles by both brothers. While Beda’s title mentions ‘the Orient’, Antonín refers to these lands simply as ‘the East’ (Východ). Both authors later use the same terms to refer to the destination of the trip throughout the text and they also use them to collectively refer to the people living there. For instance, a passage about the lack of entertainment venues in the Ottoman Empire refers to an inhabitant of the Orient/East as *der Orientale* (the Oriental) in German, and *Východčan* (Easterner) in Czech.²¹

Orientalism is a term used to describe the West’s overall view of the East in the nineteenth century. While most scholars of the nineteenth century regard Said’s work as ground-breaking, one must take into consideration that Said’s framework draws examples and conclusions only from ‘global’ empires such as Britain and France, leaving out peculiarities of the traditional contiguous em-

19 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. vi. [‘Und wenn dasselbe in die Hände des durchlauchtigsten Kronprinzen kommt, dann möge es dem geliebten Erben der Kaiserkrone Zeugnis ablegen von der unbegrenzten Verehrung, mit welcher der Orient und Occident den Kaiser, Höchstdessen erlauchten Vater, in Nah und Ferne bewillkommt und empfangen hatte.’]

20 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 6. [‘Dá-li Pán Bůh, chceme později vydati ještě cestu na „Zapad“, jejížto směr byl opět vědecký a poněkud zábavný.’]

21 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. 116. and A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 33.

pires such as Austria-Hungary or Russia. Furthermore, Said does not make any references to the specifics of the territories in the Balkans visited by the Emperor during his trip and considered as part of the nineteenth century 'Orient'. Geographically, they belong to Europe but were independent states (Greece) or part of the Ottoman Empire (Bulgaria).

Building on Said's Orientalism, Maria Todorova coined the term Balkanism.²² Balkanism defines the West's view towards the Balkans and its development over time. Todorova justifies the need to study the particularities of the Balkan peninsula separately from the general Orientalist presumptions in the Balkans' geopolitical significance, which differed from other parts of the Ottoman Empire in the predominantly Christian character of Balkan people, and the construction of a certain image of the Balkans in the West throughout the twentieth century.²³ The Ottoman Empire as a whole was vast and diverse both linguistically and culturally, comprising various Muslim, Christian and Jewish religious denominations, spread over separate geopolitical regions which, over the course of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, established varying relations with what we perceive as 'the West' today. Todorova's argument thus applies to all parts of the former Ottoman Empire and not only the Balkans.

While in this context neither Orientalism nor Balkanism accurately describe the Dudík brothers' views of the Orient, Antonín's view can be seen through the concept of transculturation introduced by Marie Louise Pratt, which explains 'how subordinated and marginal groups select and invent from the materials submitted to them by a dominant or metropolitan culture'.²⁴ Even though it applies to colonized peoples, the concept of transculturation can also be used to explain the differing views of the Dudík brothers. In this case the dominant metropolitan culture would be Austrian imperialism represented by Beda's travelogue whereas Antonín's work can be viewed as an example of a subordinated culture reinventing a story from the materials provided by the dominant culture. Pratt continues by saying that 'while subjugated people cannot readily control what emanates from the dominant culture, they do determine to varying extents what they absorb into their own, and what they use it for'.²⁵ And this is precisely what Antonín did by creating a shorter version of the imperial narrative and

22 MARIA TODOROVA, *Imagining the Balkans*, New York 2009.

23 M. TODOROVA, *Imagining the Balkans*, p. 20.

24 MARY LOUISE PRATT, *Imperial eyes; travel writing and transculturation*, London 1992, p. 6.

25 M. PRATT, *Imperial eyes; travel writing and transculturation*, p. 6.

filling it with references and language that would be considered inappropriate for an imperial narrative.

In his work on the rhetoric of empire,²⁶ David Spurr lists twelve rhetorical modes which he identified as elements of colonial discourse. For Spurr, colonial discourse includes ‘particular languages which belong to [the process of colonization], enabling it while simultaneously being generated by it,’ while acknowledging that there is no single colonial discourse, but rather ‘a series of colonizing discourses, each adapted to a specific historical situation, yet having in common certain elements with the others’.²⁷ While the Emperor’s trip to the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 is not a case of classic colonialism, where one power decides to conquer new lands and ‘civilize’ its peoples, Spurr’s rhetorical modes are essentially ways of writing about the ‘Other’ and can thus provide a useful framework for analysing how Dudík brothers presented the East in their accounts.

Historical context

The Dudík brothers were born in the Moravian town of Kojetín, neary Olomouc in what is now the Czech Republic. Both were ordained Catholic priests and active writers and historians, however Beda Dudík is much better known than his younger brother Antonín, mainly because of his contribution to the historiography of Moravia, and because he enjoyed high reputation in the Austrian circles, teaching at the University of Vienna and later becoming a member of the Academy of Sciences in Vienna. He wrote in German, and except for the travelogue, which is a subject of this article, most of his other works relate to Moravian history or archival and library sciences, which were also areas of his expertise and reasons for several of his trips abroad.²⁸

Richard Mahel argues that Beda Dudík was selected to accompany the Emperor on the trip to the East because of his loyalty to the Monarchy, personal acquaintances which he had among high-ranking government officials, and in recognition for his contributions in science.²⁹ In an article analysing Beda’s travels through his passports and travel permits available in the archives, Ma-

26 DAVID SPURR, *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration*, Durham 1993.

27 D. SPURR, *The Rhetoric of Empire*, p. 1.

28 For a detailed overview of Beda Dudík’s biography and works, see R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890)*.

29 R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890)*, p. 407.

hel also argues that one of the reasons why Beda was selected to travel was his strong Austrian patriotism, which became evident as of 1850,³⁰ making him loyal and trustworthy enough to be entrusted with such a task. As a priest and a historian, he was able to cover two roles in one that of an official chaplain, as well as the writer and publisher of a travelogue about the Emperor's trip. Beda was not a complete stranger to the Balkans and the Middle East, since he had visited Corfu (under the British rule at the time), Greece, Istanbul and Smyrna in 1863.³¹ While conducting research for this article, I came across an unpublished handwritten travelogue of about 25 pages in the Moravian Provincial Archive in Brno, titled *Meine erste Orientreise 1863*,³² which went largely unnoticed in secondary literature related to Beda Dudík, and would definitely be an indispensable source for any future analysis of Beda's experience with the Orient.

To this day, Antonín Dudík, an active writer like his brother, has remained mostly in the shadow of his older brother Beda, whom he saw as his role model. Antonín's bibliography covers a wider range of genres, from several works of fiction and two travelogues based on the travels of his older brother, to several historiographical works. A year before publishing the travelogue based on Beda's trip to the East, Antonín published another one, mostly based on Beda's letters which he had received during Beda's trips to Sweden and Italy.³³ Unlike his older brother, Antonín wrote mainly in Czech. This can be attributed to his passion for the Czech national cause at the time as he was an avid opponent of Germanization in Moravia.

Travelling to the opening of the Suez Canal was Franz Joseph's first trip to the Ottoman Empire and came shortly after the Austro-Prussian war in 1866 resulting in Austria's defeat and the subsequent unification of the German states led by Prussia. The defeat in the war weakened Austria and forced the Austrians to compromise with a major ethnic group in the Empire, the Hungarians. The compromise led to the creation of Austria-Hungary in 1867, which lasted until the Empire's dissolution in 1918. According to Mahel, the main motivation for the Emperor to tour the Balkans and the Middle East was purely diplomatic, and came as a result of the warming of relations between

30 RICHARD MAHEL, *Za poznáním napříč Evropou* [Exploring Across Europe], Archivní sborník 14/2008, p. 37.

31 R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890)*, p. 408.

32 BEDA DUDÍK, *Meine erste Orientreise 1863*, Moravský zemský archiv Brno, E6, karton 178, sig. Dm 3/3ch-1.

33 ANTONÍN DUDÍK, *Severa a Jih: cestopisné obrázky* [North and South: Travel Pictures], Prague 1879.

Austria-Hungary and France, which was the driving force behind the construction of the Suez Canal and, like Austria-Hungary, had a strained relationship with Prussia at the time.³⁴

Following several centuries of war and conquest between the Habsburgs and the Ottomans, the nineteenth century was a period of relative peace between the two empires. In 1869, both empires were facing an uncertain future, largely due to the growing movements for autonomy and ethnic self-determination among numerous ethnicities which comprised both empires. Having reached an agreement with the Hungarians in 1867, Austria averted dissolution for the following half-century, while the Ottoman Empire was losing much of its territories in the Balkans to the emerging nation-states. The Austrian occupation of the Slav-inhabited Ottoman provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1878 and the subsequent 'civilizing mission' which followed are of particular importance to the tone of Antonín Dudík's travelogue, published in 1880. Passionate for the Czech cause resisting the German influence within Austria-Hungary, Antonín did not hesitate to criticize the Ottoman Empire's rule over its numerous and diverse ethnic groups, as will be shown later in the article.

The entire trip lasted for 42 days, with the Emperor leaving Vienna on October 25th and arriving back in Vienna on December 6th. The journey began by train via Budapest to Buziaș,³⁵ followed by a boat trip on the Danube to Ruse.³⁶ The greater part of this section included journey within Austria-Hungary, where crowds of local people and dignitaries came to greet the Emperor and his entourage along the way. After a short train journey to the port city of Varna, the Austro-Hungarian delegation was transported by ship to Istanbul, where they spent several days as guests of the Sultan. From there, they went by ship to Athens, where they stayed as guests of the Greek king. After Greece, the Emperor and his delegation continued to Palestine, where they visited various biblical sites, before proceeding to the official opening of the Suez Canal. After visiting the main Egyptian sights, they boarded a ship in Alexandria which took them to the Austrian port of Trieste, with a short stop on the island of Corfu.

34 R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudik (1815–1890)*, p. 409.

35 Final stop of the railway in Austria-Hungary, today Buziaș in Romania.

36 Today Ruse in Bulgaria.

Travel writing

What is important to note is that Antonín's work is unusual in the study of travel writing as Antonín did not undertake the journey himself but relied on the experience of his older brother. For example, the Routledge Research Companion to Travel Writing states that a travelogue, or a 'travel narrative consists of the narrative of an actual journey told by the person of persons who undertook it'.³⁷ By this definition, Antonín's work does not meet the criteria for a travelogue, however given that it is a rewrite of a previous work which certainly is a travelogue, by an author very close to the original author, far from being a work of fiction, it can be considered a second telling of the same travel story.

In the context of the nineteenth century travel writing and travel writing in general, similar examples of a travelogue rewritten at a later point by a different person in a different language are rare and have yet to receive significant scholarly attention. An article published in 2016 by Czech historian Lucie Storchová examines parallel travel diaries of a Czech married couple, Jiří and Růžena Baum who spent six months in South Africa in 1938–1939, travelling and conducting scientific research.³⁸ Storchová's intention was to show how different categories such as gender, class and race shaped the two travel diaries, their style and rhetorical strategies employed by both authors. She further explored how the couple reflected on themselves and perceived Otherness during their travels.³⁹

My analysis follows Storchová's approach while taking into consideration the specifics of the travelogues written by the Dudík brothers. While Storchová's example focuses on the case of two people who travelled together and wrote diaries which were never published nor were they intended for publication, in the case of the Dudík brothers only the older brother Beda actually undertook the journey and recorded his first-hand experiences. Antonín's narrative is thus based on the travelogue written by his older brother, his travel notes, as well as personal conversations between the two brothers, not on his own experience, besides his own personal interest in the lands visited. As mentioned earlier in the article, the

37 *The Routledge Research Companion to Travel Writing*, (edd.) ALASDAIR PETTINGER, TIM YOUNGS, London-New York 2019, p. 4.

38 LUCIE STORCHOVÁ, *Presenting the Other in Jiří and Růžena Baums' Parallel Travel Journals from South Africa (1938–39)*, in: *Egypt and Austria IX. Perception of the Orient in Central Europe (1800–1918)*, Krakow 2016, pp. 311–324.

39 L. STORCHOVÁ, *Presenting the Other in Jiří and Růžena Baums' Parallel Travel Journals from South Africa (1938–39)*, p. 314.

Dudík brothers' travelogues were created in different time periods, their style of writing thus reflected different challenges which Austria-Hungary faced in 1870 and 1880, both in relation to the status of various ethnicities in Austria-Hungary and Austria-Hungary's relationship with the decaying Ottoman Empire. The languages are also different, with Beda's travelogue written in German and Antonín's in Czech. Finally, travelogues written by the Dudík brothers were created with the intention of being published for specific audiences.

Despite the differences, the travelogues of the Dudík brothers still represent an interesting analogy to the diaries of the Baum spouses as both examples deal with two individuals describing the same events and their experience with Otherness. Considering the different formats, periods and contexts in which the Baum and Dudík travelogues were created, it is still suitable to structure my analysis using the three levels of analysis suggested by Storchová – style and rhetoric, perceptions of 'us' and 'ours', and perception of the Other.

Style and rhetoric include the tools which both authors use to address their readers, whether it is the language in which the travelogue is written, the selection of situations which are described in the travelogue, or the choice of words the author uses to express his views or to appeal to the travelogue's target audience. The second level, perceptions of 'us' and 'ours' relates to the representations of people and lands encountered during their trip in the territory of Austria-Hungary, as well as the authors' reflections on the Monarchy when confronted with a world different from the one at home, or to their impressions when encountering certain familiar things, for example, when looking at the way of life of the population which emigrated from Austria-Hungary to the Ottoman Empire, especially the Jews in Palestine. The final level includes the perception of the Other, i.e., perception of people and lands outside Austria-Hungary, completely different from the life which they were used to at home.

Style and rhetoric

As mentioned earlier, the key difference between the two travelogues is the language in which they were written. While Beda was commissioned by the Emperor to accompany him on the trip and write a report about it, he used German, which was the *lingua franca* in Austria-Hungary at the time, and as such, it addressed a wider audience within the Empire, as well as the surrounding German-speaking territories. Antonín, on the other hand, wrote his work in Czech, thus satisfying a growing interest of the Czech-speaking citizens of the Empire in first-hand experiences from the Orient, which had been evident since the 1870s. In his reference to Antonín's work, Mahel states that we can consider

Beda's work as 'an official publication from the expedition' while Antonín's work in Czech was intended for broader audiences.⁴⁰

Content-wise, Antonín's travelogue of 110 pages is significantly shorter than Beda's, who had written 352 pages. Mahel argues that Antonín omitted most of the historical descriptions and general depictions of the visited places in order to bring the text to a wider audience of 'common readers',⁴¹ whereas Bunža states that Antonín omitted many details concerning the imperial protocol and at the same time deprived himself of the opportunity to include some details which would have been interesting for the reader, such as the scene where the governor of Syria gave a leopard to the Emperor, and the animal immediately escaped.⁴²

For anyone familiar with both German and Czech languages, Antonín's account is easier to read. While some parts are literal translations from German into Czech, the absence of long passages describing in detail the history or architecture of the visited places brings the author's experience into the forefront while omitting some parts which readers can easily find elsewhere. The difference in readability can also be attributed to the different genres in which the travelogues were written. Beda wrote his travelogue in a very formal style, reflecting the fact that he had been commissioned to write it by the Imperial Court and that its purpose was not so much to entertain or inform the reader as to commemorate the Emperor's trip. Antonín had more freedom in his writing because his target audience was the general reader at the time, and he wrote the travelogue out of his own initiative, not to please the publisher or someone who might commission him to write a work. In recounting the Emperor's trip, Antonín could thus concentrate on what might interest his readers without including every single detail about the travel.

Beda strives to present the Emperor in the most favourable light by depicting his contacts with the local population and dignitaries of the Austro-Hungarian lands through which he passed, or the impressive reception which the Emperor received as a guest of the Ottomans throughout the Ottoman Empire. On the other hand, Antonín's account reflects the different era in which it was published, and he does not hesitate to mention the problems faced by the Austro-Hungarian provinces, or to criticize, either directly or in more subtle ways, the Ottomans and the way of life in the Ottoman Empire. An example of these differences is

40 L. STORCHOVÁ, *Presenting the Other in Jiří and Růžena Baums' Parallel Travel Journals from South Africa (1938–39)*, p. 314.

41 R. MAHEL, *Beda Dudík (1815–1890)*, p. 84.

42 B. BUNŽA, *Antonín Dudík – Spisovatel a buditel* [Antonín Dudík – Writer and Revivalist], p. 19.

apparent from the very beginning. In describing Beda's visit to the Hungarian city of Győr which Beda omitted in his travelogue because it preceded the official trip, Antonín noted that much construction was taking place in the area but that the hard labour was carried out by Slovaks, similarly to the situation in Vienna, which led him to ponder whether 'Slavic peoples were sentenced not only to life under hegemony, but also to slavery'.⁴³

Beda knew that his work would be under scrutiny due to a stricter censorship of printed material within Austria-Hungary at the time and the fact that it was commissioned by the authorities, thus he adopted a more cautious approach in describing the first part of the trip, inserting in several parts articles and letters which he had written during the journey for some of the leading newspapers of the time such as the *Pester Lloyd*,⁴⁴ *Wiener Zeitung*,⁴⁵ and *Fremden-Blatt*.⁴⁶ While Beda describes in detail the enthusiastic welcome which they received on their journey throughout Austria-Hungary, Antonín does not deny the warm reception but he does not hesitate to mention the inconveniences caused by this enthusiasm, for example when their train arrived in Nagyikikinda⁴⁷ shortly after midnight, and everyone on board was awakened by cheer and music. He wonders 'why is there such enthusiasm, such dedication, such happy thoughts as we observed among the viewers'.⁴⁸

The first ships on which the Emperor and his entourage embarked in Baziaş were named after two of the Emperor's children, Rudolph and Giselle. For Beda, this fact 'kept our memories of Vienna and the hope of Austria awake',⁴⁹ whereas Antonín's work refers to the ships' names as a 'sweet memory of the fatherly

43 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 8. ['Ostatně Ráb pěkně jest mesto, mnoho se zde staví, ale divná věc, že jak ve Vídni, tak i zde těžkou zednickou práci jen ubozí Slováci konají. Mnozí říkají, jakoby lid slovanský ne ku panování, alebrž k otroctví odsouzen byl. Zatím ale pilnost a činný život zvelebuje člověka mnohem více, nežli lenost a rozmařilost. Touto nectností klesli národové druhdy světem vládnoucí!']

44 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. 14.

45 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. 18.

46 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. 24.

47 Today Kikinda in Serbia.

48 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 13. ['Byloť půl jedné hodiny v noci, když vlak vjížděl na prostoru staniční. Aj, bum! bum! hrozně rány z hmoždířů na blízku vypálené otrásaly vzduchem. Vše na nohou. Velkolepý pochodňový průvod se blíží, sbor cikánů hraje hymnu národní, a přítomné publikum provolává z plna hrdla po maďarsku, 'éljen!' Arciť příliš líbezně to neznělo v uších těch, jejichž oči spánkem obtíženy byly, ale zač stojí ta nadšenost, ta obětivost, ta jará mysl, jakouž jsme v řadách divákův byli pozorovali?!']

49 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. 20. ['Es war dies eine zarte Aufmerksamkeit von Seite der Donau-Dampfschiffahrts-Gesellschaft, beim Antritte der Wasserfahrt gerade zwei

heart of the beloved ruler'.⁵⁰ In this particular example, Beda emphasises the importance of the ships' names for the entire delegation whereas Antonín stresses the importance of the fact for the Emperor alone.

The Orient in Antonín's work

On two occasions Antonín compares the social life in the Ottoman Empire to that in Austria-Hungary. What fascinated him in Istanbul was the lack of open public spaces intended for socializing, which urged people to meet in unusual places, such as cemeteries.⁵¹ In Cairo, Antonín comments on the scarcity of public spaces where children could play, which forced them to improvise various games, similar to which he remembered playing in his childhood.⁵² In both examples, Antonín makes comparison between the life in Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire, in both cases implying that Austria-Hungary was more advanced regarding the urban infrastructure intended for leisure activities, which again is an example of Spurr's Classification, where cultures are judged by how similar or different they are from what the authors are accustomed to in the 'West'.

Another area where Antonín noticed striking differences between the East and the West was the local cuisine. When describing their first local meal in Varna, he emphasized that everything was Turkish and that they had to use their hands instead of forks and knives, a practice which he calls 'patriarchal'. He concludes the list of meals with an exclamation that it was certainly not

Schiffe zu wählen, deren Namen jenen der kaiserlichen Kinder entnommen sind. Rudolph und Gisella, sie hielten wach unsere Erinnerung an Wien und an Oesterreichs Hoffnung.']

- 50 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 13. ['Zajímati bude zajisté, povíme-li, že hlavní loď nás unášející i s družkou svojí, kteráž ji po boku jako pyšná labuť plula, jmenovaly se Rudolf a Gisella. Aj! jak sladká to byla upomínka pro srdce otcovské milovaného mocnáře!']
- 51 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 33. ['Východan nezná žádného života pod širým nebem, jako my, jelikož každá rodina pro sebe odloučeně žije. Protož náleží zábavná místa ve smyslu evropském na východě k věcem nemožným. A predce touží i moslemín, by ob čas z úzkých prostor svého domova a dusivých ulic městských vyvaznul. Onť si vyjde aneb vyjede a kam? Na pole všem lidem společné, na své rozsáhlé pohřebišťě. Zde ve stínu tmavých cypřišů, zde v pažitě na prachu svých předků sedí a dumá.']
- 52 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 92. ['Východ nezná žádných dětských zahrádek aniž veřejných míst na hraní. Na domech se ubožáci prohánějí, tam si hrají. A jak? V hrách v liskové ořechy, v jádra dýňová neb melounová sudou a lichou, hrají v míč anebo 'v semel', právě jako my to za mládí dělávali.']

a fine cuisine.⁵³ In his description of a feast served in Palestine, Antonín implies that no member of the Austrian delegation enjoyed the local cuisine and since European food was also available ‘if a Turkish meal came to the table, it mostly remained untouched’.⁵⁴

In the scene describing a visit to a medical institution managed by Christian monks in Palestine, Antonín notes that the hospice was managed by Catholic monks from Austria, while the hospital was managed by Protestants from Prussia. Reflecting on the strained relationship between Austria-Hungary and Prussia, Antonín mentions that he was troubled by the fact that this historical place was in foreign hands and used for non-Catholic purposes.⁵⁵ While in other instances Dudík writes about Christians in the Ottoman Empire as a coherent group without specifying whether they were Orthodox, Catholic or Protestant, in this case Antonín refers specifically to how the tensions between Austria and Prussia hurt Austrian interests in the Middle East, rather than to the benefits of the existence of such an institution for the Christian population in the Ottoman Empire.

In terms of descriptions of what they saw and experienced in the Ottoman Empire, both narratives contain many Orientalizing references, typical of the nineteenth century European travel accounts about the Balkans and the Middle East. Both brothers are amazed at the hospitality of the people, lavishness of the social and diplomatic events in which they participated, and the overall differences between the life in Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire.

Given that the relations between Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire changed during the ten years which passed between the publishing of the two travelogues, particularly after the Austrian occupation of Bosnia-Herzegovina in

- 53 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 20. [‘Kuchyně byla turecká, obsluha turecká, náčiní turecké a způsob při jídle docela – patriarchální. t. j. zuby byly nožem a prsty vidličkou. Studená teletina a vařená skopovina, kuřata, rejže, oblíbený pilaf, moučný pokrm se zavařeným ovocem, kapusta s posekaným masem a šťavou citronovou a ovoce na mísách. Nápoj u hojně míře – víno bordeaux. Po obědě následoval nezbytný čibuk a černá káva. Ctiborova (t. j. vybraná) kuchyně to není!!!’]
- 54 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 68. [‘Ráno, kdo chtěl, dostal kávu anebo čaj. O 1. hod. byl malý oběd pozůstávající ze 4 pokrmů; ovocem se skončil. O 6. hod. pak velký stůl; pokrmů bylo o dva více, ale kuchyně a obsluha měla ráz evropský. Přišel-li někdy nějaký turecký pokrm na stůl, obyčejně nikdo se ho nedotkl. Předkládalo se toliko víno Bordeaux.’]
- 55 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], pp. 49–50. [‘Toto zbořeníště převzal korunní princ pruský, aby je k nekatolickým upotřebil účelem. Právě ten den před naším do Jerusalema příjezdem počala prusácká žežule tam kukati. Mrzelo mně to, že toto historické místo do cizích rukou se dostalo, kdežto zákonitě jeho dědicové až posud ještě nevmřeli. Rakuský hospic spravují katoličtí kněží svěťští, špitál Johanitů ale jest ve správě protestantů!’]

1878, Antonín's work is more straightforward. This is apparent once they cross the borders of foreign lands. While Beda merely acknowledges that the Emperor 'found himself on foreign soil',⁵⁶ Antonín's description of their welcome by the Romanian troops is explicit in saying that 'the sight of those troops subconsciously removed all memories we had of civilized Europe'.⁵⁷

As for the description of the world which Beda encountered in the Ottoman Empire, both works contain extensive accounts of the places which he visited and the events which he attended along the way. Even though both brothers were obviously impressed by all the sights and experiences, Antonín did not hesitate to add his own opinions and express his prejudices, particularly about the Ottoman rule and the Muslim population. His view of the Turks was already evident from his first descriptions of the Bulgarian peasants: 'Poor Bulgarians! The dawn is only beginning for them. They are good people, but uncultivated. Let us not be surprised by that. For where the Turk sets his foot, grass dries out immediately'.⁵⁸

Similarly to the earlier example, when he showed compassion for the Slovaks working on construction sites in Hungary, Antonín's sympathetic view of Slavs in Austria-Hungary and beyond is an obvious example of a rhetorical mode Spurr calls Classification, whereby 'Western writing generates an ideologically charged meaning from its perceptions of non-Western cultures'.⁵⁹ Essentially, Classification refers to a certain subjective system of ranking different cultures based on how close they are to 'Western' political, economic and social development. In the example of Slovak construction workers, this classification referred to how the different cultures within Austria-Hungary were ranked against each other, with the Slavs being at the bottom, whereas in the example of Bulgarians in the Ottoman Empire, the Turks were blamed for denying Bulgarian culture more opportunities to be seen as 'developed' from the Western perspective.

When writing about history, Antonín does not fail to mention the cruelty which accompanied the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in the fifteenth

56 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. 34. ['Bei Večerova, kaum eine halbe Stunde von Neu-Oršova entfernt, betrat der Kaiser zum ersten Male fremden Boden – das tributäre Fürstenthum Rumänien.']

57 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 16. ['V pravdě pohled na vojsko toto vyrval nám mimoděk z hlavy veškeré upomínky na civilisovanou Evropu.']

58 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 19. ['Ubozí Bulhaři! U nich teprv svítati počíná. Jest to dobrý lid, ale zanedbaný. Nedivíme se tomu. Neboť kam noha Turka šlápe, tam hned usýchá tráva.']

59 D. SPURR, *The Rhetoric of Empire*, p. 62.

century, adding that ‘they murdered all the faithful, so blood flowed in a stream’.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, he acknowledges that the times have changed and that ‘back then the world trembled before the sword of the ferocious Turk. Now it shows compassion for this sick man’.⁶¹

Both travelogues feature several descriptions of women in the Ottoman Empire, which is in line with what Todorova writes about the Austrian travellers to the Balkans who focused almost exclusively on women and neglected the men in their descriptions.⁶² While women and their status are described in detail in several parts of the travelogue, only a few short descriptions are dedicated to men, mostly focusing on their social status and not on their physical appearance.

Antonín’s view of the women in the East varies throughout the travelogue. For example, when recalling the first encounter with Muslim women in Bulgaria, Antonín focuses on their status in society, from having to be completely covered in public to their subordinate position to men.⁶³ Subsequently, when describing women in Istanbul, he focuses on their beauty and bodily decorations⁶⁴ whereas in Palestine, he notices tattoos on local women.⁶⁵ Spurr’s rhetorical mode of Surveillance is obvious in these examples. For Spurr, ‘the body of the primitive

60 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 28. [‘Křesťané uchýlili se do chrámu sv. Sofie, očekávající tam pomoc a ochranu s hůry. Zatím lití Turci vrazivše do posvátných síní všechny věřící tam povražдили tak, že krev proudem tekla.’]

61 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 24. [‘Tehdaž třásl se svět před mečem krvolačného Turka. Teď ale má soustrast s ním, co mužem churavým.’]

62 M. TODOROVA, *Imagining the Balkans*, p. 67.

63 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 19. [‘V turecké říši nemá žena u veřejnosti žádného práva. Domácnost jí výlučně patří, a ukáže-li se kde, ostýchavě a vzdáleně od mužů sobě počíná. Pročež v Ruščuku viděli jsme sem a tam na návrších ženštiny se zastřenou jako jeptišky tváří a otočené širokým, jednobarvým, neladným pláštěm; seděly pohromadě, tiše a mlčky. Ale žádné pružnosti, žádné jadrnosti, žádné elektrické veselosti jsme na nich nepozorovali. Turek a Turkyně jest a zůstává mumii bez ladu a skladu.’]

64 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 32. [‘Jejich ruce na dlani byly na žluto a nehty na červeno pomalovány; měly červené a žluté kalhoty se širokými záhyby, na nohou nešikovné botky a svrchní šat kaftanu podobný. Ostatně byt měly hlavu, čelo a dolní část tváře až k nosu bílým zastřeny šatem, přece jsem poznal, že turecké panicky v lícidlech dobře se znají. Věru, turecká žena, ať nižšího neb vyššího stavu, jest o sobě podivný tvor Boží! Ve společnosti s družkami svými arcit’ vypadá jako květinový záhonek, na němž oko cizince rádo spočívá.’]

65 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 42 and 64. [‘A ty paničky! Modře neb bíle oblečeny, se zakrytou tváří, jen prostým okem zvědavým, na rukou jakési kroužky z modrého, zeleného neb žlutého skla a pak ve tváři i na ramenou – tetovány. Snad se tážeš, čtenáři, co tetování znamená?’, p. 42], [‘Překonavše cestou tuto překážku spatřujeme několik oliv a cisternu. Byla uzavřena bílým, ne příliš velikým kamenem. Právě odvalnje ho mladá sice ale ošklivě modro- a červeno-tetovaná Arabka.’, p. 64]

becomes as much the object of examination, commentary, and valorisation as the landscape of the primitive'.⁶⁶ During the delegation's stay in Egypt, they had the opportunity to visit the harem and the 400 women who usually lived there were relocated at the time of their visit. Feeling privileged to be among the few Europeans who have ever had a chance to enter a harem,⁶⁷ he goes to great lengths to describe the harem's luxurious interior, wondering if there can be any pleasure 'in being such a woman' and condemning the concept of harem from a Christian perspective.⁶⁸

Another interesting feature is the antisemitism prevalent in Antonín's description of Jewish population in Palestine. While Beda simply mentions that numerous Jews who came to greet the Austrian delegation were immigrants from Austria-Hungary,⁶⁹ Antonín shows clear bias when he wonders how a Jew in Palestine can be Hungarian and how a Jew from Moravia can be Czech and German. He concludes that 'the dirty Jew always seeks his profit'.⁷⁰ When Antonín describes the Jewish quarter in Jerusalem, he is not as sympathetic as he was towards the fate of Bulgarians earlier and depicts the poor living conditions in this quarter without giving any reason or showing empathy,⁷¹ as in the case

66 D. SPURR, *The Rhetoric of Empire*, p. 22.

67 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 87. ['Ne tak lehce podaří se některému Evropanu, aby se do haremu dostal a tudíž nebude se škodou, nějaký nakreslití obrázek o tomto tajuplném místě']

68 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 89. ['Není-li pak to rozkoš, takovou ženinou býti? Arci, jest rozkoš, ale ona krátce zajde; jestiž zdánlivá a lahodí toliko na chvílku; dřív neb později dostaví se nepokoj a hrůza, nemoc, choroba, předchůdcové trestu pekelného. Nedbežť tedy, jak si připravíš veselost tělesnou, ale hled' si v srdci utvořit stanek, aby v něm přebývala rozkoš nehynoucí, věčný Bůh.']

69 B. DUDÍK, *Kaiser-Reise nach dem Oriente*, p. 180. ['Und merkwürdig! gerade die Juden waren die Ersten, welche dem Kaiser, bevor noch Jerusalem unseren Blicken sich darbot, huldigten. Auf einem Felsenvorsprunge standen sie mit einer Riesen-Tricolor, auf welcher in ungarischer Sprache zu lesen war: 'Eljen dem Kaiser und ungarischen Apostolischen Könige Franz Josef! Eljen den Deutschen! – Die magyarische, mährische und böhmische Judengemeinde'. Diese Fahne zugleich mit der österreichischen Hausstandarte ward dem Kaiser bis zum ersten Triumphbogen vorgetragen.']

70 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], p. 45. ['Židé byli ti první, jenž holdovali císaři. Na skalním výběžku stáli tito synové Abrahamovi, držíce obrovskou trikoloru s maďarským nápisem: 'Ať žije císař a uherský apoštolský král František Josef! Ať žijí Němci!' – 'Maďarská, moravská a česká obec židovská'. Památno, pravíme: Žid v Palestině a – Madar; žid z Moravy a Čech a – Němec; ó, žid špinavec, jen vždy hledí na svůj zisk.']

71 A. DUDÍK, *Východ* [East], pp. 55–56. ['Po té přišli jsme do čtvrti – židovské. Zde dlužno poněkud důkladněji se ohlednouti. Povědělo se mi, že v Jerusalemě asi 8000 židů se zdržuje. Ale, milý čtenáři, abys viděl tu bídu mezi nimi! Snad v širém světě nenajdeme města, kde by tolik židů jen almužnou se živilo, jako v Jerusalemě. Bez řemesla a obchodu, bez orby a průmyslu, bez peněz a majetku stěhuje se jich ročně na sta, hlavně z Ruska a Haliče, sem do města svatého, aby se zde

of his description of Bulgarians. Once again he used Spurr's rhetorical mode of Classification to establish a ranking system of the different cultures living in the Ottoman Empire. However, since Jews are presented in Antonín's work in a predominantly negative manner, these examples are also related to Spurr's rhetorical mode of Debasing, which refers to 'active production of images inspired by the fear and loathing that lie at the heart of classificatory systems presented as the products of rational thought'.⁷²

From the above examples we can conclude that even though both texts show striking similarities and it may seem at first glance that the Czech version is simply an abridged and simplified account of the previously published German version, the subtle differences between them convey different messages to the readers and create two different visions of the Ottoman Orient, leading to two different interpretations of the same journey.

The two authors write for different audiences and use different tools to reach and engage those audiences. While Beda wrote his travelogue because he was commissioned by the Viennese court and had to observe certain standards in order not to offend anyone in Vienna and create diplomatic tensions with the Ottoman Empire, Antonín's work is written to appeal to a wider Czech audience which in 1880, under the influence of the Habsburg's 'civilizing mission' in Bosnia and Herzegovina, perceived the Ottoman Empire as in decay and hindering the development of numerous ethnicities of which it was composed, particularly the Slavs. In my article, I offer a supplement to contemporary historiography on both Dudík brothers and examine how the two travelogues translate culturally.

za doma pozůstalé modlili a pak v údolí josafatském pochovati dali. A tito žebraví židé, s tváří bledou a matným okem, odění v hadrech a špíně, vrávorajíce po ulicích, sevření jsou takovou psotou a tak děsným svízelem, že to bez hrůzy ani vysloviti nelze. Všelicos se pro jich úlevu činí, avšak ztrácí se vše jako kapka v nedoměrném moři.]

72 D. SPURR, *The Rhetoric of Empire*, p. 77.