BALKAN RESEARCH JOURNAL

Administrative Legacies of Ottoman and Habsburg Empires in the Balkans: A Comparative Analysis

Hamza Ateş

DOI: https://doi.org//10.69648/MIDX8017
Balkan Research Journal(BRJ), 2025; 2(2): 65-83
brj.ibupress.com
Online ISSN: 2955-2524

Application :08.10.2025
Revision :06.11.2025
Acceptance :30.11.2025
Publication :30.11.2025

Ates, H. (2025). Administrative Legacies of Ottoman and Habsburg Empires in the Balkans: A Comparative Analysis. Balkan Research Journal, 2(2), 65-83. https://doi.org//10.69648/MIDX8017

Hamza Ateş
Istanbul Medeniyet University, Istanbul, Türkiye
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0975-0062

I declare no conflicts of interest.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Hamza Ateş

Email: ates.hamza@gmail.com.

Abstract

The Balkans have historically been a region of great geopolitical significance, shaped by the administrative, cultural, and social influences of two major empires: The Ottoman Empire and the Habsburg Empire. These empires ruled over the region for centuries, leaving a profound impact on governance structures, religious dynamics, and urban development. Despite their shared control over parts of the Balkans, their administrative approaches differed significantly, leading to long-lasting regional distinctions.

The Ottoman Empire implemented a decentralized yet hierarchical system. The millet system allowed religious communities to administer their own legal and educational affairs, fostering a diverse and multicultural society. Additionally, the waqf (endowment) system contributed to social welfare, funding mosques, schools, and public services. The Ottoman legacy remains evident in the urban architecture, linguistic influences, and socio-economic structures of modern Balkan states. Conversely, the Habsburg Empire employed a more centralized and bureaucratic model, focusing on strict control and uniformity. The Balkans under Habsburg rule experienced heavy taxation, compulsory military conscription, and Germanization policies, particularly in Croatia and Slovenia. The Austro-Hungarian legal system, with its emphasis on codified laws and secular governance, influenced modern state-building in the region. The empire's impact is still visible in urban planning, Baroque architecture, and centralized governance structures.

This study examines the contrasting administrative legacies of the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires in the Balkans, evaluating their influence on contemporary socio-political institutions. By analyzing historical governance models, the paper highlights the enduring effects of these empires on modern nation-state formation in Southeastern Europe.

Keywords: Ottoman Empire, Habsburg Empire, Balkans, administrative structure, administrative legacy.

Introduction

The Balkan Peninsula, shaped by centuries of imperial rule, remains deeply marked by the contrasting legacies of the Ottoman and Habsburg Empires. These empires governed Southeastern Europe through distinct legal, bureaucratic, and political frameworks, producing divergent institutional cultures that continue to influence the region's governance and state-society relations (Barkey, 2008: 9–11; Judson, 2016: 4–6). The Ottoman Empire embraced a pluralistic model rooted in Islamic governance, with decentralized structures such as the *millet* system and patrimonial land tenure (İnalcık, 1973: 104–106; Barkey, 2008: 15–17). In contrast, the Habsburgs pursued administrative centralization, legal codification, and bureaucratic standardization, particularly under Enlightenment-era reforms (Deák, 1990: 44–46; Judson, 2016: 7–8). These diverging logics led to enduring path dependencies.

Post-imperial trajectories reflect these foundations. Ottoman successor states like Bosnia and Albania exhibit communalism, legal pluralism, and informal governance, while Habsburg-influenced regions such as Croatia and Slovenia show stronger legal formalism and institutional continuity (Jelavich, 1983: 94–96). Reform efforts often mirror these inherited norms: Weberian models face resistance in post-Ottoman settings, yet resonate more readily in former Habsburg territories (Elbasani, 2009: 17–19; Brusis, 2005: 293–295). This paper adopts a comparative-historical approach, utilizing imperial edicts and recent scholarship to show that these imperial legacies are not relics but living frameworks shaping governance possibilities. It challenges simplistic East-West binaries and highlights both empires' adaptive strategies in governing diverse, multilingual peripheries (Judson, 2016: 11–13; Barkey, 2008: 22–24). Understanding these institutional memories is essential for interpreting contemporary administrative cultures and reform trajectories across Southeastern Europe.

The Ottoman Administrative Framework in the Balkans

Ottoman governance in the Balkans was characterized by a flexible and layered administrative logic, designed to manage the region's complex geography and deep ethno-religious diversity. Rather than enforcing uniform centralization, the empire developed a segmented and stratified model of rule that combined vertical state authority with localized forms of adaptation and control. This system, rooted in pragmatic governance and institutional pluralism, allowed the empire to maintain stability over vast and heterogeneous territories (Barkey, 2008: 93–95).

A critical moment in the formalization of Ottoman provincial administration was the 1864 Vilayet Law of the Tanzimat period, which established a hierarchical structure consisting of *vilayets* (provinces), *sanjaks* (districts), and *kazas* (subdistricts), each governed by centrally appointed officials such as *valis*, *mutasarrıfs*, and *kaymakams* respectively (İnalcık, 1973: 120–122). While these officials operated under the authority of the central government in Istanbul, their effectiveness depended on their ability to negotiate local dynamics and cooperate with established notables. This hybrid arrangement enabled administrative penetration without entirely displacing existing communal authority structures. Crucially, the drawing of administrative boundaries was guided less by ethnic coherence and more by considerations of security, economic utility, and geopolitical control. For instance, the Vilayet of Kosovo was designed to assert imperial presence over strategic trade corridors and highland regions rather than to reflect ethno-linguistic realities (Jelavich, 1983: 56–58). The territorial logic of this structure left a lasting imprint, with many post-Ottoman Balkan states adopting similar frameworks in their national administrative divisions.

One of the foundational mechanisms for early Ottoman control was the *timar* system, a form of prebendal land tenure in which revenues from agricultural land were allocated to cavalry officers (*sipahis*) in exchange for military service. This system allowed for the integration of local elites—often including recently converted Christians—into the imperial military-administrative apparatus, thereby extending loyalty to the center while retaining a measure of local embeddedness (İnalcık, 1973: 104–106; Barkey, 2008: 74–76). However, by the 17th century, the decline of cavalry warfare and the growing costs of a centralized standing army led to the erosion of the *timar* model. The rise of tax farming (*iltizam*) and the increasing autonomy of provincial notables (*ayans*) ushered in a more monetized and fragmented fiscal regime, often resulting in intensified exploitation and diminished central oversight.

Another pillar of Ottoman administration was the *millet* system, which granted a degree of legal, educational, and religious autonomy to non-Muslim communities, most notably Orthodox Christians, Jews, and Armenians. These communities operated through their own institutional frameworks under the supervision of religious leaders such as patriarchs or chief rabbis, who served as intermediaries between the state and their flocks (İnalcık, 1973: 215–217; Barkey, 2008: 142–144). While this system provided a pragmatic means of managing diversity and ensuring relative peace, it also entrenched sectarian divisions by reifying religious identity

as the basis of political and legal membership. By the 19th century, with the rise of nationalist ideologies and growing communal assertiveness, the *millets* became loci of ethno-religious mobilization and separatist ambitions (Subotić, 2021: 80–81). Thus, a framework originally intended to sustain imperial cohesion inadvertently contributed to its fragmentation.

Urban governance and socio-economic integration were further supported by the *waqf* (endowment) system, which played a vital role in funding public infrastructure and embedding Ottoman-Islamic institutions in the urban fabric of Balkan cities. Wealthy individuals—often provincial elites or religious figures—established *waqfs* to finance mosques, madrasas, caravanserais, hospitals, and other public utilities. Cities like Sarajevo, Skopje, and Bitola became sites of dense institutional development thanks to such philanthropic investments (İnalcık, 1973: 258–260; Barkey, 2008: 109–111). While *waqfs* relieved the central treasury and legitimized imperial authority at the local level, they were also vulnerable to mismanagement and elite capture, particularly in the declining centuries of the empire. Nevertheless, their durability—many continued to function even under post-Ottoman regimes—underscores their significance as semi-autonomous instruments of urban governance.

Legal pluralism constituted a core feature of Ottoman administrative practice. The empire maintained a tripartite legal structure in which *sharia* (Islamic law), *kanun* (imperial decrees), and *'urf* (customary law) operated simultaneously. Muslims were primarily judged under *sharia*, administered by state-appointed *kadis*, while non-Muslims had access to their own religious courts in matters of personal status. In mixed cases or disputes involving state interests, imperial courts retained jurisdiction (İnalcık, 1973: 281–283; Barkey, 2008: 172–174). This system allowed for a high degree of procedural flexibility and context-sensitive adjudication but also created jurisdictional ambiguities and potential for forum-shopping. In the 19th century, efforts to rationalize the legal order led to the creation of *nizamiye* (secular) courts and the promulgation of codified law. Nonetheless, the empire continued to tolerate legal hybridity, reflecting its underlying ethos of governance as pragmatic accommodation rather than rigid standardization.

In short, the Ottoman administrative framework in the Balkans was shaped by a distinctive combination of hierarchical control and local autonomy, religious pluralism and legal flexibility, fiscal decentralization and strategic central oversight. This governance model prioritized functional adaptation over ideological uniformity, enabling the empire to maintain order in an exceptionally diverse frontier

region for centuries (Shusharova, 2017). Its institutional legacy—visible in territorial subdivisions, communal identity structures, urban foundations, and legal pluralism—continues to influence the political and administrative cultures of many post-Ottoman Balkan states. While modern nation-states have often distanced themselves from this imperial past, its foundational logics remain embedded in the region's governance imaginaries and institutional practices.

The Habsburg Administrative Framework in the Balkans

The Habsburg Monarchy's expansion into the Balkans following its territorial acquisitions from the Ottoman Empire in the late 17th and early 18th centuries marked the beginning of a deliberate project of administrative centralization and bureaucratic consolidation. In contrast to the Ottoman model of decentralized governance and confessional pluralism, Habsburg rule sought to impose a uniform state architecture across a highly diverse imperial realm. This process was driven by both pragmatic state-building imperatives and Enlightenment rationalism, particularly under the reigns of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, whose reformist agendas aimed at restructuring provincial administration, law, and education in line with absolutist modernization ideals (Judson, 2016: 108–110).

Central to this transformation was the standardization of governance across the monarchy's newly acquired southeastern provinces. Administrative reforms weakened the traditional power of local estates, abolished many feudal privileges, and introduced hierarchical, professionalized bureaucracies answerable directly to the imperial center in Vienna. German was institutionalized as the primary language of administration, which facilitated bureaucratic coherence but alienated non-Germanic populations (Ingrao, 2000: 146–149). These policies were most extensively implemented in Croatia-Slavonia, the Kingdom of Dalmatia, and the Military Frontier (*Militärgrenze*), each of which experienced different degrees of integration into the Habsburg bureaucratic order. The Military Frontier, a militarized zone governed separately from civilian authorities, became a particularly stark example of direct imperial oversight, governed through military chains of command and serving as a buffer zone against perceived Ottoman threats.

Institutional modernization included the introduction of population censuses, cadastral mapping, and rationalized tax collection systems. These reforms dramatically increased state infrastructural power and fiscal capacity but simultaneously eroded traditional forms of local autonomy. The imposition of standardized legal

and bureaucratic norms often clashed with entrenched local practices and identities, producing tensions that would later fuel nationalist mobilization, particularly among Slavic populations in the empire's southern and eastern peripheries (Deák, 1990: 63–66). As such, the Habsburg administration was both a vehicle for modernization and a catalyst for ethno-political conflict.

Legal codification was a core pillar of the Habsburg administrative logic. Efforts to replace customary and plural legal systems with universal, rationalized codes culminated in the *Codex Theresianus* and, later, the *Allgemeines Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch* (ABGB), which aimed to enshrine a civil law tradition applicable across the monarchy (Judson, 2016: 145–147). These codes reflected the Enlightenment belief in law as a neutral, universal framework for adjudicating rights and obligations. In Balkan territories such as Transylvania and Croatia, however, these reforms encountered resistance due to longstanding legal pluralism rooted in Roman, Hungarian, and customary traditions. Despite such friction, Habsburg authorities pressed forward with a model of legal subjecthood grounded in individual rights, secular authority, and hierarchical adjudication—concepts largely alien to the communal and discretionary legal traditions inherited from Ottoman rule.

Religious governance under Habsburg administration differed fundamentally from the Ottoman *millet* system. Rather than institutionalizing religious pluralism through communal autonomy, Habsburg rulers, particularly Joseph II, pursued a policy of ecclesiastical integration and confessional homogenization. Josephinist reforms subordinated church authority to the state and privileged Roman Catholicism as the ideological cornerstone of imperial identity (Ingrao, 2000: 174–176). In regions with significant Orthodox or Muslim populations—such as Bosnia, Dalmatia, and parts of Croatia—this policy produced alienation and, at times, open resistance. The Serbian Orthodox Metropolitanate of Karlovci, though recognized by the state, was instrumentalized as a vehicle for imperial surveillance and control. Confessional policies also permeated symbolic and material domains, with religious education, public iconography, and institutional architecture reflecting the state's attempt to produce a Catholic-imperial civic ethos (Jelavich, 1983: 89–91).

Education was another foundational tool for fostering administrative uniformity and political loyalty. Under Maria Theresa's school ordinances and subsequent Josephinist reforms, the Habsburg state expanded secular education, trained teachers in state curricula, and sought to inculcate imperial loyalty through instruction in the German language and Enlightenment values (Deák, 1990: 88–90). These

reforms aimed to replace ecclesiastical and vernacular education with state-centered models. Yet, in multilingual regions, this policy proved deeply ambivalent. While it succeeded in creating a literate, administratively capable elite aligned with imperial authority, it also equipped these elites with the linguistic and historical tools to articulate nationalist agendas. Croatian, Slovenian, and Romanian intellectuals, for instance, repurposed state-sponsored education to mobilize ethnic consciousness, draft historical narratives, and challenge the homogenizing pressures of imperial rule (Judson, 2016: 162–165).

Cultural institutions—including museums, academies, and historical societies—were likewise mobilized to shape imperial identity. While officially framed as embodiments of enlightened cosmopolitanism, these institutions became contested spaces where competing national histories were constructed and disseminated. In the Balkan provinces, these arenas often reflected the double bind of Habsburg governance: an aspiration to forge imperial unity through modernization, coupled with the reality of entrenched cultural heterogeneity and increasing national assertiveness. In sum, the Habsburg administrative framework in the Balkans combined rationalization, centralization, and modernization with cultural assimilation and confessional regulation. Its strengths lay in its ability to create standardized legal and bureaucratic structures that undergird many contemporary governance systems in the region. However, its limitations were equally pronounced: it often failed to accommodate local diversity in a meaningful way and, in doing so, inadvertently seeded the very nationalist movements that would later undermine imperial cohesion. The legacy of Habsburg administration thus resides not only in institutional blueprints and legal codices, but also in the cultural contradictions, political tensions, and identity negotiations that continue to shape the post-imperial trajectories of Southeastern Europe.

Comparative Analysis of Ottoman and Habsburg Governance

The Ottoman and Habsburg empires embodied divergent models of imperial rule. The Ottoman system relied on decentralized, pluralistic governance rooted in local autonomy, religious communities, and patrimonial authority (Barkey, 2008: 75–78). Provincial governance functioned through negotiated authority, often with significant local discretion. In contrast, the Habsburg Empire, particularly from the 18th century onward, advanced a centralized, bureaucratic model, emphasizing codified law, fiscal discipline, and administrative standardization, especially under

Maria Theresa and Joseph II (Ingrao, 2000: 115–117). These differing logics shaped imperial cohesion and state capacity. The Ottoman approach enabled religious coexistence and adaptable governance but struggled with enforcement and fiscal consistency. Habsburg administration promoted predictability and integration but often provoked resistance in its multiethnic provinces (Judson, 2016: 122–124). Ottoman legitimacy was built on patronage and communal loyalty; Habsburg authority emphasized legal-rational governance, shaping contrasting public cultures.

Religion played a defining role in both systems. The Ottomans institutionalized religious diversity through the *millet* system, granting autonomy to non-Muslim communities (Barkey, 2008: 106–110). Conversely, the Habsburgs promoted Catholicism as a hegemonic faith while tolerating others under state oversight, particularly after the 1781 Patent of Toleration (Judson, 2016: 178–180). These models had long-term consequences: Ottoman governance reinforced communal solidarities, while Habsburg policies fostered more standardized civic identities—albeit through coercive assimilation. Today, these legacies are visible in differing approaches to religious freedom, church-state relations, and minority rights across Southeastern Europe.

Bureaucratic recruitment also reflected distinct imperial visions. The Ottomans relied on the *devşirme* and *kul* system, creating a loyal elite detached from local roots (İnalcık, 1973: 201–204). The Habsburgs increasingly drew bureaucrats from educated local populations, fostering a professional civil service and enabling elite integration, particularly among urban minorities (Judson, 2016: 132–134). While the Ottoman model limited local advancement, the Habsburg approach cultivated administrative professionalism and secular bureaucratic norms—differences still echoed in public sector structures today.

Land tenure and taxation offer further contrasts. The Ottoman *timar* system granted land in exchange for military service, with the state retaining ultimate ownership and relying on intermediaries (İnalcık, 1973: 145–147). The Habsburgs, especially after 18th-century reforms, implemented direct taxation, cadastral surveys, and legal titles. Reforms like the Hungarian *urbarial laws* converted feudal dues into cash rents (Ingrao, 2000: 165–167). These divergent property regimes shaped rural economies, agrarian relations, and continue to inform contemporary land governance, with clearer cadastres in former Habsburg areas and more fragmented tenures in post-Ottoman regions.

Urban form and legal culture also diverged. Ottoman cities were structured around religious institutions and communal neighborhoods (*mahalles*), reflecting social

segmentation (İnalcık, 1973: 119–122). Habsburg urbanism prioritized zoning, infrastructure, and civic monumentalism (Judson, 2016: 140–144). Legally, the Ottoman Empire maintained pluralism—balancing Sharia, imperial decrees, and custom—whereas the Habsburgs moved toward codified, secular legal systems influenced by Enlightenment rationalism (Ingrao, 2000: 172–175). These legacies persist in legal culture: post-Habsburg societies tend to exhibit stronger adherence to formal legal norms and secularism, while post-Ottoman contexts retain more legal pluralism and informality.

Finally, heritage and memory reflect these imperial imprints. In public narratives, Habsburg legacies are often associated with European modernity and institutional sophistication, while Ottoman architecture and traditions are variably celebrated or marginalized, depending on national identity politics. Thus, beyond governance, imperial legacies continue to shape institutional practices, urban aesthetics, and civic imaginaries in the Balkans. Table 1 presents a comparative analytical framework for examining the distinctive administrative styles of the Ottoman and Habsburg empires as manifested in the governance structures of the Balkans.

Table 1.

Ottoman vs. Habsburg Administrative Styles in the Balkans

Dimension	Ottoman Empire	Habsburg Empire
Governance Model	Decentralized, negotiated pluralism (millet system, local autonomy)	Centralized, codified bureaucracy with structured hierarchy
Legal System	Pluralistic (Sharia, Kanun, customary law) with community-specific jurisdictions	Uniform civil and criminal law under imperial codifications
Religious Governance	Millet autonomy granted to religious communities	Catholic confessional hegemony with regulated toleration of others
Bureaucratic Personnel	Patrimonial, devşirme-based elite recruitment; military-administrative fusion	Professionalized civil service with career ladders and legal qualification
Land Tenure and Taxation	Timar system (military-feudal obligations); informal revenue farming common	Cadastral land surveys; state peasant reforms (e.g., Urbarial Patent)

Dimension	Ottoman Empire	Habsburg Empire
Urban Governance and Planning	Organic, functional urbanism with guild control and religious zoning	Rationalist, geometric urban planning with infrastructural investment
Local Autonomy	Strong in practice (e.g., ayans, janissary cities), often informal	Limited, formally regulated through imperial decrees and supervisory bodies
Civic Identity and Belonging	Communal belonging over imperial identity	Gradual civic identity formation through imperial citizenship reforms
Mechanism of Legitimacy	Dynastic-religious legitimacy (Caliph-Sultan); symbolic sovereignty	Legal-rational legitimacy (laws, reforms, bureaucracy) under monarchic rule
Administrative Rationality	Customary, pragmatic, informal	Rule-bound, document-driven, formalistic

Enduring Legacies in Contemporary Southeastern Europe

The administrative legacies of the Ottoman and Habsburg empires continue to shape governance across Southeastern Europe. These divergent imperial trajectories have produced distinct institutional patterns, evident in state organization, legal enforcement, and bureaucratic culture. Former Habsburg territories—such as Slovenia and Croatia—tend to exhibit greater bureaucratic coherence, legal formalism, and fiscal discipline (Brusis, 2005: 292–295). In contrast, post-Ottoman states like Bosnia and North Macedonia often rely more on informal institutions, patronage networks, and fragmented legal frameworks (Elbasani, 2009: 260–263).

These variations reflect historical path dependencies rather than deterministic outcomes. Habsburg rule fostered hierarchical professionalism and centralized authority, while the Ottoman system emphasized local autonomy and negotiated governance. These embedded administrative norms continue to shape public expectations of state behavior. They also influence the adoption of European Union governance standards, with Habsburg-influenced states typically aligning more rapidly with EU acquis requirements. Table 2 systematically compares the administrative legacies of Ottoman and Habsburg governance in the Balkans, elucidating their divergent institutional logics and long-term implications for state formation and bureaucratic development.

Table 2.

Administrative Legacies of Ottoman and Habsburg Rule in the Balkans

Legacy Dimension	Ottoman Legacy	Habsburg Legacy
Public Administration Culture	Informality, clientelism, negotiated authority	Rule-based, hierarchical, and procedural governance
Legal System	Legal pluralism (religious courts, customary law)	Codified civil law, continuity with Austro-Hungarian legal codes
Religious Governance and Tolerance	Confessional pluralism; autonomous religious communities (millets)	Confessional regulation; Catholic dominance with toleration under state control
Bureaucratic Structure	Weak institutional continuity; patrimonial appointments	Strong institutional memory; merit-based bureaucracy
Corruption and Accountability	Personalized governance, limited oversight	Formal accountability, bureaucratic supervision
Municipal Autonomy	Guilds and religious endowments controlled urban affairs	Structured municipal governance; local councils integrated into central state
Urban Morphology and Infrastructure	Organic city growth; limited public infrastructure planning	Grid-planned towns; emphasis on transport, sanitation, public buildings
Judicial Practices	Communal justice; limited appeal mechanisms	Layered court systems; appeal rights and legal recourse established
Education and Civil Service Training	Religious schooling dominated; no standardized civil service training	Imperial academies and law schools; bureaucratic education systems

Legacy Dimension	Ottoman Legacy	Habsburg Legacy
Citizen-State Relations	Subject-based, indirect, often communal relationships	Direct civic engagement with state through legal frameworks and institutions
Minority Rights Legacy	Recognition of identity groups, but within hierarchical order	Early development of equality discourses, especially post-1867
Transition to Modern Statehood	Fragmented, uneven modernization; reliance on religious institutions	Stronger continuity into 20th-century state structures (especially in Croatia, Slovenia)

Imperial legacies continue to shape governance, legal culture, and identity in Southeastern Europe. The divergent administrative traditions of the Ottoman and Habsburg empires have produced persistent institutional path dependencies, visible in state organization, public trust, and EU accession trajectories. In former Habsburg territories, law has long been viewed as a rational tool of governance—formal, codified, and professionally administered (Ingrao, 2000: 172–175; Judson, 2016: 182–184). By contrast, post-Ottoman regions inherited a pluralistic legal culture, where Sharia, kanun, and customary law coexisted (Barkey & von Benda-Beckmann, 2013: 8–10). These differences influence public trust in the judiciary: formalism and proceduralism dominate in Croatia or Slovenia, while informality and mediation remain common in Bosnia or Kosovo. Legal Europeanization has progressed more rapidly in Habsburg-influenced states, while post-Ottoman ones often struggle with judicial fragmentation and limited engagement with formal courts.

The Ottoman *millet* system institutionalized religious communalism, fostering durable but sectarian identities (Barkey, 2008: 106–112). In contrast, the Habsburg model promoted secular, territorial identities through administrative integration and education, though often in tension with ethnic nationalism (Jelavich, 1983: 117–119). These legacies continue to shape political institutions: Bosnia's consociationalism echoes Ottoman pluralism, while Croatia's unitary governance reflects Habsburg administrative centralism. Institutional path dependency is evident in state capacity and administrative culture. Former Habsburg areas (e.g., Slovenia, Vojvodina) retain Weberian traditions: merit-based recruitment, rule-bound bureaucracy, and centralized oversight (Judson, 2016: 162–165). Post-Ottoman

systems remain more fragmented, personalized, and clientelist, reflecting historical patterns of delegated authority and elite mediation (Inalcık, 1973: 185–187; Elbasani, 2009: 260–263). These divergences affect responsiveness to external reforms—Habsburg-style systems adapt more readily to EU standards; Ottoman-derived administrations often require context-sensitive approaches.

Urban form also bears imperial marks. Ottoman cities (e.g., Sarajevo, Skopje) feature organic layouts and religious centers, reflecting communal and inward-facing spatial logic (Inalcık, 1973: 119–122). Habsburg urbanism emphasizes civic monumentalism, zoning, and rational design (Judson, 2016: 140–144). These patterns persist in planning institutions and public space governance. In heritage discourse, Habsburg architecture is often valorized, while Ottoman heritage is either marginalized or politically contested—though inclusive conservation efforts are increasingly reshaping this landscape (Barkey, 2008: 118–120).

Both empires managed religious diversity, but through distinct mechanisms. Ottoman governance institutionalized communal autonomy, while the Habsburgs promoted religious tolerance within a unified civic framework (Judson, 2016: 178–182). These legacies influence current models of minority rights: Bosnia reflects Ottoman-style consociational pluralism, whereas Croatia and Slovenia exhibit more individualized, secular rights regimes. The Ottoman absence of secular institutions delayed modern statehood in places like Albania or Kosovo, while Habsburg regions benefited from early bureaucratization and nationalist education. Bosnia's complex consociationalism mirrors overlapping imperial inheritances. Serbia reflects a hybrid path, balancing centralism and pluralism. Croatia, leveraging its Habsburg legacy, aligns more closely with EU governance standards (Ingrao, 2000: 179–181; Jelavich, 1983: 117–119).

Ottoman and Habsburg legacies continue to inform administrative performance, legal reform, urban identity, and political culture across the Balkans. While Habsburg traditions generally foster greater institutional continuity and legal formalism, Ottoman legacies underpin communalism, informality, and negotiation-based governance. Recognizing these histories is essential for designing effective reform strategies, aligning with EU standards, and promoting post-conflict reconciliation. Rather than remnants of the past, imperial inheritances remain embedded in the present, shaping the contours of Southeast European governance (Table 3).

Table 3:

Endurance of Imperial Administrative Legacies

Criterion	**Ottoman Legacy (e.g., Bosnia, Albania)**	**Habsburg Legacy (e.g., Croatia, Slovenia)**	**Which Shows Greater Endurance?**
Institutional Continuity	Fragmented, informal	Structured, centralized	Habsburg
Legal Culture	Pluralist, personalized	Codified, rule-bound	Habsburg
Bureaucratic Professionalism	Patronage-based	Career-based	Habsburg
Urban Governance	Communal/religious endowments	Municipal-civic	Habsburg
Minority Management	Millet system	Confessional supervision with equality claims	Ottoman (for pluralism)
State Legitimacy	Dynastic-symbolic	Rational-legal	Habsburg
Citizen Trust in State Institutions	Low to moderate	Moderate to high	Habsburg
Political Behavior	Clientelist, factional	Civic, party-oriented	Habsburg

While both empires have left enduring administrative footprints, the Habsburg legacy exhibits greater resilience in shaping modern bureaucratic norms, legal expectations, and civic infrastructures. Its emphasis on proceduralism, public administration training, and institutional coherence provided a more transferable template for post-imperial state-building. This is especially evident in EU accession processes, where countries with Habsburg administrative heritage (e.g., Croatia, Slovenia) adapted more seamlessly to EU acquis communautaire, reflecting their compatibility with European norms of legality, transparency, and governance. The Ottoman legacy, by contrast, while valuable in promoting religious pluralism and local self-governance, bequeathed a more fragmented and informal state apparatus. This has complicated post-communist transitions, especially where institutions are expected to act autonomously from political patronage—a legacy difficult to overcome without major cultural shifts.

Evaluation: Assessing the Legacy of Imperial Governance Models

The governance structures of contemporary Southeastern Europe cannot be fully understood without a critical engagement with the enduring legacies of Ottoman and Habsburg rule. These empires, which administered the Balkan Peninsula for centuries through fundamentally different administrative logics, have left behind more than mere institutional relics. They have bequeathed what might be termed governance habitus—deeply ingrained dispositions, norms, and relational patterns through which citizens engage with authority, law, and the state apparatus. The comparative legacy of these imperial formations continues to shape institutional performance, legal behavior, state legitimacy, and reform trajectories in the region.

The Ottoman Empire governed through a system of decentralized pluralism. Authority was dispersed across multiple layers—sultanic, provincial, and communal—enabling negotiated rule and accommodating the region's ethnic and religious heterogeneity. The *millet* system institutionalized confessional autonomy, allowing religious communities a significant degree of self-governance in matters such as education, personal law, and social welfare (Barkey, 2008: 106–110). This pluralism proved adaptive for managing diversity and minimizing overt conflict in multi-ethnic settings. However, it also inhibited the emergence of unified civic identities and a standardized legal-administrative system. The Ottoman preference for delegated authority and local mediation over bureaucratic penetration led to a governance environment that prized flexibility over predictability, and informal consensus over formal rule-making.

By contrast, the Habsburg Empire pursued a rationalized and centralized governance model. Grounded in Enlightenment ideals and absolutist state-building, it sought to replace fragmented legal and administrative traditions with a unified bureaucratic framework. Through codified law, standardized procedures, and a professional civil service, the Habsburgs introduced administrative uniformity that fostered a shared understanding of public authority and rule-bound behavior (Judson, 2016: 140–144). This system, though often coercive in its imposition, laid the groundwork for modern legalism, merit-based bureaucracy, and civic trust in the institutional integrity of the state. It also cultivated a normative orientation toward procedural justice and public accountability—elements largely absent in Ottoman-influenced territories.

Yet, neither imperial legacy is free from critique. Ottoman governance's reliance on local notables and communal elites fostered patron-client relations that persist today in the form of politicized administrations, weak judicial enforcement, and widespread informality. Habsburg centralization, though effective in building state capacity, was often resented in peripheral regions, where it was viewed as culturally homogenizing and politically repressive (Ingrao, 2000: 165–167). Moreover, the administrative rationality it promoted, while technically efficient, could become unresponsive to local cultural forms of legitimacy and social cohesion. In short, both traditions offer resources and risks for contemporary governance.

The path-dependent nature of these legacies is most visible in the realm of public administration. Former Habsburg territories such as Slovenia, northern Croatia, and Vojvodina tend to display stronger bureaucratic institutionalization, legal compliance, and capacity for procedural governance. Their administrative cultures align more easily with the European Union's acquis communautaire, facilitating smoother convergence in areas such as civil service reform, regulatory oversight, and anti-corruption frameworks. Conversely, in post-Ottoman territories such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, and Kosovo, informal governance practices, ethno-political bargaining, and overlapping jurisdictions often impede the consistent implementation of reforms (Brusis, 2005).

Crucially, these divergences are not simply legacies of the past but active frameworks of perception and practice. Citizens socialized in Ottoman-influenced regions may view the state less as a neutral arbiter and more as a negotiable actor embedded within networks of reciprocity and group loyalty. This affects everything from how laws are followed and contested, to how bureaucrats are recruited and public goods are allocated. In turn, this shapes the design and outcomes of institutional reform efforts. For example, anti-corruption measures that assume individual compliance with universal rules may falter in environments where collective identity and relational trust override formal legality.

European Union–driven reform programs often assume a Weberian model of public administration—rule-bound, impersonal, and procedurally consistent. This model resonates well with the institutional inheritance of Habsburg governance, where the rule of law and bureaucratic neutrality were historically embedded. In Ottoman-influenced regions, however, the imposition of this model can produce resistance or superficial compliance, as it clashes with localized expectations of governance based on mediation, discretion, and communal representation. Reforms premised on uniformity thus risk reproducing structural exclusions and

legitimacy deficits if they ignore the historically contingent foundations of public authority.

Nevertheless, imperial legacies also offer constructive resources for reimagining governance in plural societies. The Ottoman *millet* system, for all its limitations, provided a historically grounded mechanism for managing religious diversity within a single polity. In contexts such as Bosnia or North Macedonia—where ethnic pluralism remains deeply entrenched—elements of institutional pluralism inspired by this model may inform the development of power-sharing mechanisms, communal representation structures, or decentralized legal arrangements that protect group rights while sustaining national cohesion. These adaptations must, of course, be critically assessed and reframed within contemporary democratic standards to avoid reifying sectarianism.

Similarly, the Ottoman tradition of administrative decentralization—adapted to modern participatory frameworks—may provide a useful counterbalance to the alienation often caused by over-centralized governance. In this regard, Ottoman-inspired flexibility, when coupled with democratic accountability, can support hybrid institutional designs that combine localized responsiveness with national coordination. Habsburg legacies, in turn, continue to provide valuable templates for professionalized administration, regulatory predictability, and civic integration—assets that remain essential for consolidating democratic governance and sustaining EU alignment.

Thus, the optimal path for institutional transformation in Southeastern Europe lies not in privileging one imperial legacy over another, but in strategically synthesizing their respective strengths. A hybrid model that integrates Ottoman pluralism and local legitimacy with Habsburg proceduralism and institutional coherence may offer the most viable framework for inclusive, resilient, and democratically grounded governance. This would require not only policy innovation but also a profound rethinking of reform paradigms—away from transplant models and toward historically attuned, culturally embedded approaches.

Conclusion: Rethinking Governance Through Imperial Legacies

The comparative analysis of Ottoman and Habsburg governance in the Balkans reveals that imperial rule did not merely impose administrative structures—it generated enduring political cultures, legal epistemologies, and modes of state-society interaction that continue to shape contemporary institutional realities. Far from

being historical residues, these imperial legacies constitute living frameworks that inform public administration, legal behavior, identity formation, and reform trajectories across Southeastern Europe.

The Ottoman model, rooted in negotiated authority, legal pluralism, and communal autonomy, cultivated flexibility and adaptability in ethnically and religiously diverse contexts. However, its reliance on informality and delegated governance produced fragmented administrative systems, which continue to manifest in contemporary challenges such as clientelism, legal inconsistency, and weak institutional accountability. Conversely, the Habsburg emphasis on codification, bureaucratic rationalization, and legal uniformity contributed to the consolidation of rule-bound governance, but often at the cost of excluding ethno-linguistic minorities and provoking nationalist backlash.

These divergent traditions have engendered distinct institutional path dependencies. States with Habsburg administrative heritage—such as Slovenia, Croatia, and parts of northern Serbia—tend to exhibit stronger bureaucratic coherence, legal formalism, and alignment with EU governance norms. Post-Ottoman states—such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and Albania—often display institutional hybridity, decentralized authority, and enduring communal segmentation. While neither trajectory is deterministic, each creates specific constraints and opportunities for institutional reform, democratization, and European integration.

Crucially, the analysis underscores that contemporary governance reform cannot succeed through technocratic transplantation alone. EU-driven reforms that prioritize procedural homogeneity must be re-calibrated to account for historically embedded administrative cultures. In this respect, Ottoman decentralization and legal pluralism—when critically adapted—may offer normative resources for inclusive governance in plural societies, just as Habsburg legacies continue to support formalized legal systems and administrative capacity-building.

Rather than viewing the Ottoman and Habsburg legacies as antithetical, a more productive approach lies in synthesizing their respective strengths through institutional hybridization. Governance models that combine the procedural integrity of Habsburg rule with the pluralist flexibility of Ottoman administration may better address the democratic deficits, ethno-political tensions, and administrative fragmentation characteristic of the region. This requires not only historical awareness but also political creativity and normative commitment to inclusive, adaptive governance.

Ultimately, Southeastern Europe's administrative futures cannot be disentangled from its imperial pasts. Acknowledging the layered inheritances of empire—rather than suppressing or romanticizing them—provides a more grounded basis for institutional design, regional cooperation, and conflict mitigation. In this light, imperial legacies are not simply historical contingencies but active variables in the evolving political landscape of the Balkans. They offer both analytical insight and normative guidance for scholars, policymakers, and reformers seeking a more plural, resilient, and democratic Southeastern Europe.

References

Barkey, K. (2008). *Empire of Difference: The Ottomans in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge University Press

Barkey, K. (2013). "Aspects of Legal Pluralism in the Ottoman Empire." In L. Benton & R. J. Ross (Eds.), *Legal Pluralism and Empires, 1500–1850* (pp. 81–108). NYU Press

Brusis, M. (2005). The instrumental use of European Union conditionality: Regionalization in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. *East European Politics and Societies*, 19(2).

Deák, I. (1990). *Beyond nationalism: A social and political history of the Habsburg officer corps, 1848–1918*. Oxford University Press.

Elbasani, A. (2008). EU enlargement in the Western Balkans: Strategies of borrowing and inventing. *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans 10(3)*

Elbasani, A. (2009). EU administrative conditionality and domestic downloading: the limits of europeanization in challenging contexts. (KFG Working Paper Series, 2). Freie Universität Berlin, FB Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften, Otto-Suhr-Institut für Politikwissenschaft Kolleg-Forschergruppe "The Transformative Power of Europe". https://nbnresolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-365633

İnalcık, H. (1973). *The Ottoman Empire: The classical age, 1300–1600*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Ingrao, C. (2000). *The Habsburg monarchy, 1618–1815*. Cambridge University Press.

Jelavich, B. (1983). *History of the Balkans: Vol. 2. Twentieth century*. Cambridge University Press.

Judson, P. M. (2016). *The Habsburg Empire: A new history*. Harvard University Press.

Shusharova, M. (2017). Local Elites and Communities in the Management of Public Order During The 18th Century: Perceptions from the Core European Territories of the Ottoman Empire. Tudes Balkaniques, LIII, 2017, 3

Subotić, J. (2021). *Yellow star, red star: Holocaust remembrance after communism*. Cornell University Press.