Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia

Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology

The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945–1991

Edited by Aleksandar Bošković and Chris Hann



LIT

The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945-1991

Anthropologists, specialists in the social production of knowledge, need also to be aware of how knowledge has been produced within their own academic field, broadly construed. Continuing a series of publications focusing on the former Soviet Bloc, this volume examines the cases of Greece, Albania, and Yugoslavia in the second half of the last century. Significant political-ideological constraints were imposed in all three states during at least part of the period examined. These restricted scholarly freedoms, without ever eliminating altogether the scope for individual academic creativity. The chapters of this book, many of which draw explicitly on personal experiences of 'insider' authors, provide rich detail concerning a region which has long been long stereotyped as marginal, both to the history of the discipline and to the history of Europe.

In much of south-east Europe, the definition of key terms remains contested: does 'anthropology' enter the scene as an activity undertaken by foreigners, or have indigenous scholars, variously known as (native) ethnographers, ethnologists, or folklorists, been ploughing basically the same furrows all along? Should the diverse plots of the anthropological field be harvested jointly or separately? Are the frictions between them deeply grounded in epistemology, or might they nowadays have more to do with factional competition for resources?

To begin to answer these questions, highly topical in many parts of Europe, it is essential to know the conditions in which knowledge was produced in the decades of the Cold War. Socialist dogmas had a significant impact on intellectual life in Yugoslavia, especially in the 1950s, though circumstances improved later and contacts with Western researchers gradually improved. Ideological factors and political interference were more severe in Albania, where earlier pioneering studies by Westerners could not be continued. By contrast, many Western anthropologists undertook field research in Greece, and numerous young Greeks studied abroad, while carrying out field projects in their homeland.

Despite these major differences, the volume also brings out important commonalities. From Athens to Ljubljana, and at all the less liberal locations in between, the anthropological field was strongly influenced by the political climate. Besides the cleavages of left and right, there was a deep-seated assumption that, irrespective of their labels, scholars were documenting a *national* heritage. Even when focusing on regional or localised variants, the national framing was highly valued and found resonance in a wider public. This normative background complicates recent debates about the unequal influence of different centres of anthropological knowledge and the problem of hegemonic languages. The Balkans are an instructive setting in which to explore multiple tensions found in many other parts of the world, not only between local and foreign researchers, but also between those locals who have had exposure to the dominant traditions (nowadays mainly English-speaking) and those who lack these advantages.



Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia

General Editors:

Christoph Brumann, Chris Hann, Thomas Hauschild, Burkhard Schnepel

Volume 29

LIT

Aleksandar Bošković and Chris Hann (eds.)

The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945 – 1991

LIT

https://doi.org/10.52038/978-3643-90507-9

Made available under a CC BY-NC-ND 4. license.

Cover: Outline of the region, from north-west to south-east: Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Albania, Macedonia, Greece (Design by Jutta Turner) (base map: http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/Europe/Europe_ref_2012.pdf; accessed 25 Nov 2013).

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

ISBN 978-3-643-90507-9

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

©LIT VERLAG GmbH & Co. KG Wien,
Zweigniederlassung Zürich 2013
Klosbachstr. 107
CH-8032 Zürich
Tel. +41 (0) 44-251 75 05
Fax +41 (0) 44-251 75 06
E-Mail: zuerich@lit-verlag.ch
http://www.lit-verlag.ch

LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf
Berlin 2013
Fresnostr. 2
D-48159 Münster
Tel. +49 (0) 2 51-62 03 20
Fax +49 (0) 2 51-23 19 72
E-Mail: lit@lit-verlag.de
http://www.lit-verlag.de

Contents

	Preface and Acknowledgements	vii
	Notes on Transliteration	ix
1	Introduction: Nations and Nationalism, Societies and Socialism, Fields and Wars *Chris Hann*	1
2	From 'National' to 'Social Science': Politics, Ideology, and Disciplinary Formation in Greek Anthropology from the 1940s till the 1980s *Evthymios Papataxiarchis*	31
3	Multiple Encounters: Attempts to Introduce Anthropology in Greece during the 1940s-1960s *Georgios Agelopoulos*	65
4	Folklore in Greece (1945-1991): The Political Dimension of its Orientation and Institutionalisation *Vassilis Nitsiakos*	85
5	Folklore Theory and Practice in Greece, 1945-1991: The Contribution of the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre of the Academy of Athens *Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou*	97
6	Albanian Ethnography at the Margins of History 1947-1991: Documenting the Nation in Historical Materialist Terms *Armanda Kodra–Hysa*	129
7	Folkloric Archaism and Cultural Manipulation in Albania under Socialism *Albert Doja*	153
8	The Ethnography of Law in a Dictatorial Situation *Nebi Bardhoshi*	175

9 Disciplinary Continuities and Breaches: Contested Issues in Slovenian Ethnology in the Socialist Era 191
Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik

10 On the Work and Activity of Prof. Stane Južnič: Or, How and When Socio-Cultural and Political Anthropology Were Initiated in Slovenia 223
Vesna V. Godina

11 In Women's Arms: Croatian Ethnology between 1945 and 1990 237
Sanja Potkonjak

12 Croatian Biological Anthropology in the Socialist Period 259
Irena Martinović Klarić

13 Between Folklore, Geography, and Ethno-Nationalism: Ethnology in Macedonia During and After Socialism 273
Ljupčo S. Risteski and Rozita Dimova

14 'Croquis' of Ethnology in Montenegro 293
Lidija Vujačić

15 Cataloguing Tradition in a Socialist Republic: Ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1945-1990 305
Larisa Kurtović

16 An Anthropological Apprenticeship among Slovenes – From 'Behind God's Back' to the Schengen Frontier 341
Robert Gary Minnich

17 Afterword: Words and Things, Ethnologies and Anthropologies 359
Aleksandar Bošković

Contributors 367

Index 369

Preface and Acknowledgements

This book is based on the conference 'The Rise of Anthropology "on the Margins of Europe", 1945-1991' we organised together at the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology on 9-10 March 2011. This meeting was a continuation of a long-term effort at the MPI to map the changes and challenges in anthropological theory and practice throughout the postsocialist world between the end of the Second World War and the alleged 'end of history' symbolised by the fall of the Berlin Wall and the subsequent disintegration of socialism throughout eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. In retrospect this was not quite the end of history, but these dramatic events did arguably signal the end of an era, both in political and in epistemological terms.

This meeting broke new ground in covering the nation-states of Greece and Albania, where the MPI has had no research projects to date. We faced the problem that, like the other socialist federations (USSR and CSSR), Yugoslavia did not survive the demise of socialism. Serbia was covered in a previous volume. In this collection attention is paid to at least some corners of the anthropological field in the new political entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Slovenia. We regret that efforts to include a paper on Kosovo did not come to fruition. The final version of this book does not include all the contributions presented at the conference, while some new ones have been commissioned. Many papers have been considerably changed following the conversations at the meeting and later correspondence with the editors. We are grateful to all who have participated in these exchanges over the last two years. As readers will see, the conversations have not led to a facile consensus, but they have, we hope, facilitated a better understanding of different points of view. What more could one ask for? Perhaps this is the only 'bottom line' on which the practitioners of very different kinds of anthropology can agree.

The success of the Halle meeting owed much to the contributions of a number of colleagues who took part as discussants and chaired sessions. For acting in this capacity, we are very grateful to Pamela Ballinger, Andre Gingrich, Hannes Grandits, Miladina Monova, Klaus Roth, Michaela Schäuble, and Stefan Troebst. As always, the organisation of Bettina Mann, Anke Meyer, and Berit Westwood was excellent.

Berit Westwood has prepared this complex text for the publisher with her accustomed professionalism. Jutta Turner provided an expert rendition of the maps and Dimitra Kofti helped out with Greek orthography. Robert Minnich offered constructive comments on several chapters on the basis of his careful proof reading. Last but not least, it is a pleasure to acknowledge

the extensive inputs of Jennifer Cash, whose work on the manuscript has gone far beyond the normal duties of the language and copy editor.

Aleksandar Bošković and Chris Hann

Notes on Transliteration

The transliteration of words and names from Macedonian, Russian, and former Serbo-Croatian has been made according to a simplified version of the Library of Congress system (i.e. without ligatures).

The rendering of Greek words and names into English equivalents has proved considerably more difficult. Many of the individuals and institutions described in the following chapters are already well known under names that would be rendered differently by the standards of ELOT 743, the system currently followed by the Greek state in issuing international passports. In such cases, like that of Stilpon Kyriakides (whose surname would otherwise be spelled *Kyriakidis*), we have kept the better-known spelling. In translating the names of institutions, academic societies, and publications, we have also generally used the official English translations (e.g. National Centre for Social Research or the Hellenic Folklore Society), even if literal translations might differ. When official English versions do not exist, we have preferred to translate Ελληνική as *Greek* rather than *Hellenic* (e.g. Greek Archaeological Society). One final difficulty occurs with the transliteration of the Greek letter φ. It has generally been transliterated with *f*, but the older *ph* version has been kept where it would otherwise cause confusion, such as in *philology*. Our preference for the use of *f* in *laografia*, and even occasionally, *filologia*, calls attention to the specificities of the discipline as it is practised in Greece.

Chapter 1
Introduction: Nations and Nationalism, Societies and Socialism, Fields and Wars

Chris Hann

The diversity of the anthropological field

When asked to specify his field, Max Weber is said to have protested that he was not a donkey and did not have a field. This quip appears to be a fabrication, widely disseminated through the internet in recent years, but there is no doubting the extraordinary range of Weber's scholarship. Yet a century ago Weber worked tirelessly to institutionalise the new discipline of sociology, and it is nowadays uncontroversial to classify him as a great (historical) sociologist. Thus Weber may not have a field, but at least he has a discipline, the boundaries and content of which are more or less agreed internationally. Defining anthropology as a discipline is a little more complicated.

In the series of which this volume is a continuation, we have explored and problematised different ways of producing knowledge within a very broadly constituted field which we label anthropology, subsuming subjects which carry names such as folklore, ethnography, and ethnology, all of which may mean different things in different times and places. This strategy (see Hann, Sárkány and Skalnik 2005) does not privilege any one patch of the field. I know enough about the shortcomings of socialist agricultural policies to reject collectivisation of these fragmented plots by some metropolitan monolith. Nor, in playing with this metaphor, do I wish to suggest that anthropological cultivators are somehow naturally more at home in a field than the urbane Max Weber. It simply seems to me the most practical way, in English language communication in the early twenty-first century, to approach the diversity we find in the countries whose research traditions interest us. Most socio-cultural research, including that of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, presupposes some familiarity with a broad field of locally generated scholarship rooted in a local past, even if our contemporary projects reflect different paradigms and seek to open up new plots, not previously ploughed by others.

This field is an extraordinary, preposterous terrain. One segment of anthropology (as 'the study of man'), which tends nowadays to be fenced off from other segments, investigates variation from the perspective of the biologically-given commonality of the human species, usually within the framework of evolutionary theory. This physical or biological anthropology is generally viewed by its practitioners as a natural science. It is represented in this collection by Irena Martinović Klarić's review of biological-medical anthropology in Croatia (chapter 12) and mentioned in passing by several other contributors. The classification of the segments generally labelled social or cultural anthropology is more problematic. Here, too, one might in principle proceed from a universalist perspective and claim the mantle of science. Why should socio-cultural diversity, for example in the ways human communities cope with uncertainty, be treated any differently from variation in blood groups or cranial proportions around the globe? Yet there *is* a difference, and as a result these plots of the anthropological field have come to be aligned not with the natural sciences but either with the social sciences or with the humanities.

A second complication, of great relevance to the studies collected in this volume, is the distinction between the academic endeavour that sets out to study human socio-cultural diversity comparatively on a global scale and that which focuses on just one segment of humanity, the investigator's own people, albeit documenting rich traditions of local and regional diversity within this people. The late George Stocking (1982) formulated this as a contrast between the expansive anthropology of European imperial powers and the introverted, nation-oriented anthropologies of small states which did not acquire territories overseas. The distinction is useful, though one needs to be cautious in deploying it. Russia was an imperial power where socio-cultural research developed within the boundaries of a contiguous, territorial state. Some countries cultivated both types of anthropology, notably Germany, where a distinction was drawn between *Völkerkunde* and *Volkskunde*. Boundaries were sometimes unclear. Some smaller European states exhibited a bias towards their titular nation, but did not exclude wider concerns altogether. For example, researchers might extend their purview to all Slavic peoples, or to distant peoples held to be somehow related to one's own, on linguistic or other grounds (this was the case with Hungarians, some of whom were very concerned to discover their relatives in distant parts of Europe and Asia).

Elsewhere, practical considerations led the 'metropolitan' anthropologists to focus on peoples governed by their state as the imperial power. More generally, they specialised in peoples who could be viewed as *Naturvölker*, remote from the civilisations of Europe and Asia. Large populations within

Eurasia, including non-literate peoples in remote parts of this vast landmass, were neglected. There was much talk of comparative methods, but the anthropologists of the European empires by and large left it to other scholars – to historians, and to sociologists such as Max Weber – to provide the data for Eurasia. As a result, the scope for myths and stereotypes to substitute for serious scholarly analysis was considerable. This was particularly the case in lands immediately adjacent to the self-confident West. Weber himself was a nationalist German who disparaged Prussia's Slavic neighbours. He paid more attention to distant Oriental religions than to eastern Christianity, which he dismissed as stagnant and ritualistic. The concept of Orientalism, developed by Edward Said primarily with respect to the Islamic world, can be extended to the Byzantine tradition within Christianity. It is pertinent to much of the territory of south-east Europe we cover in this book, epitomised in deprecating imaginings of 'the Balkans' by those who took it for granted that some Europeans were inherently superior to others (Todorova 1997). Foreign and native anthropologists alike have been complicit in mythologising and exoticising. For example, the extended household known as the *zadruga* generated a vast literature, much of which presents it as an ancient and pristine institution. Critics have repeatedly pointed out that it emerged under relatively recent political and economic conditions, and that the obsessive documentation of the *zadruga* as a 'traditional' form of family structure has impeded the development of other ethnographic perspectives on the nature of tradition itself, Balkan society, and gender relations (Rihtman-Auguštin 1984; Todorova 1989; cf. Delipaj forthcoming).

The yields of the various plots in the anthropological field are highly sensitive to the environment – to educational and cultural institutions, but also to developments outside the universities and Academies of Sciences. The impact of decolonisation on Anglophone socio-cultural anthropology has been extensively debated for several decades now, but the effects of the demise of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist socialism on anthropological knowledge production across a vast Eurasian space have not been studied in the same depth. The socialist countries of Eurasia never figured very prominently on the research agendas of the dominant metropolitan schools of comparative socio-cultural anthropology. But if anthropology, as the study of human socio-cultural diversity is to become more balanced and truly global, we need to situate the overseas empires of western European powers in wider contexts and recognise the extraordinary plurality of anthropological knowledge. For some purposes it may make sense to distinguish core centres from the periphery or margins, but we shall surely need to recognise diversity and hierarchy within these broad categories (Bošković 2008b).

The socialist era in eastern Europe deserves close attention as a case of more or less well developed nation-oriented traditions being abruptly subjected to an external, hegemonic model – not the bourgeois paradigms of structural-functionalism or cultural relativism, but another metropolitan paradigm, that of historical materialism and proletarian internationalism. Earlier volumes in this series have examined in detail how these tensions played out in different countries and regions.[1] The range is considerable and access to the global anthropological field varied. While some countries cut themselves off almost completely from the West, others encouraged academic exchanges and supported the participation of their elites in international congresses. The investment of resources in the study of folklore and national heritage was a shrewd legitimation ploy in times of rapid industrialisation and social convulsion, even if this risked perpetuating many of the characteristics of a 'bourgeois science'. While East Germany adapted Soviet theories quite rigorously, most states of east-central Europe paid only lip service to Moscow publications and continued earlier practices. In the Soviet Union itself, *etnografiia* came to focus obsessively on the *etnos*. The discipline was entangled in the hierarchies of power which subordinated regions such as the Caucasus and Central Asia to Moscow, continuing the hierarchy of the imperial past. Elsewhere, university curricula were dominated by nation-centred (or *ethnie*-centred) paradigms, leavened only with a sprinkling of socialist ideology, the strength of which varied from one country to the next and always reflected internal and external political vicissitudes.

This volume builds upon those earlier studies by extending the investigations to countries of south-eastern Europe that were not considered previously. It breaks new ground in several ways. First, as our title indicates, more attention is paid to questions of marginality – more precisely, to the encroachment of Western strands of socio-cultural anthropology in countries and regions which had long appeared as marginal to the dominant paradigms in the West. Second, while retaining the decades of socialist power as our temporal frame, we have allowed for more discussion of both earlier and very recent developments. Third, we have broken with the precedents of the series by inviting scholars from Greece to explore the anthropological field in a country which was never part of the socialist bloc and for many years in effect a client state of the United States.[2] The emblematic features of the

[1] See Hann, Sárkány and Skalnik 2005; Mihăilescu, Iliev and Naumović 2008; Mühlfried and Sokolovski 2011. Serbia was treated in some detail (alongside Bulgaria and Romania) in the second of these volumes, which explains its absence in this book.

[2] Of course, the influence of communist ideals did not disappear completely with the end of the Greek Civil War, but communism was suppressed in the public sphere and all public institutions. When Marxist influences made themselves felt in the emerging Greek social

Greek case for the anthropological field as a whole have been highlighted by previous scholars, notably Michael Herzfeld, who also problematised the notion of 'the margins' in *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass* (1987). In this volume, Evthymios Papataxiarchis, Georgios Agelopoulos, Vassilis Nitsiakos, and Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou, all four trained in social anthropology in Britain but thereafter pursuing careers in research and teaching in different institutions in their native country, probe into both the intellectual and socio-political contexts of anthropology in Greece. The relationships between the 'old' folklore and the 'new' social anthropology turn out to be complex. There is some evidence of a convergence of interests, both before and after the military junta which ruled the country between 1967-74.

During these decades, Greece exemplified the shift away from older imperialist paradigms and became a significant object of research for Western anthropologists. More Anglophone dissertations were based here than in Albania and Yugoslavia combined. Will easier access to the latter countries in recent years result in comparable dialogues between insiders and outsiders? Is intellectual rapprochement desirable? Some might see it as a lazy compromise and prefer to maintain established specialisations and their traditional names. The factors which hinder dialogue should not be underestimated, but the insider-outsider binary turns out to be much too crude to capture the realities of ongoing exchanges. Knowledge of the plots adjacent to one's own and a willingness to explore common interests seems preferable to aggressive posturing at the boundary markers. I shall return to these matters below. First, I need to situate the anthropological field which concerns us in the general history of south-east Europe, and to introduce the chapters.

Cold War Anthropology in a *Longue Durée* Perspective

There is a tendency among some Westerners, in looking back at the polarisation of Europe between the 1940s and the 1990s, to imagine that scholars in the socialist states of the East were necessarily in thrall to the major centre of political power, namely Moscow. We have shown in previous volumes that this was rarely the case. Outside the German Democratic Republic, Marxist-Leninist ideology had rather little impact on conventional science in the anthropological domain. To understand knowledge production in the anthropological field we must start elsewhere: with socio-political conditions as they emerged in the course of the decline of the great agrarian empires and the rise of nations and nationalism. In this volume we are dealing with

---

sciences, they were imported from the West and not from socialist neighbours; see Papataxiarchis, chapter 2.

countries which were either non-aligned (Yugoslavia), transferred allegiance to China (Albania), or remained – after a traumatic civil war – consistently in the Western camp (Greece was admitted to the European Community in 1981). Contrary to what might have been anticipated in the wake of the Second World War, contacts with Moscow turned out to be relatively unimportant in all three countries

As a federation, Yugoslavia was the most complex case, exhibiting formal and informal hierarchies dating back to the pre-socialist era. As the capital, Belgrade was at the top, closely followed by Zagreb and Ljubljana, where institutionalisation of the anthropological field had begun in the nineteenth century. Macedonia, Montenegro, and Bosnia-Herzegovina lacked these precocious foundations. They were dependent on the northern republics for training and support and their scholars were less likely to have connections abroad. Leading scholars in Yugoslavia often conducted research, worked, and taught in several republics (see Kurtović chapter 15), and some scholars spent many years studying abroad (see Potkonjak, chapter 11). However, even in the northern republics, the majority of researchers in the anthropological field were not very mobile. Outside of the northern republics, research was generally restricted to museums. These scholars were not particularly loyal were not to Belgrade, let alone to Moscow.

From a certain *longue durée* perspective, the disintegration of Yugoslavia after 1990 was the completion of a process launched with the Greek War of Independence in the 1820s. It took almost two centuries for the western and southern Balkans to replace empires and federations with the nation-state, the alleged harbinger of modernity. Indeed, two units on the current political map still seem far removed from this terminal point and function as states only thanks to international tutelage (Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo). The territories covered in this book are arguably more diverse than the populations which forged nation-states much earlier in other parts of Europe. In a total area roughly the same as that of France, we find three major religious traditions (two of them Christian) and three language groups (Albanian, Hellenic, and South Slavic); these distinguishing features do not overlap, nor does either coincide neatly with an evolved political boundary. In Bosnia-Herzegovina the speakers of one language are divided by three religious traditions. Albania has only two religious dominations, but in terms of popular practices there are major differences between Albanian Catholics and their co-believers in Croatia and Slovenia. Orthodoxy unites Greeks with Macedonians as well as Serbs and Montenegrins, but this does not suffice to prevent secular tension over the very name Macedonia. More ethnic Macedonians and Montenegrins live outside their national states than within them (the same is true of Albanians). Other significant communities, notably

Roma and Turks (the latter a legacy of the major imperial power) are invisible on political maps, yet they are recognised as minorities and indeed guaranteed parliamentary representation in Macedonia.

For all this diversity, we can also point to similarities. Across most of south-east Europe, Ottoman rule was indeed destructive of established social hierarchies. When the Turks were pushed back towards Anatolia, property relations in the countryside, which was where the overwhelming majority of the population lived, were relatively egalitarian in comparison with the great estates which dominated to the north. Greece, Serbia, and Albania all imported foreign monarchs, but the aftermath of empire also witnessed strivings after more democratic forms of governance. Significant sections of the emancipated populations were in ferment and susceptible to the idea that a common national identification should be the foundation of the new polity, even as the economic infrastructure of the region remained patently backward.

The scholarly approaches to the national problem were basically similar, even if demarcating the boundaries and distinguishing features of nations was much tougher in some regions than in others. Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina were incorporated into the *Vielvölkerstaat* of the Habsburgs and exposed directly to the emerging field of German-language *Volkskunde.* Intellectuals in Serbia, Greece, and later Albania also looked to both Austrian and German sources of inspiration as they sought to uncover the unique material and spiritual endowment of the preindustrial peasantry. Like the anthropologists who travelled to remote colonies, some of these 'native ethnographers' (the term introduced by Hofer 1968) had an acute awareness of the fact that the people whose customs they were salvaging were on the cusp of dramatic social changes, due to the spread of bureaucracies, schools, and railways. Some foreigners approached the Balkans in a similar spirit, but only in Albania did outsiders play a leading role in the 'discovery' of the nation (Doja, chapter 7). Whatever the precise political path, with the demise of empire (primarily that of the Ottomans) the native ethnographers were expected to show that, while lagging behind other powerful states in terms of technology and economic development, the peoples of south-east Europe were extraordinarily rich in culture, in their unique Herderian *Volksgeist*.

It is important not to caricature this 'people science', as it proclaimed itself literally (Sl. *narodopis*, B-C-S. *etnologija*, Gk. *laografia*). Although the focus was on the nation at hand, this did not entail isolation from scholarly communities elsewhere. Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou (chapter 5) draws attention to the international folklore conference organised in Athens in 1963. Numerous Yugoslav scholars maintained ties abroad, especially to the United States. They could take pride in their country's status as a uniquely

non-aligned federation on the global stage, and some were very active internationally. Thanks primarily to the energies of Hubert Maver and Pavao Rudan (see Martinović Klarić, chapter 12), the International Union of the Ethnological and Anthropological Sciences held its twelfth Congress in Zagreb. Scholars from all over the world gathered in the Croatian capital in July 1988, which showcased all the variegated plots of the Yugoslav anthropological field of that era.[3]

With the exception of Albania (which attracted a little attention from Moscow before the rupture), it was not particularly difficult for foreigners to carry out fieldwork in the region. The activities of Westerners in Yugoslavia, both their field research and their interactions with local scholars, were carefully monitored. Of course, some contact with the latter was usually essential in order to gain permission for field research. Robert Minnich outlines his personal experiences in Slovenia in the final chapter of this collection. Interaction between foreigners and local ethnographers was more complex in the case of Greece, where the former exercised a significant impact on the institutional development of the field, both directly and indirectly (Papataxiarchis, chapter 2; Agelopoulos, chapter 3).

The anthropological field in south-east Europe in the second half of the twentieth century had a lot of variety, in substance as well as in the nomenclature. The prime subject matter of the local scholars remained the preindustrial 'folk culture'. Like their overseas counterparts who documented disappearing tribal worlds, the task in Europe was to capture what was palpably vanishing. The anthropological field expanded in tandem with the rise of modern institutions, of industry, and of new urban agglomerations. The salvage-oriented researcher was not expected to address these contemporary processes, not even the social changes taking place within the countryside. The study of conflict and elites was also out of bounds, especially where there was strong political and ideological pressure to confuse the ethnic meaning of people with a socialist sense of 'the working people' (Bardhoshi, chapter 8).

Not all tillers of the anthropological field respected these demarcation lines. In this volume, Sanja Potkonjak (chapter 11) shows how feminist

[3] I attended this conference and vividly recall being told by some young local participants that, according to recent census data, many citizens, especially younger ones, were now declaring 'Yugoslav' to be a more salient level of collective identity than their ethnicity. Yet while Eric Wolf lectured in the conference hall on the links between ethnicity and political economy, I was also impressed by large and noisy parades on the streets of central Zagreb, in which folk costumes mingled with the national colours in celebration of a uniquely Croatian identity. Long after this meeting (presumably along with thousands of other participants) I was contacted by the organising committee with a request to sign a document denouncing violent provocations by Serbs, as the socialist federation disintegrated into chaos.

scholars led the way in abandoning the old *etnologija* paradigm in the last decades of socialism in Croatia in favour of addressing contemporary subjects and power relations. Feminist debates in the West would have been enriched by greater awareness of this critique from within the infamously patriarchal Balkans, but even the development of a strong focus on gender as a point of convergence between local and foreign anthropologists in Greece, did not lift the Balkans into a privileged position of theoretical innovation in 'global anthropology'. Some native ethnographers paid attention to dynamic processes and conflicts with the old rural society (their exposure to socialist ideology perhaps serving to increase their sensitivity to issues of conflict and dynamic change). Some adapted ideas and methods from sociologists, urban as well as rural, more readily than their counterparts in the West. While part of our interest in this series of investigations of the history of anthropology under socialism is to explore the often difficult conditions in which knowledge was produced, implicitly making the local scholars the objects of our research, we also emphasise their *agency* (see Risteski and Dimova, chapter 13). There are abundant good reasons for taking the creative work of these colleagues seriously and for building stronger bridges to them.

The legacy of the older nation-building paradigm has remained strong in many places. Merely changing the name is not enough to change habits, conceptual approaches, and research practices (see Kodra-Hysa, chapter 6). When a younger generation is exposed to new influences, the perception of petrification 'at home' will spur critique. Younger scholars may be dazzled by the latest innovations in Western socio-cultural anthropology's efforts to research the 'scapes' of multi-, virtual, and non-places, leaving behind even modernist concerns for the effects of urbanisation, industrialisation, and nationalisation (Vujačić chapter 14). For such new 'anthropologies', the paradigms of the native ethnographies described in these chapters are antiquarian or worse. Since the 1990s, new regimes of knowledge production have seen the proliferation of anthropologies in faculties of social sciences, alongside the 'people sciences' that continue to seek out old people in remote villages, typically from their base in a faculty of humanities alongside historians.

This general contrast is undeniable but I want to argue, strengthened in my views by the papers which emerged from our workshop, that the flow of ideas between different plots in the anthropological field has never been unidirectional. Native ethnographers have often drawn on the same bodies of theory as the foreign comparativists. Who can deny that folklorists such as Arnold Van Gennep have, on the basis of their work in Europe, made contributions to general theory comparable in importance to those made by the students of remote *Naturvölker*? Preindustrial European lifeways offer much

material to enrich the anthropological field. After all, for most of our history the vast majority of humans have not lived in towns or worked in industry or chatted on the internet. They have earned their livelihood primarily from the land. These distinctive ways of living proved resilient to the pressures of socialist breakneck industrialisation, which reached south-east Europe a whole century after the transformations which had inspired the rise of people's science in German-speaking Central Europe. To make sociological sense of the contemporary world, it is essential to understand this history of late development and its legacies in the obstinate shadows of the socialist decades. Thus, many plots of the anthropological field have something to contribute to the harvest; besides, an understanding of the contemporary world may not be the only crop worth harvesting.

The Chapters

We begin with four chapters devoted to Greece, the first of which by Evthymios Papataxiarchis provides an overview of the intricate paths between the various plots of the anthropological field, and between this field and the wider socio-political context. It may surprise some readers to learn that the implications of political events in Greece for anthropologists were for a long time just as constraining as anywhere else in south-east Europe, though the eventual outcomes in the last decades of the last century were quite different. Papataxiarchis organises his account chronologically. While the Greek case has some specificities, *laografia* emerged historically in much the same relation to the nation as *etnologija* and similar disciplines throughout Europe. The conservatism of this 'national science' was consolidated during the authoritarian, isolationist period which followed the end of the Civil War; in this period, even alternative social paradigms had a nationalist bias. Foreigner researchers, some of them funded by aid programmes, did not have very much to do with local ethnographers. Some of the best, notably Oxford's John Campbell, initially approached the natives as 'objects' with paradigms derived from studies in tribal Africa. Despite such 'primitivist' assumptions, the Athens Centre for Social Sciences, established in 1959, functioned as a creative clearing house and introduced Western approaches to interested natives. At the same time, some native ethnographers began to develop new, non-nationalist approaches to Greek society.

These convergences were interrupted by the period of military rule between 1967 and 1974. Foreigners continued to undertake fieldwork, but staff at the Athens Centre lost their jobs, some local scholars went into exile, and only the national science found favour in the corridors of power. However, the balance tipped again with the restoration of democracy. New departments of social anthropology (*koinoniki anthropologia*) were set up from the

1980s, the first at the University of the Aegean in 1986. Their staff, mostly trained abroad, now shared the non-national paradigms of the foreigners, such as Western structuralist variants of Marxism. Much productive work was carried out on topics such as kinship and gender. For a time, it seemed that folklorists would be fully incorporated into these conversations (which still bore some of the marks of an ethnic division of labour, with foreigners at the top). However, by the end of the century (and strictly speaking outside the period of our comparative investigation), rising ethno-nationalism in the region was exposing a lingering divide between the national science of *laografia* and the new social science of *koinoniki anthropologia*.

Evthymios Papataxiarchis offers a subtle, balanced account from the perspective of an insider with an avowed commitment to opening up more 'symmetrical, heteroglossic spaces' in the global map of anthropology. My broad brush summary does not do justice to the complexities of the story he tells (his footnotes should be read carefully to appreciate the many nuances). He concedes that some local ethnographers innovated within their tradition and moved it closer to the one with which he himself identifies. But no one should suspect this author of simply importing to the University of the Aegean the social anthropology he was taught in London, Papataxiarchis makes it very clear that a 'domestic critical heritage' was no less important in shaping his perspective, indeed in bringing him to study social anthropology in the first place.

Agreeing with Papataxiarchis that Greek social anthropology did not develop on a tabula rasa after democracy was restored in 1974, in chapter 3 Georgios Agelopoulos looks more closely at diverse contributions from outside *laografia* in earlier decades, including the fields of physical anthropology and psychoanalysis. The concerned intellectuals of every epoch reacted more or less adequately to contemporary political issues, the need to acknowledge ethnic minorities, and (somewhat later) to promote rural development. The most important elite forum for debate was the Greek Anthropological Society, founded in 1924. Its most colourful member was Prince Peter, son of Maria Bonaparte, both of them good friends of Bronislaw Malinowski of the London School of Economics. Agelopoulos does not blanch over the weaknesses of Peter's wide-ranging scholarly work. However, he promoted a non-nationalist concept of culture and, though he never held an academic position, he did offer energetic support for the activities of the Athens Centre for Social Sciences in its most creative phase. But, Peter's patrician background was out of kilter with the modernising agenda of the age; those who wanted to bring Greece, and especially the Greek peasantry, into the canon of socio-cultural anthropology were obliged to look elsewhere for inspiration.

In the next two chapters, Vassilis Nitsiakos and Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou explore continuity and adaptation among scholars trained in the national science, *laografia*. In chapter 4, Nitsiakos examines the work of Stilpon Kyriakides (a student of the undisputed founder of *laografia*, Nikolaos Politis) in Thessaloniki and of Georgios Megas in Athens. Kyriakides was well informed about Western anthropology, including the functionalism of Malinowski, while Megas drew more heavily on German *Volkskundler*, notably Wilhelm Riehl. Both men were conservative, indeed nationalist in their politics. Yet Nitsiakos finds a great deal of their work to be sober and scholarly: historically oriented in the case of Kyriakides and more ethnographically oriented in the case of Megas. Other contemporaries who had studied abroad began to introduce subversive voices into *laografia* in the 1960s. Kyriakides' own daughter was on the left politically and she lost her job under the junta. However, Alki Kyriakidou-Nestoros was able to resume her career after 1974 and went on to play a key role in introducing to Greek readers the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss, with whom she had studied in Paris. While continuing to see herself as a folklorist, she paved the way for a rapprochement to social anthropology that was later recognised with the addition of this name to the programmes taught at the Aristotle University in Thessaloniki. Elsewhere, for example in Ioannina, even though the name of the discipline remained simply *laografia*, substantive teaching and research practices became indistinguishable from those of *koinoniki anthropologia*.

Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou (chapter 5) explores other facets of this complex history. She too notes the impact of German influences, beginning with Herder, on academic folklore in Greece, but she is more concerned to emphasise the vitality of the discipline outside its elite institutions. *Laografia* has long been embedded in nationwide networks of amateur enthusiasts, through local and regional 'civil society' associations and through the school system. The Folklore Centre in Athens has been staffed by native ethnographers, many of whom had a background in pedagogy. Some have gone on to teach at universities, where they have trained teachers who, in the course of their careers, have generated a continuous flow of new data to be analysed at the Folklore Centre. Chryssanthopoulou argues that these chains of data production have been accompanied and modified by theoretical and methodological innovation. While the classifications of the founders of *laografia* were in some domains inflexible and biased to oral literature, philology and 'survivals', she shows that even the first generations engaged intensively with social organisation, with comparisons outside Greece, and with the contemporary conditions they found in their fieldwork. Following the impact of new social anthropological approaches, introduced partly as a result of Greek students studying abroad, and partly through the impact of Western

anthropologists who conducted fieldwork in Greece from the 1950s onwards, Greek folklorists came to pay ever more attention to social context during their field research. Chryssanthopoulou points out that researchers of every hue can profit from new technologies: visual anthropologists can use multimedia technologies to depict intimate local complexities more vividly than ever before, while digital databases provide scholars in folklore with improved means to pursue the monumental ambitions that fuelled earlier initiatives such as national ethnographic atlases.

All in all, after reading the four chapters of this book devoted to Greece, the reader may feel that there has been a considerable measure of convergence between what the scholars of *laografia* do and what the scholars of *koinoniki anthropologia* do. Vassilis Nitsiakos concludes his chapter with a warning to be wary of 'camouflage and dissimulation' in the packaging of programs. Persisting frictions may be best explained not in intellectual terms but in terms of competition for resources, and this is the note on which Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou closes her chapter. She emphatically denies the charge that Greek folklorists have been politically compromised; in her view, their commitment to the nation has never led them to prefer dictatorship above democracy. Yet, while calling for more cooperation and dialogue within the anthropological field, she does not deny persisting differences of approach and epistemology.

Albania stands out from all its neighbours in numerous ways: the only European socialist state which shifted its allegiance from Moscow to Beijing, it was impenetrable to Western researchers during the decades of Enver Hoxha's personality cult. Albanian scholars were required to work within a rigid ideology, almost entirely cut off from international scholarly communities. In chapter 6, Armanda Kodra-Hysa begins her overview of the anthropological field in these unpropitious circumstances by recalling her anxieties when hired as a researcher in Tirana at the beginning of the new century. Her research institute had changed its name from ethnography to ethnology in 1990, but her senior colleagues were unable to explain the rationale for this change. A diffuse oral culture made it impossible to eradicate the essentialist, nationalist views which had taken hold under socialism. Following short-lived contacts with Yugoslavia before the 1948 rupture, Kodra-Hysa identifies Rrok Zojzi as the key figure in Tirana in succeeding decades. His endorsements of historical materialism, notably in an influential article published in 1962, prescribed an emphatic dismissal of bourgeois ethnography as a weapon of capitalism. Yet Kodra-Hysa notes his acknowledgment of valuable foreign contributions in the past, and leaves open the possibility that Zojzi might have been paying lip service to the ideology in order to facilitate and protect empirical researches in the countryside, his own and

those of others. According to the dogmas propagated by the Party, communist rule was committed to uncovering the unsullied spirit of the Albanian people, which was located exclusively in the 'popular classes'. The obsession with ethnic identity came to the fore at a unique conference in 1976 and persisted through the 1980s. In no other country of Eurasia was the fusion of Marxist historical materialism and nationalism so doggedly pursued; but all this did not prevent the native ethnographers from collecting a wealth of data, which is now available and open to quite different interpretations from scholars of the new generation.

The long-term intellectual context of this strange convergence of Herder and Marx is explored further by Albert Doja in chapter 7. The relative isolation of this country, linguistic as well as geographical, renders its people and their practices particularly exposed to 'frozen' exoticised representations by both foreign and native Albanian authors. According to Doja, these have persisted into the present century. In this context, it was all too easy for the scholars of Albanology in the socialist decades to fall back on notions of survivals in the manner of Tylor and Frazer. Ethnographic expeditions such as those of Zojzi automatically prioritised remote, highland villages. Social scientific studies of contemporary realities were unwelcome to power holders, irrespective of location. Doja explains how scholars were required to play along with the Soviet ideology of 'national in form, socialist in content' by selecting those customs and practices conducive to folklorisation and weeding out the rest. Unlike Kodra-Hysa, Doja finds little of value in these socialist era works and is rather contemptuous of scholars' conservative servility to the regime of Enver Hoxha. Long after the end of socialism he finds that those trained in *kultura popullore* were unwilling to analyse Albanian data (such as his own materials concerning age-grades) in wider comparative frameworks. He does, however, note glimmers of hope in the new generation.

In addition to Armanda Kodra-Hysa (chapter 6), that new generation is also represented in this volume by Nebi Bardhoshi in chapter 8. Following Doja, Bardhoshi digs deeper into studies of customary law (*kanun*). Thanks to foreigners such as Edith Durham, the northern highlands of Albania have long had a unique niche in legal anthropology. No such specialisation existed in socialist Albania. Rather, Bardhoshi argues that these legal codes exemplified a more general schizophrenia in the profession and in Albanian society. On the one hand, they were to be celebrated as national spiritual heritage, part of the core tissue of Albanian folk culture. *kanun* was a collective good, the product of the common people's ingenious response to foreign invasions and the exploitation of feudal rulers such as King Zog. On the other hand, these customs were the very opposite of what the state was

ostensibly in the process of establishing, a modernity based on socialist state law. Since it was not possible to admit the persistence of *kanun* in socialist conditions, the evidence had to be couched by ethnographers not as a living tradition but in the form of narratives by older people, set in the immediate pre-socialist years. The Albanian case was evidently extreme: apart from these general constraints, it was understood that, regardless of the issue at hand, Enver Hoxha had to be cited first, followed by Engels, and then perhaps Tylor. Nonetheless, Bardhoshi implies that the data in the archives, when appropriately decoded to take account of the dictatorial situation, can be of great interest to researchers today. He notes that Rrok Zojzi himself made a valuable contribution to the *kanun* corpus. Some foreign literature (mainly Soviet and Yugoslav) was translated and available in Tirana to small groups of scholars considered politically reliable. In 1988, shortly before the collapse, a key text of Claude Lévi-Strauss was published. Alas, the impact seems to have been only to convince the majority of native scholars that this kind of social anthropology was something they could not aspire to themselves, and would have to resist by all means possible.

All the remaining chapters deal with components of what was, in the decades on which we focus, Yugoslavia. Here, too, that part of the anthropological field known generally as *etnologija* (in the dominant Serbo-Croatian language; *narodopis* was used as a variant in Slovenia) had been and remained pertinent to nation-building processes. The socialist state had no obvious reason to support this discipline and, in the light of its national tinge, some reason to be suspicious of it. However, compared to Albania the interference of socialist dogma seems to have been slight in Yugoslavia. The actual outcomes fluctuated over time and there was much variety between the constituent republics, notably between the relative openness of Slovenian and Croatian scholarship to Western influences from an early phase and the more isolated conditions which prevailed in the southern republics of Montenegro and Macedonia. Links between academic dynamism and socio-economic development were not straightforward. The struggle to overcome the backwardness of academic institutions in Montenegro and Macedonia continued after the demise of the federation (Risteski and Dimova chapter 13; Vujačić chapter 14). In Bosnia-Herzegovina, for reasons to do with the special characteristics of that polity, the battle appears to have been lost (Kurtović, chapter 15).

We begin the Yugoslav papers in Slovenia with an overview of the local variant of *narodopis/etnologija* by Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik, an 'insider' in the Ljubljana department for over four decades (chapter 9). The discipline had its origins in the nineteenth century and grew in popularity in the course of resistance to German cultural domination, even as the fledgling ethnogra-

phers and ethnologists drew closely on German models of *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* respectively. The first decade of socialism was characterised by progressive exhortations to make the study of folk culture relevant as an applied science, exemplified in the work of Boris Orel at the National Museum; but there was no in-depth engagement with Marxism. A change in the name of the university department from *narodopis* to *etnografija* in 1955 was indicative of pressure to take seriously the Soviet paradigm of historical materialism. The key figure of the next two decades was Slavko Kremenšek, who studied in Moscow in the early 1950s (after earlier plans to send him to England were dropped for political reasons). Kremenšek was influenced by Sergei Tokarev and the Russian use of the concept of 'lifestyle', combining this creatively with the innovations of post-*Volkskunde* scholars in Germany, notably Hermann Bausinger. This enabled him to move decisively beyond the traditional folk culture paradigm. In interviews with the author, Kremenšek made it plain that, though nominally a Party member, there had never been anything rigid about his materialism. Rather, he seems to have been adept in opening up creative spaces. Party controls in this corner of the anthropological field remained ineffectual (in contrast to sociology) and it was not necessary to espouse historical materialism to find a niche.

Vesna Godina's sympathetic portrayal of her supervisor Stane Južnič in chapter 10 shows the influence exerted by another charismatic individual, one with a more political vision of anthropology, which he developed in the faculty of social science, quite separately from the *narodopis* department of Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik. One important difference lay in Južnič's extensive international experience, which gave him interests ranging far outside those of traditional folklore, indeed outside the canons of the social sciences. Almost single-handedly, he built up a program comparable in its range to the North American 'four field' approach (see also Minnich chapter 16).

Any readers who still suppose *etnologija* in patriarchal Yugoslavia to have been a conservative and male-dominated pursuit will be thoroughly disabused after reading Sanja Potkonjak's feminist genealogy from socialist Croatia (chapter 11). Four outstanding women contributed, each in her different way, to emancipatory intellectual perspectives in the second half of the last century. The first was Vera Stein Erlich, who collected data from the length and breadth of Yugoslavia to demystify stereotypes of the primordial Balkan family. Her analyses were influenced by a sojourn in California in the 1940s, where she worked with Alfred Kroeber. However, this scholar continued to identify more with sociology and social psychology than with *narodopis*. By contrast, Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin launched a sustained critique of the old nation-focused *narodopis* within the discipline itself. In major works such as *The Structure of Traditional Thinking* (1984), she

stepped outside the Western 'anthropology of women' paradigm to analyse a 'female model of reality', of exceptional interest in view of the prevailing power relations in which the female subculture of the extended family was embedded. In the same period Olga Supek-Zupan, who had also undertaken graduate studies in the United States, engaged more closely with Marxist rather than feminist theory. Needless to say, she paid more attention to creative debates in Western Marxism than to Soviet historical materialism. Empirically, for example in her ethnography of the village of Prigorje, she too emphasised contemporary subjects. Finally, in a career that was tragically cut short, Lydia Sklevicky brilliantly added a Foucauldian agenda to feminist and Marxist approaches in her researches into social history and memory.

These four women may not have been representative of Croatian *etnologija* under socialism, if only because of their exceptional theoretical sophistication. We would have liked to have been able to include more papers dealing with the institutions in which they worked, along with other personnel and research accomplishments.[4] However, we are very pleased to include a paper covering a quite different plot within the Croatian anthropological field, namely the biological (also important for the holistic approach of Južnič in Ljubljana). As Irena Martinović Klarić makes clear in chapter 12, the fertility of this plot, too, owed much to the agency of particular cultivators, specifically Hubert Maver and Pavao Rudan in the 1970s. Trained in biological and medical science and based in the Faculty of Medicine, these widely travelled individuals were Yugoslav anthropology's most influential international emissaries. Martinović Klarić emphasises Rudan's rejection of the concept of race and his school's comprehensive approach to the study of population history, for which Adriatic islands such as Hvar provided the perfect testing ground.

In chapter 13, Ljupčo Risteski and Rozita Dimova outline the tortuous path to establish anthropology as an academic discipline in Macedonia. One problem was a general weakness of the academic infrastructure in Yugoslavia's poorest republic. Another was the contested character of Macedonian ethnic identity, and the presence of minority groups. For reasons that remain unclear, the pioneering efforts of Branislav Rusiḱ to consolidate a seminar in ethnology at the University of Skopje were thwarted and aborted in 1953. This Belgrade-trained scholar was similarly unsuccessful in establishing a strong ethnological presence at the Folklore Institute. However, one of his students was eventually able to take responsibility for developing a minor in ethnology within the university's department of geography in the late 1980s.

[4] See Halpern and Hammel 1969; Rihtman-Auguštin 2004; and Bošković 2008a for some overviews in English.

The syllabus was an obsolete 'Victorian' version of Marxism strongly inflected by contemporary political concerns. In particular, Serbian reactions to the Albanian 'threat' in Kosovo led to pressures in Skopje to distinguish Macedonian converts to Islam (the so-called Torbeši were analysed as a distinct ethnic group) from Albanians. These external political factors had a direct impact on teaching and research in the anthropological field. An autonomous Institute for Ethnology and Social Anthropology did not emerge until long after Macedonian independence.

In chapter 14, Lidija Vujačić turns a spotlight on tiny Montenegro, where local traditions of scholarship reflected the historical ambiguities of a fuzzy national identity not sharply distinguished from that of Serbia. Until the 1990s, the field was dedicated to the steady and unquestioning reproduction of an increasingly professionalised 'survivalist' paradigm. The winds of change in other republics throughout the 1970s and 1980s had no impact here before the 1990s when, quickly and invisibly, courses in cultural anthropology (permeated with cultural studies and oriented towards new agendas of globalisation) were introduced in the Faculty of Philosophy at the Nikšić campus of University of Montenegro.

Larisa Kurtović did not attend the Halle Workshop, but we were very pleased to commission chapter 15 on Bosnia-Herzegovina from a young scholar who knows the country intimately, but who has received all her training in quite different traditions in North America. Bosnia-Herzegovina is a special case, argues the author, because in the absence of a clearly defined ethnicity to function as titular nation, *etnologija* in Sarajevo developed as a territorially-defined, explicitly multi-ethnic undertaking. This could not happen in any other republic, nor could such approaches develop at the federal level. Kurtović questions the very category 'native researcher': in the absence of a full department of *etnologija* at the University of Sarajevo, most native ethnographers who spent part or all of their careers in Bosnia-Herzegovina had qualifications from Belgrade or Zagreb. More importantly, they carried out fieldwork among multiple communities of this republic. Milenko Filipović (1902–69) was the outstanding figure of the early socialist years. This ethnic Serb, educated in Belgrade, engaged with both Western theoretical currents and with the processes of contemporary socialist modernisation. He was defeated politically on both counts in the mid-1950s by his rival, the head of the *etnologija* section at Sarajevo's Zemaljski muzej (and ethnic Montenegrin), Špiro Kulišić. According to the latter, to address modern life in functionalist terms was to give up the hallmark of historical materialism. The Marxism of Kulišić, unusually dogmatic in the Yugoslav context, led him eventually to heresies of his own concerning the ethnogenesis of the Montenegrins.

But the picture presented by Kurtović of the later decades of socialism is by no means entirely negative. The Zemaljski muzej organised innovative teamwork to carry out systematic surveys in parts of the republic little studied previously. Špiro Kulišić censored the data they deposited, but these young researchers of the 'Sarajevo School', most of them of urban background and some lacking any formal training in ethnology, undermined the director's nominal commitment to the investigation of ethnogenesis. The pan-Yugoslav conference at Zenica in 1969 was a significant step toward expanding intellectual horizons. By the 1980s, long after the death of Filipović, his orientation toward a modernised ethnology open to diverse national and international influences was gradually gaining ground. It found expression in a reputable journal, but was still handicapped by the lack of an autonomous department at the university. Unfortunately, this unique experiment in which the native ethnographers focused on space rather than on *ethnos* was aborted with the collapse of the federation in the 1990s.

We conclude the substantive chapters by returning to Slovenia for a foreigner's account of his work there since the 1970s. Robert Minnich (chapter 16) juxtaposes details of his interaction with different local academic communities with an engrossing account of how the rather underdeveloped countryside of west Haloze was transformed to reach an extraordinary prosperity by the time of European Union accession in 2004. Beginning with a revelatory moment in the late 1970s, when it dawned on him that he had been unwittingly practising Geertzian hermeneutics in his 'deep play' analysis of local pig-killings, Minnich explains that some of his most helpful gatekeepers in Ljubljana were social geographers rather than academics formally holding positions in the anthropological field. It took many years before his work was translated and presented to Slovenian audiences as a distinctively *social* variant of anthropology. When, after independence, he was invited to lecture in Ljubljana at both the Faculty of Social Sciences (where Stane Južnič, who introduced the Slovenian translation of his monograph, had taught in isolation for many years) and the Faculty of Humanities, Minnich devoted his lecture in the latter to fieldwork: this was a topic, perhaps the only topic, which he felt could bridge the gaps. Minnich breaks off his account before the modernisation and Europeanisation bubble burst, which it did soon after the conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists in Ljubljana in 2008. One hopes that these villagers, like their Greek counterparts, can have recourse to older patterns of resilience in the ongoing crisis of the Eurozone.

Permutations in the Anthropology Wars[5]

The chapters of this volume engage with the history of what many social scientists would consider to be a marginal discipline, busying itself with marginal issues in a marginal region. Although our story comes to an end with the demise of socialism in the early 1990s, the structural underpinnings have not changed very much in the last two decades. Of course, there have been significant transformations, and these have affected the anthropological field. A territory divided between three states in 1990 now has seven capital cities. In six of them, anthropology has been tightly bound up with nation-building, and with specifically *national* museums. The special circumstances of Bosnia-Herzegovina made for a different story in Sarajevo. The denouement of Larisa Kurtović's narrative (chapter 15) is almost tragic. If ever a Balkan city needed a coherent anthropological community, it would surely have to be Sarajevo. But no such community exists today; various university departments squabble over scraps of the field and the Zemaljski muzej, which accomplished so much in such unpropitious circumstances during the socialist decades, has been closed for lack of funds.

The East-West polarity of the Cold War decades, in key respects a new variant of older orientalising polarities, has been replaced by a revival of the more ancient North-South cleavage. Old stereotyping of south-east Europe ('the Balkans') persists in new forms. All of the countries covered in this volume fall into the category 'south'. Of course, the details vary. Greece adopted the euro in 2001; Slovenia followed in 2007, three years after joining the EU. But in the wake of the global crisis which began in 2007-08, both of these countries have fallen on hard times. By the time of Croatia's admission to the EU in 2013 as the twenty-eighth member, spirits were muted; the country was in bad shape economically and certainly not a candidate for the euro. As for the smaller sovereign states of the region now increasingly referred to as the 'western Balkans', they are vivid testimony to this region's continuing inability to meet the norms of the viable nation-state. Bosnia-Herzegovina is by far the most dramatic case, due to its reliance upon a foreign peace-keeping force to sustain complex power-sharing arrangements (see Hayden 2013, Part IV). Sensitive problems persist elsewhere. It is surely too late for Macedonia to resolve the tensions with its Albanian minority in the way that Greece has effectively assimilated most of its Macedonians. Montenegro and even Kosovo have won international

[5] To the best of my knowledge Peter Skalnik (2002) was the first to write about the 'struggle for anthropology' in postsocialist Eastern Europe. Evthymios Papataxiarchis uses the phrase 'anthropology wars' in chapter 2. My discussion in these pages has also been influenced by exchanges over many years with Michał Buchowski and László Kürti; see Buchowski 2004, Kürti and Skalnik 2009.

recognition; great tasks lie ahead for their fledgling anthropology departments and national museums. Albania remains a quixotic enigma to visitors from the north today just as it was in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Yet there it lies, obstinately fixed on the European mainland, exporting labour in all directions, legally and illegally, hardly any closer to being integrated into the unifying institutions of Europe than it was under King Zog.

Is it possible that, just as the work of their predecessors engaged with public issues in the classical age of nation-building, today's cultivators of the anthropological field might have something to say about all these contemporary problems? While individual scholars in all of these countries no doubt have their views on political and many other matters, as an intellectual community there can be no consensus – if only because there is no consensus as to what constitutes the anthropological field in south-east Europe. The Sarajevo scenario may be particularly depressing, but the field is hardly less fragmented in the other capitals. In Greece, the folklorists and anthropologists remain by and large suspicious of each other ('mutual avoidance' is the expression used by Papataxiarchis in chapter 2); both sides doubtless have good reason to be fearful as their funding comes under intensified pressure. In Albania, institutionalisation is only just beginning but Kodra-Hysa (chapter 6) and Doja (chapter 7) agree that it will take a long time before the rigidities of the Hoxha era can be overcome. The last years of socialist Yugoslavia under Slobodan Milošević have left problematic legacies for both Macedonia and Montenegro. Even where a new institute has been established, as in Skopje, anthropologists struggle to avoid being marginalised in a sea of 'identity studies' (Risteski and Dimova, chapter 13). In Croatia we have seen evidence of vitality in quite different corners of the anthropological field (chapters 11 and 12); but these scholars have very little contact with each other. Even in Slovenia, the only country in this region so far to have hosted a major conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists, where the field seems well entrenched, the chapters by Godina, Slavec Gradišnik, and Minnich make it clear that local struggles and demarcation disputes continued after the end of Yugoslav socialism.

All of these 'anthropology battles' of the western Balkans are tightly bound up with battles elsewhere. The end of the Cold War coincided with the rise of intellectual currents in the West which appeared to make a virtue of sabotaging everything grown in the global anthropological field hitherto. Whatever view one takes of the merits of these developments in the metropolitan worlds, their impact on the margins was not conducive to intergenerational conversations and thus detrimental to the effective cultivation of more productive plots at this crucial conjuncture.

Conclusions: A General Model

Abstracting from the Balkanised detail of the preceding section, let me conclude by reflecting on the history of anthropology in terms of ideal types and abstract predicaments on the global scale. My first ideal type is that of the social anthropologist who sees the task of the discipline as that of comparative scientific enquiry: a 'natural science of society' in the phrase of Radcliffe-Brown (1957). This creature may not be altogether bloodless, but passion and commitment are devoted primarily to the accuracy of the data and the sophistication of the analysis. Language learning might or might not have a high priority. In the Malinowskian paradigm the fieldworker is conceived of as a camera, whose primary task is to provide faithful representations of how the various institutions of society functioned at the time of fieldwork. The subsequent task, emphasised by Radcliffe-Brown and developed by George Peter Murdock in the *Human Relations Area Files*, is to compare these results with those of other, equally meticulous positivists, around the world.

Let us postulate that country A is a stronghold of scholars who approximate this ideal type, in teaching and research. Those trained in this scientific spirit in A do not carry out their field research in A but in B, a less developed, or at any rate less wealthy country. Historically, it was often conveniently the case that A exercised power in B, sometimes of a straightforward colonial sort, and sometimes in more diffuse ways, long after the colonial empire was formally abandoned.

The second ideal type is that of the native researcher. Confusingly, he or she has many labels: in English, ethnographer, ethnologist, and folklorist are among the most common. In this introduction I have also referred to the literal expression 'people science' and borrowed Tamás Hofer's (1968) generalised use of 'native ethnographer'. This person is typically committed to the investigation of some aspect of the material or spiritual culture of his or her nation. The framework is that of national heritage. A close engagement with history is common but not ubiquitous; some scholars prefer to emphasise the timeless, primordial qualities of the phenomena they study. A sense of duty and identification is intrinsic to the project, the aim of which is not global explanatory comparison but understanding, appreciation, and ultimately celebration of one's own people. Let us suppose that country C has produced numerous scholars of this sort since the nineteenth century.

For a very long time, the institutions of A, B, and C are separate worlds, with rather little in common. However, around the middle of the twentieth century they are catapulted together. The great colonial empires come to an end and, quite suddenly, social anthropologists in A, hitherto limited in their field research to B, find it interesting, indeed intellectually

exciting, to develop projects in C. Of course, they do not adopt the scientific paradigms of the native ethnographers in C, and may prefer to avoid contact with them altogether; instead, they seek to integrate the results of their fieldwork into their own, more comparativist paradigms. Somewhat later, natives of C have opportunities to study in A. They may be supervised by scholars in A who have field experience in C. These transgressors do their field research at home in C, but write it up to meet the expectations of scholars in A. They have little or no contact with native ethnographers in their own country. These foreign-trained anthropologists are likely to be dismissive of those in C with 'only' local training. Some of these transgressors may succeed in building careers and introducing the paradigms of A into C. Others, however, are penalised several times over. The paradigms they defend may be seen as alien; jobs are more likely to be allocated to those trained in C who show willingness to continue the academic traditions of C. In addition to such tensions in their native C, the transgressors are disconcerted if scholars back in A fail to perceive the essential differences between the outputs of their own intellectual progeny and the works of the parochial scholars who retain control over the institutions in C. They will be seriously irritated if Western authors, international journals, and conferences pass over their contributions in favour of research undertaken in C by scholars from A who did not grow up in C and who, if the truth be told, can barely manage an extended conversation in the local language, though this is no impediment to their applying the theoretical approaches currently at the cutting edge of scholarship in A.

Alas, as I know from personal experience in various countries of the region, these scenarios are not entirely far-fetched. However, as many chapters in this volume show, the real world is more complicated and the paradigms by no means so neatly distinct. The model of clinical detachment certainly shaped generations, but most social anthropologists always knew that they could never hope to replicate the method of the laboratory scientist. The great majority sought to understand 'the native point of view', many learned local languages to a very high standard and developed deep empathy for those they documented; some became what we nowadays call 'advocates', and some interacted generously with the native ethnographers. Many foreign anthropologists supplemented their fieldwork-based accounts with diachronic analyses, using whatever sources were available. This complicated their use of the comparative method, which by and large did not lead to much in the way of universal laws, but rather to a treasure trove of particularist ethnographies, sometimes supplemented by theoretical work at the level of a region or culture area.

It is equally implausible to reduce native ethnography to an antiquarian variant of butterfly collecting, fuelled solely by patriotic sentiments. Many ethnographers do take account of traditions other than those of their own nationality, inside and outside their countries. Folklorists often pursue comparisons of their own, throughout the Slavic world and even further afield. They too present their research results at international conferences such as those of the *Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore*. The scholars of these traditions organise their field research differently, but do not merit the Western disdain they so often receive. The native ethnographers do not need to stay very long in villages where they have a high degree of familiarity with the setting already, including fluent knowledge of the language which opens up levels of understanding that few foreigners can hope to match.

So the fields become less distinct. Many might still argue that the plots should remain separate: the respective scholarly communities have different languages and genres of publication, and different institutions. Do they also have fundamentally different research agendas? Some of the evidence in this volume suggests that this is not the case, that differences have generally been a matter of degree. There has certainly been a lot of convergence in recent decades as the native ethnographers in C have engaged increasingly with the same bodies of theory as those used in A. Some have learned to look with fresh eyes at their traditional topics, including material culture, for example in order to highlight symbolic appropriation in processes of nation-building (the kind of critical analysis formerly delivered only by the outsiders). Many natives have shown that they are just as capable as the foreigners of carrying out insightful studies of a range of modern topics, such as the impact of new media or the proliferation of new subcultures shaped by the West, or by trends that are no longer simply Western but truly global. If students receive good teaching at home in C, such that they are well informed about the latest trends in A, then it is no longer clear what advantages the foreigner may have, especially when even the much vaunted advantages of 'cultural distance' become suspect. Under socialism, those coming from abroad and publishing their work for foreign audiences could maintain that political constraints allowed them to address a swathe of topics in contemporary society where the natives were obliged to remain silent. But those constraints no longer apply.

Elsewhere I have argued for a plurality of approaches within unified departments as the best way to resolve these tensions (Hann 2012). Most researchers from abroad will stand to gain by cultivating some links with established departments which offer a wide range of courses, from preindustrial folk culture to (post)modern cultural studies. Some staff will continue

the familiar specialisations of their teachers. Others will open up new fields, shaped by the education they have received abroad in A. Meanwhile it should be remembered that many anthropology graduates in A nowadays study local populations; structurally, they are no longer so different from students in C. It should be possible to imagine that students from C privileged to study in A may, instead of returning home for their fieldwork, undertake projects in A – or indeed in B, so that other regions of the world eventually find a place in the anthropological curricula available in C.

The toughest challenge facing the returnee with this kind of expertise is likely to be that of establishing a career, since it may not be easy to persuade funding bodies in C (if there are any) to prioritise posts involving specialised knowledge of remote peoples. But we can at least think about such possibilities, and do what we can to encourage the spread of new seeds between the multifarious plots of the anthropological field. The scholar who returns to C with a PhD from A based on extended fieldwork in B may then go on to implement further projects at home in C, and these projects may be significantly enriched by those earlier years in both A and B. There are precedents for such a trajectory; at present it is rare, but it should not be dismissed as wishful thinking. The more common pattern for those I have termed 'transgressors' is to be to work in one's native country for the dissertation, and to continue doing field research there later after returning to work in that country. There may be contacts with native ethnographers, but stronger links may develop to sociologists, or to specialists in cultural studies. In any case, it is hard for these products of Anglophone socio-cultural anthropology to develop a salient public profile for this plot. This seems to be roughly the situation in contemporary Turkey (Tandogan 2008).

Northern Europe is often cited more positively, as a region where the anthropological field has been successfully purified of its dark nationalist and imperialist legacies, to reach maturity as a modern social science. Indeed, departments built up by the likes of Fredrik Barth in Bergen and Ulf Hannerz in Stockholm exemplify the plurality that I pleaded for above. These scholars worked abroad, before later developing projects at home. Some members of the departments I know in Scandinavia do most or all of their research at home. They engage with contemporary issues and many seek to disseminate the results of their research to a wide public. At the same time, other colleagues work mostly abroad. As a result, students are exposed to programmes covering classical topics and many regions of the world. The fly in the ointment is that, even here, it has not proved possible to integrate the older stream of people science. This persists more or less vigorously in many places throughout Scandinavia, but it exists seperately, and inevitably with some degree of duplication.

In south-east Europe it is hardly imaginable that autonomous departments of social anthropology could emerge to emulate those of Scandinavia. Is it possible instead that the countries covered in this volume could follow a different path, one which would allow local academic traditions to *combine* with other variants to form larger departments that would allow for a wider range of conversations? Is it utopian to imagine that countries which formerly belonged to non-aligned Yugoslavia, together with their southern neighbours Albania and Greece, with their complementary forms of marginality in the European imagination, could succeed in creating conditions which would allow for the emergence of the proverbial level playing field?

Of course, everything depends on what vision one has of the long-term future of the anthropological field. If one takes the view that the subject of social anthropology begins and ends with the synchronic study of modern forms of social life, then assimilation into neighbouring fields such as cultural studies and sociology may be the optimal outcome for some of the transgressive seeds about which I have been speculating. In many countries, projects which elsewhere fall under anthropology are carried out under these names. Even where anthropology does have visibility and some degree of institutionalisation, some of the projects of an anthropologist from A (also from B, let us be optimistic) might connect more closely with those of a sociologist in C, rather than those of a native ethnographer. Obviously, there should be no barriers to such communication. But even in these cases, I would still enter a plea for paying attention to the multifarious plots of the local anthropological field (and in cases where it is not institutionalised at all, then directly to history).[6] Beyond common intellectual sources, there will usually be compelling practical considerations: as long as empirical projects continue to engage with social life in particular places, among people speaking particular languages, it surely makes sense to connect with the disciplines which have emerged to study those particular places and peoples. The challenge is how to encourage the transgressors, while avoiding new forms of academic imperialism and what Michał Buchowski (2004) calls 'hierarchies of knowledge', not just in south-east Europe but everywhere. If we cannot achieve this, our skirmishing factions will continue to weaken each other on infertile fields on 'the margins' of academic life, instead of harvesting both distinct and shared plots of the anthropological field for mutual benefit.

---

[6] Of course, not all contemporary projects have the same degree of local historical resonance: one thinks of topics such as social media, or health farms, or homelessness? But even in such cases there might be precious nuggets, for example in what folklorists have written about attitudes to poverty, homelessness, sociability, and hospitality in the past, so that an effort to establish communication might be worthwhile.

References

Bošković, A. 2008a. Anthropology in Unlikely Places: Yugoslav ethnology between the past and the future. In A. Bošković, *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic practice on the margins*, pp. 156–168. New York & Oxford: Berghahn.

———. (ed.). 2008b. *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic practice on the margins*. New York & Oxford: Berghahn.

Buchowski, M. 2004. Hierarchies of Knowledge in Central-Eastern European Anthropology. *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 22 (2): 5-14.

Dalipaj, G. Forthcoming 2013. Domesticating the domestic. The house in Albanian ethnography during the communist regime. Annuario, *The Albanian Yearbook of Historical and Anthropological Studies* 2. Tirana: Center for Historical and Anthropological Research.

Halpern, J., and E. A. Hammel. 1969. Observations on the Intellectual History of Ethnology and Other Social Sciences in Yugoslavia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1): 17-26.

Hann, C. 2012. Faltering Dialogue: for a doubly rooted cosmopolitan anthropology. *Focaal. Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 63: 39-51.

Hann, C., M. Sárkány, and P. Skalnik (eds.). 2005. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist era anthropology in East-Central Europe*. Münster: LIT.

Hayden, R. M. 2013. *From Yugoslavia to the Western Balkans: Studies of a European Dissolution, 1991-2011*. Leiden: Brill.

Herzfeld, M. 1987. *Anthropology through the Looking Glass*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofer, T. 1968. Anthropologists and Native Ethnographers in Central European Villages: Comparative Notes on the Professional Personality of Two Disciplines. *Current Anthropology* 9 (4): 311-315.

Kürti, L., and P. Skalnik. (eds.). 2009. *Postsocialist Europe. Anthropological Perspectives from Home*. New York: Berghahn.

Mihăilescu, V., I. Iliev, and S. Naumović (eds.). 2008. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist era anthropology in South-East Europe*. Münster: LIT.

Mühlfried, F., and S. Sokolovskij (eds.). 2011. *Exploring the Edge of Empire. Soviet Era Anthropology in the Caucasus and Central Asia*. Berlin: LIT.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. 1957. *A Natural Science of Society*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Rihtman-Auguštin, D. 1984. *Struktura tradicijskog mišljenja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

–––––. 2004. *Ethnology, Myth and Politics: anthropologizing Croatian ethnology*. (Ed. by J. Čapo-Žmegač). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Skalnik, P. (ed.). 2002. *A Post-Communist Millennium: The struggles for sociocultural anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*. Prague: Set Out.

Stocking, G. W. 1982. Afterword: A View from the Center. In U. Hannerz, and T. Gerholm (eds.), The Shaping of National Anthropologies. *Ethnos* (special issue) 47 (1-2): 172-186.

Tandoğan, Z. G. 2008. Anthropology in Turkey: Impressions for an overview. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies: ethnographic practice on the margins*, pp. 97-109. New York & Oxford: Berghahn,

Todorova, M. 1989. Myth-making in European Family History: the Zadruga Revisited. *East European Politics and Societies*. 4 (1): 30-76

–––––. 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Acknowledgements

I thank Aleksandar Bošković for his stimulus throughout the gestation of this volume. I have learned a great deal from his knowledge of Yugoslavia and also his more general contributions to the recognition of 'other' valuable plots in the world anthropological field. I also thank him, Jennifer Cash, Thomas Hylland Eriksen and Robert Minnich for helpful comments and corrections to this chapter, but emphasise that I alone am responsible for all remaining imperfections.



© Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Halle/Saale, Germany

Map 1. Regional overview. [1]

[1] Base map: http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/Europe/Europe_ref_2012.pdf; accessed 25 Nov 2013.



Map 2. Universities engaged with folklore (*laografia*) and socio-cultural anthropology. [2]

[2] Base map: http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/Europe/txu-pclmaps-ocle-679396312-greece_pol-2010.jpg; accessed 25 Nov 2013.

Chapter 2

From 'National' to 'Social Science': Politics, Ideology, and Disciplinary Formation in Greek Anthropology from the 1940s till the 1980s

Evthymios Papataxiarchis

The Greek Anthropological Itinerary: Introductory Remarks[1]

We are moving fast towards a more polycentric history of the anthropological discipline, away from the monological paradigm that narrates the story of the anthropological metropolis in universalistic terms. The traditional narratives that actually constituted the centre into what it claimed to be, that is an 'anthropology with a lot of history', are losing currency. The power dynamics inherent in these hegemonic narratives are also questioned. Now, much more than before, it is widely understood that if any of the 'world anthropologies' wants to be part of the global anthropological landscape it needs to have a 'history'. To look backwards, therefore, in time and assess the achievements and failures of past efforts to establish socio-cultural anthropology as an academic discipline in diverse places is by definition the other face of a lively debate on the politics and future prospects of anthropology.

Writing the history of peripheral anthropologies is also an analytically challenging enterprise. Since the politics of anthropology are mediated by often idiosyncratic naming strategies of disciplinary trends or methodologies, the treatment of names and terms at the analytical level needs attention. In particular when we write in English we have to be cautious and to not take the semantic equivalence of local constructs of the anthropological enterprise with English terms for granted. Instead we have to carefully distinguish our analytical terminology from local usages and put indigenous constructs in context.

Here I adopt a broad approach, which relies on George Stocking's (1982) distinction between national ('nation-building') and imperial ('em-

[1] I would like to thank Georgios Agelopoulos, Efi Avdela, Alexandra Bakalaki, Panos Panopoulos, and Efi Plexousaki for their very useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Also many thanks to Jennifer Cash for her editorial suggestions.

pire-building') anthropologies.[2] Thus I include in my discussion various trends of Greek anthropological thought which have eclectic affinities to both poles of Stocking's comparative scheme and correspond to what in the Anglo-American world have been coined as folklore and socio-cultural anthropology. These diverse anthropological traditions, which have been practised under the names of *laografia*, *ethnografia*, *ethnologia*, and *koinoniki anthropologia*, have been guided by varying and often mutually conflicting epistemic concerns since they have been often committed to opposite political projects. They have also changed over time, both in relation to each other or to their international disciplinary allies.[3]

After these preliminary remarks let me offer an introductory comment on the kind of history I am proposing for Greek anthropology, an anthropology with (so far) little history, and one that is not written in a major language of international scholarship. Greece is a small 'island' on the global map of anthropology. It is situated quite near both the Anglo-American and the German 'mainland' and therefore caught up in the anthropological wars of the twentieth century. Greek anthropology was born out of the necessities of nation-building at the end of the nineteenth century.[4] It took the name *laografia* and specialised in the study of 'internal others'. Later, in the inter-war period, it was entangled in the paradigmatic formation of the so-called *ethniki epistimi* (national science) and the political project of establishing a homogeneous national identity built on the assumption of cultural continuity between ancient and modern Greeks. *Laografia* thus 'missed' the modernist course, which 'empire-building' anthropology took after Malinowski, and turned into a disciplinary hybrid, a blend of romantic historicism, methodological evolutionism, and philological scholasticism. As an academic discipline in close touch with German *Volkskunde*, official *laografia* mostly served the conservative, anti-communist establishment and remained at the core of the struggles between 'national' and 'social science' throughout most of the twentieth century.[5]

---

[2] Here I do not address the history of indigenous traditions that resemble the European and American traditions of physical or biological anthropology.

[3] In this paper I use transliterations of the indigenous Greek constructs of anthropology rather than translating the Greek terms to allegedly English equivalents. This is particularly so for the term *laografia*; *laografia* is often glossed as 'folklore', but in local practice the use of the term is idiosyncratic. When I put an English term in inverted commas (e.g. 'social science') I suggest reference to the Greek usage of the term.

[4] See the important contributions by Herzfeld (1982 and 1987) and Kyriakidou Nestoros (1978).

[5] For most of the twentieth century, from the 1920s until the 1970s, the development of anthropological ideas in Greece was over-determined by the split and opposition between two alternative conceptions of self-knowledge: 'social science' versus 'national science' (see

However, this is only half of the story. In a rather paradoxical way, Greek anthropology was integrated in the modernist anthropological project, as *koinoniki anthropologia* (social anthropology), in the context of imperial type ethnographic fieldwork in post-war Greece. Its integration was initially realised by foreign researchers trained in the methods and theories of British and American anthropology. These ethnographers transplanted the best anthropological traditions of the time onto southern European soil. Later cooperation between foreign ethnographers and Greek scholars contributed to the progressive establishment of *koinoniki anthropologia* and the social sciences more generally at the margins of Greek academia. It provided the vital bridge between cosmopolitan anthropology and the domestic 'social science' project.

Since then *koinoniki anthropologia* has developed through a number of successive mutations – involving foreign fieldworkers, Greek fieldworkers trained abroad, and Greek fieldworkers trained in Greece (Bakalaki 1997). At the turn of the twenty-first century *koinoniki anthropologia* had achieved the status of a fully-fledged, rigorous academic discipline, well synchronised with contemporaneous theoretical developments in socio-cultural anthropology throughout Europe and the Americas (Papataxiarchis 2003a and 2005). This course, however, and the struggle between 'national' and 'social science' have left a legacy of uneasy relations (ranging from limited communication and some cooperation to mutual avoidance) between *koinoniki anthropologia* and *laografia* (Papataxiarchis 2003b and Tountasaki 2003).[6]

Put in comparative terms, the development of anthropology in Greece has aspects that contrast with the defining characteristics of various anthropological schools. Greece never had overseas or continental colonies.[7] In

---

Kyrtsis 1996). The dialectic between these two (multi) disciplinary formations was an extrapolation at the level of systematic knowledge of *Ethnikos Dichasmos* (National Schism), the division between two opposed conceptions of the Greek nation and its place in the world. 'Social science' was built on Eleuthérios Venizélos's vision of Greece as a large extraterritorial nation of the 'two continents and the four seas', while 'national science' rested on the anti-Venizelist vision of an introverted and 'small yet honest Hellas' (see Mavrogordatos 1983).

[6] In this respect the dilemma 'separation or convergence', which 'western style' anthropologists and 'national ethnographers' of ex-socialist countries faced after 1989 (Hann 2007: 18), has been troubling Greek social anthropologists and folklorists for a much longer period.

[7] Greece did have, however, a powerful commercial diaspora that mediated the circulation of European intellectual trends. As producer of a diasporic consciousness this elite contributed to the shaping of a Hellenic identity ('Hellenism') that was based on the idiosyncratic synthesis of ethno-romanticism and evolutionism. More importantly, this elite also contributed to later differentiations within the dominant paradigm of 'Hellenism', to successive breaks with ethnocentric evolutionism, to the '(re)turn to the present', and to a perspective of distancing

contrast therefore to the major metropolitan traditions (such as British social anthropology, American cultural anthropology, French *ethnologie*, and German *Völkerkunde*), Greek anthropology, in Balkan style (see Mihăilescu, Iliev and Naumović 2008), almost exclusively focused on Greece. In this respect it cannot be described, to use Susan Rogers' phrase concerning the French anthropology of France, as 'the child of two estranged parents of unequal social standing: ethnology and folklore' (2001: 488). Also, in contrast to Italy, academic *laografia* for most of the twentieth century did not develop into radical 'left wing' directions[8], while it remained disengaged from the Anglo-American ethnography of Greece exhibiting an attitude of indifference and hostility towards the conception of Greek modernist anthropology. Yet despite the fact that a fixation with Greek identity dominated *laografia* and the research focus on Greek society still haunts certain sections of *koinoniki anthropologia*[9], the theoretical identity and the methodological practices of the latter have greater affinity with the 'secondary metropolitan' or 'white-settler' traditions practised respectively in Sweden or Brazil (Stocking 1982: 179) than with other Balkan anthropologies.

The paradoxical coexistence of an introvert research orientation with rigorous theories and methodologies, a combination which, in my view, highlights a distinctive and important feature of Greek *koinoniki anthropologia*, can be explained in terms of the conditions of its development after the Second World War and, much later, its institutional accommodation in the university system during democratisation. Modern anthropological ideas - and particularly the methodological sensitivity of the imperial type of anthropology that derives from the in-depth study of colonial others - have been imported into Greece by foreign scholars who applied the modern ethnographic canon to the study of Greek society. Anthropological ideas have been imported into Greece not as abstract theories – as part of a philosophical agenda - but as ethnographically-informed images and interpretive schemes of Greece. These ethnographic schemes have been reproduced in a mutual intellectual engagement between the foreign ethnographers of Greece and their Greek students, both in the context of abstract instruction and in the field. It is through these interactions that the foreign ethnography

---

which has been an important intellectual undercurrent in the formation of Greek anthropology. This is a complex historical issue which I cannot consider further here. On the bearings of an extrovert, not to say expansive, view of 'Hellenism' on the project of establishing a School of Oriental Ethnology at the Greek University of Smyrna, see the very interesting work of Georgios Agelopoulos (2010).

[8] On the synthesis between Marxian thought and folklore studies in Italy's *culturologia*, see Saunders 1984.

[9] On the limitations of 'indigenous anthropology' in Greece, see Gefou-Madianou 1993 and Bakalaki 1997.

of Greece moulded Greek anthropology. It is in the context of high quality ethnographic practice that Greek scholars of my generation were introduced to social anthropology.

Let me add a reflexive note. My perspective is an interested one: I am offering an insider's view. For more than 35 years - and in various capacities: as a student, researcher, teacher, administrator, and citizen - I have been a participant observer of the intellectual and institutional scene that I am describing. Put otherwise, I have been involved in the subject matter of my study. I am writing from the position of someone who was initiated into an idiosyncratic Greek version of *koinoniki anthropologia* that offered a Marxist, critical alternative to the formalist, ultra-conservative, and highly ethnocentric 'national science'; who was academically trained as a social anthropologist in Britain in the course of the 1970s; and who has been involved in the academic establishment of social anthropology in Greece since the middle 1980s.

Since producing a history of Greek anthropology is an ingredient of the domestic as well as the international politics of the discipline, it is important to clarify my standpoint. My political position is shaped around a central concern: to achieve a double balance between what I regard as the two formative currents of Greek social anthropological thought (the domestic heritage of critical thought and the international anthropological tradition of in-depth ethnographic fieldwork), and between the introvert (oriented to self-knowledge) and extrovert (comparative and more cosmopolitan) orientations. This position is reflected in writing and publishing in my native as well as in other languages, thus trying to reach both a Greek and an international audience. Over all I am committed to the opening up of a more symmetrical, multi-centered, heteroglossic global anthropological space.[10]

In this paper I consider the development of Greek anthropology in connection to socio-political realities and wider ideological trends in three successive periods: the post-war period and particularly its second phase, the 'short decade of the 60s' (Sefereiadis and Chatzivasileiou 2008); the 1967-74 military dictatorship; and the period between the restoration of democracy in 1974 and the mid-1980s, when the first university departments in the social sciences (including social anthropology) were founded.

The main line of my argument is that after the Second World War, the interwar division between 'national science' and 'social science' became more rigid with the eruption of civil war and the establishment of an authoritarian democracy. As a result academic *laografia* was firmly bound to 'national science' at the same time that social anthropology was imported

[10] For example, see Schippers 1995; Restrepo and Escobar 2005; Bošković and Eriksen 2008.

through the work of foreign ethnographers in Greece. The ideological divisions of the Civil War as they were reproduced in the context of Cold War polarities also increasingly internally divided both *laografia* and *koinoniki anthropologia* between academic and non-academic versions as well as between opposed ideological variants of these disciplines. The establishment of the Athens Centre for Social Sciences (*Kentro Koinonikon Epistimon Athinon*, KKEA) in the early 1960s was an important development in the direction of transcending Cold War polarities and bringing together the cosmopolitan anthropology of foreign fieldworkers with indigenous social thought. Yet this did not last since the coming of the junta widened the gap between 'national' and dissident 'social science'. The military dictatorship was a step backwards in relation to the earlier processes of modernisation: it led to the extreme polarisation between the ultra-conservative ethnocentric forms of official state ideology, and the radical social thinking primarily of intellectuals exiled in the western European capitals. The conflict between these ideological trends eventually contributed to the discrediting of anti-communist ethnocentrism. Thus the restoration of democracy in 1974 brought a reversal in the configuration of power between 'national' and 'social science' and the emergence of a new Marxist socio-centric paradigm. The socio-centric paradigm was an appealing alternative, particularly among a younger generation of scholars. It also brought together a number of disciplines, including *koinoniki anthropologia* and progressive *laografia*, under the hegemony of historical sociology. The new paradigm promised a break with the academic establishment, a prospect that was realised in the context of institutional changes in the university and the academic upgrading of social sciences, including *koinoniki anthropologia*, in the new peripheral universities.

The Post-War (1949–1967): Foreign Anthropological Research in Greece, *Laografia* and the Athens Centre for Social Sciences (KKEA)

The Role of the Civil War

The Civil War and its outcome played a decisive role in shaping the direction taken by anthropology in Greece. In few words, the prevalence of the National Army – in alliance with the British and later the American military - over the Democratic Army and the consolidation of a nominally democratic regime that rested upon Western political, military, and financial support contributed both to the development of foreign anthropological research in

the country and to the reconfiguration of 'national science', including *laografia*, in ultra-conservative directions.

First, the Civil War determined the geopolitical position of Greece in the post-war world. Greece, a country situated, to use the (world system) terminology of the 1970s, in the European semi-periphery, was firmly placed at the side of the capitalist, democratic West. As the country was transferred from the British to the American sphere of influence (and soon after entered NATO) foreign intervention in Greek domestic affairs became the norm (Kofas 1989: 137-167). For a long period Greek politics were decided at the office of the American ambassador while the administration of American financial aid (under the Marshall Plan) became a channel of influence in domestic affairs and a shaping factor of development and research (Stathakis 2004; also Kofas 1989: 107-35). Under such conditions Greece was regarded as an open and friendly place for potential ethnographers in an era when classical colonial destinations were closing. Therefore in the 1950s it became a favourite spot of anthropological research for British, American, and French scholars.

During this period military involvement in Greek affairs definitely affected the academic engagement of distinguished scholars with the study of Greece. It is quite characteristic that in 1944, (ancient historian) Nicholas Hammond as an SOE officer was head of the Allied Military Mission to the resistance in Northern Greece, (anthropologist) John Campbell was part of the British Force that participated in the first round of the Civil War, and (historian) William H. McNeill was American assistant military attaché in Athens.

Second, the victory of the National Army and the allied forces led to the establishment of an authoritarian ('limited') democracy: repressive violence was realised under the auspices of formal constitutionalism (Nikolakopoulos 2001). The winning side of the Civil War established its grasp on the state and state institutions through a combination of coercive measures with the ultra-conservative doctrine of *ethnikofrosyni* (national conviction). *Ethnikofrosyni* was a reconfiguration of nationalist ideology in the context of anti-communism, a project that was initially pursued by the interwar liberal politicians (Alivizatos 1986). Together with a set of value concepts such as family, religion, and tradition, *ethnikofrosyni* constituted a 'new synthesis' in political ideology (Bournazos 2009:12), and a new form of nationalist fundamentalism.

In the circumstances of the Cold War, the authoritarian regime adopted *ethnikofrosyni* as the defensive tenet of its official ideology. It thus pitted the nation as an organic whole (conceived in racial terms) against both its 'internal' (i.e. communists and sympathisers) and 'external enemies' (for

example, minority groups that had ethnic connections with the 'northern enemy', i.e. the socialist states of the Balkans). In the context of 'formal constitutionalism' the regime strengthened its hold of the state by using 'declarations of *ethnikofrosyni*' against its ideological opponents, and secured the full control of the civil service by requiring civil servants to sign so-called certificates of social convictions which were formal written statements of obedience to the regime (Tsoukalas 1981 and Bournazos 2009).

Under such conditions Greek universities were 'cleansed' of 'anti-national elements' through the expulsion and exclusion of dissidents. Ideological opponents of the rightist regime, including many intellectuals such as Konstantinos Th. Dimaras, Evangelos Papanoutsos, and Alexandros Delmouzos were pushed into the extra-academic, unofficial margins. Others, such as Cornelius Kastoriadis, Kostas Axelos, or Nikolaos Svoronos were forced into exile (Manitakis 2009). For a time, Greek intellectual life was dislocated from the wider western and central European context in which it had been situated before the Second World War. A whole generation of liberal intellectuals retreated into 'demobilized introspection' while a more general 'regression of intellectual and cultural debate' (Tsoukalas 1981: 332) took place. 'Social science' was one of the main victims of this climate: sociology and political science were totally marginalised.[11]

On the other hand, 'national science' became one of the ideological cornerstones of the authoritarian regime and was offered total control of formal institutional structures, including the universities. On the academic front *laografia* -as one of the disciplines that had well-served earlier nation-building projects - developed further in a conservative direction. It reproduced its interwar identity as a philological discipline, lost any comparativist interest, and reinforced its eclectic association with *volkskunde* (cf. Nitsiakos this volume). These domestic politico-ideological developments had serious negative implications on social research by native scholars, but they did not limit the emergence of a tradition of empirical social research by primarily British and American scholars in the context of foreign aid to Greece.

Foreign Ethnography of Greece: John Campbell and Ernestine Friedl

The development of anthropology in capitalist Greece and the socialist rest of the Balkans is respectively informed by two different notions of the 'social'. In the socialist democracies throughout the Balkans, the 'social'

[11] For example, the chairs of Sociology and Philosophy of Law in the University of Athens, whose occupants were exiled during the rightist Metaxas' dictatorship (1936-41), remained vacant after the Civil War (Tsoukalas 1981: 337, also see Lampiri Dimaki 1987).

acquired a largely canonical meaning that rendered its systematic empirical study meaningless.[12] In contrast, the efforts to recover Greek society under the aegis of the Marshall Plan defined post-war Greek society as a 'problem' and, therefore, as an object of study. Thus in Greece the modernist aims of Anglo-American social sciences, particularly sociology, to analyse 'social problems' and contribute to economic development, provided the framework in which Greek anthropology was also conceived of, primarily by a modernising elite, as a social and not a philological science. Anthropology gradually became part of a set of disciplines – the sciences of the social - which served the project of induced socio-economic change.

The development of empirical social research in post-war Greece was mainly in the hands of foreign researchers because it was linked to the administration of foreign aid.[13] The systematic study of social and economic structures was regarded as a precondition for the efficient use of foreign resources in the recovery of the country. The first, rather small, ethnographic project realised in 1950 by a professional anthropologist, Dorothy Demetracopoulou-Lee (1962), a student of Margaret Mead, is a characteristic example. Demetracopoulou-Lee explicitly addressed the 'agents of change', that is the foreign institutions that were active in Greece, asking them to take into serious consideration the cultural preconditions of transformation and particularly 'Greek individualism' (Avdela 2002: 208). The major ethnographic fieldworks of both John Campbell and Ernestine Friedl in 1954 – two projects that put Greece on the anthropological map – were also aspects of this wider tradition although they did not entail applied research.

---

[12] Because 'socialist society' was reconfigured as a 'new nation' that had transcended class antagonism and achieved egalitarian harmony, 'society' could not be defined as a problem worthy of discussion.

A comparison with the Albanian case is instructive. In socialist Albania, in the name of 'Marxism-Leninism' and 'historical materialism' sociology was fully co-opted into state ideology as a normative discipline teaching proper conduct in the allegedly accomplished, harmonious socialist order. The same highly normative project guided socialist folklore, 'ethnography', and *kultura popullore* in their missions to establish a correspondence between 'socialist society' and the 'people' particularly through promoting the cause of the 'new man' in the context of a popular culture that had to be 'national in form and socialist in content' (see Kodra-Hysa's contribution in this volume).

[13] Early examples of this tradition include the research 'On American Aid in Action' done by William H. McNeill and other researchers on behalf of the Twentieth Century Fund in 1946-47 and later in 1952-53 (Smothers, McNeill and McNeill 1948; McNeil 1957); the work done by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) mission in Greece in 1947; and the field research in rural Crete by a group led by Leland Allbaugh under the aegis of the Rockefeller Foundation in 1948 (Allbaugh 1953). In the same period (1952-53) important research was also conducted in the countryside of Northern Greece by the American sociologist Irwin Sanders (1953, 1962). On foreign empirical research in post-war Greek society, see Couroucli 1978 and Tsaousis 1985.

As we saw John Campbell first came to Greece in 1944 as a member of the British expeditionary force. This experience shifted his academic interest to anthropology. After studying at Cambridge, with Meyer Fortes and Emrys Peters, and later at Oxford, with E.E. Evans-Pritchard and John Peristiany, Campbell returned to Greece in 1954 with his wife Sheila to conduct the fieldwork that led to the publication of *Honour, Family and Patronage* (1964). Although other anthropologists had already conducted ethnographic research in southern Europe (e.g. Julian Pitt-Rivers had finished his doctoral thesis on Andalusia), Campbell was guided by the typically primitivist bias that had shaped British anthropology in its colonial heydays. In his own words: 'As I went to the Greek mountains my anthropological preconceptions remained essentially African. I expected kinship relations to be a central aspect of social structure. The existence, or not, of unilineal descent groups would be a main consideration. However bizarre it may now seem, the one anthropology book I took to the field, whether as a symbolic gesture or as a practical guide, I no longer remember, was *The Nuer*' (Campbell 1992: 151).

It is true that Campbell saw mountainous Greece with the eyes of an Africanist. This cannot be said of the other major ancestor of Greek ethnography, Ernestine Field who conducted fieldwork with her husband, the classicist Harry Levy, in an agricultural village of Boeotia in 1955. Friedl was already an experienced anthropologist since she had completed a thesis on the Chippewa Indians. She described her project as part of the anthropological interest that the 'New World' was showing to the 'Old World' and to those populations who were 'co-heirs' of the great civilisation to which the Western anthropologists also belonged. In the introduction of her monograph on Vasilika she explained: 'In the last two decades many cultural anthropologists have turned to the study of societies whose cultures are in the main line of the Near Eastern tradition. They have done so because of a conviction that the techniques and insights developed through the study of primitive societies are useful for the description and analysis of all societies' (Friedl 1962: 2).

There is no doubt, therefore, that Campbell and Friedl worked within different traditions. Friedl worked within the framework of 'community studies' initiated by Conrad Arensberg's research in Ireland in the 1930s, a research that 'opened up Europe for modern anthropology' (Silverman 2000: 48).[14] British anthropologists, on the other hand, and particularly those of the Oxford School who adopted Evans-Pritchard's strategy of comparison,

[14] Arensberg located Europe 'within the Old World, he placed it among the Peoples of the Book and, more specifically, among the Peoples of the Plow' (Silverman 2000: 49). He also showed a particular interest in peasants.

pursued the primitivist quest for differences, particularly at the level of values (Cowan 1995). Indeed, Oxford anthropologists soon analysed the Mediterranean societies in terms of the 'honour and shame' value complex (Peristiany 1965b).

Despite their differences, Campbell's and Friedl's projects both employed means of distancing the Anglo-American scholars from the populations they studied. In this regard, both anthropologists participated in the exercise of colonial authority that still characterised British and American anthropology of the time (Pina-Cabral 1989: 399). The rigid hierarchy that pervaded the cognitive structure of the imperial model of anthropology was not limited to the strict colonial division of ethnographic labour that prevented native speakers from conducting anthropological studies of their own society. It was also reflected in the use of English as the language of analysis and description. Among professional British and American anthropologists, it was accepted that cultural categories from different local and national settings must necessarily be 'translated' first into English before they could be comparatively assessed and processed into larger synthetic schemes, syndromes, value complexes, and so on. 'Translation', however, as an analytic strategy that focuses on the common cultural denominator failed to recognise the internal complexity and diversity of local knowledge (Herzfeld 1980). In this respect, Greece entered modern anthropology in the way that colonies did, as an *object* of ethnographic study. In the 1950s this seemed to be the only possible way for foreign anthropologists to approach Greece.

This becomes clearer through a closer look at the wider political circumstances of fieldwork. Foreign anthropological research was enveloped in local and national political structures, was closely connected to foreign policy considerations, and was susceptible to fluctuations in foreign relations. Campbell's efforts to conduct fieldwork in Epirus exemplify the political contingencies of anthropological research in Greece. Good relations between Greece and Britain, along with personal political connections with high standing Greek officials allowed Campbell access to the sensitive and restricted border zone of Zagori villages in Epirus. In fact Campbell enjoyed the patronage of Panagiotis Kanelopoulos, a philosopher-sociologist and powerful politician (who could not understand how a well-qualified and gifted scholar could choose such a second rate topic of study). On the other hand, Campbell's fieldwork suffered a setback during the Cyprus crisis of 1955, when Greek-British relations were put to the test and Kanelopoulos was out of ministerial office. In a long unpublished interview Campbell has described the situation in Ioannina, the capital of Epirus, where he happened to be in the days of the crisis: the demonstrations, the tension and the strong anti-British feeling he experienced, how he was helped to hide in a friend's

house, and his subsequent expulsion by the Greek authorities from the field (Papataxiarchis 2010b).

The Domestic Scene: **Laografia** *and Alternative 'Knowledge of the Ancients'*

Let us turn to native anthropologists. During the 1949-67 period the deep polarisations in the intellectual life intensified further the interwar divisions within *laografia* between the academic mainstream and a nonacademic *laografia* applying fieldwork methodologies (Papataxiarchis 2003a: 129-32). Academic *laografia* was institutionally accommodated – together with archaeology, history, and philology - in the Philosophical Schools of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens (hereafter and in subsequent chapters University of Athens) – a bastion of national values and institutional base of 'national science' – and of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (hereafter and in subsequent chapters University of Thessaloniki). It was also practised in the Academy of Athens. The academic leaders of *laografia*, Stilpon Kyriakides and Georgios Megas, were committed to the 'continuity thesis' (between moderns and ancient Greeks) and during the interwar period had built links with German *Volkskunde*.[15] On the other hand, non-academic practitioners of *laografia*, such as Angeliki Chatzimichali and Katerina Kakouri, were primarily attached to private museums and collections. They focused their research on material culture or ritual life; identified themselves also as 'ethnographers'; and abandoned the armchair methodology for research techniques that relied on fieldwork (Papadopoulos 1982). Intellectual exchanges and influence between the two groups were limited.

Outside *laografia,* research that directly referred to *anthropologia* was also affected by the ideological divisions of the time (Papataxiarchis 2003a: 126-28). For example, the Greek Anthropological Society provided a quasi-institutionalised, non-academic context for wider dialogues between *laografia,* imperial type anthropology, and physical anthropology. The society was founded in 1924 by Ioannis Koumaris, a doctor specialising in anatomy who held Greece's first chair of physical anthropology in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Athens. Koumaris (1955) pursued an all-inclusive view of *anthropologia* that embraced physical anthropology, prehistoric archaeology, and '*ethnologia*, *laografia* and popular art'- disci-

[15] On the interplay between scholarly concerns and political commitment in post-war academic folklore and, particularly, the strong conservatism and anti-communism in the work of Kyriakides and the Romantic nationalist overtones in the work of Megas, see V. Nitsiakos's contribution in this volume.

plines that in his earlier writings were included in '*psychiki anthropologia*' (psychic anthropology) (Koumaris 1925). His anthropological project had been initially inspired by German physical anthropology and heavily relied on racial anthropological concepts (Trubeta 2009). Like the academic leaders of *laografia* (including Stilpon Kyriakides who was a member of the Society), Koumaris wanted to put the 'anthropological sciences' (and the Anthropological Society in particular) at the service of the nation and prove the racial continuity of the Hellenic race (Trubeta 2010).[16] The heterogeneous membership of the Anthropological Society included Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark, a sort of 'native' social anthropologist who had done a number of field trips to the Himalayas (the Todas) (Prince Peter of Greece 1963; Agelopoulos this volume). Prince Peter had offered lectures in the society, thus conferring prestige to Koumaris's initiatives. In return, Koumaris had made an unsuccessful move to secure the election of Prince Peter to the chair of physical anthropology (Gizelis 2004: 30). Political sympathies also accounted for the involvement of an 'amateur' anthropologist, Lazaros Piniatoglou, in the society. Piniatoglou (1938) used Frazerian evolutionism to give historical depth to his royalist convictions.

Outside of formal institutions and organisations, anthropology was often coupled with leftist sympathies. The non-academic front of Greek anthropology was dominated by a heterodox thinker and philologist, Panagis Lekatsas, who wrote prolifically about ancient Greek religion from the perspective of an alternative, less ethnocentric *archaiognosia* ('knowledge of the ancients'). Lekatsas was influenced by George Thompson's Marxist interpretation of ancient Greek society as well as by the social evolutionary schemes proposed by Johann Jacob Bachofen and Lewis Henry Morgan. In his analysis of religious phenomena in ancient Greek society Lekatsas used historic-philological material not as means of proving the continuity with the Modern Greeks but as evidence for past stages of evolution and means for relativising the historical present.

Lekatsas described his project on *The Origin of Institutions, Customs and Beliefs* (1951) as 'social history'. His notion of anthropology and his evolutionist framework worked more in engagement with history and philology than with social sciences proper. Yet in contrast to Koumaris, Lekatsas's project challenged the paradigm of 'national science' from within. Instead of reifying the nation, Lekatsas contributed to a capitalist critique from the perspective of Marxism. This offered great popularity to his work, particularly in the middle 1960s, when the domestic political scene diversified and shifted to the Left.

---

[16] On the reception of Darwinian thought in late nineteenth and early twentieth century Greece, see Krimpas 1993.

More generally in Greece the various forms of indigenous anthropology –the academic mainstream of *laografia*, or the alternatives of ethnographic *laografia*, or Marxist *archaiognosia* - despite the occasional references to works commonly associated with the early development Anglo-American anthropology, did not lead to an extended engagement with the work of foreign ethnographers. Particularly in the case of academic *laografia* this was due to 'a theoretical and methodological non correspondence' between foreign ethnography and *laografia* (Nitsiakos 2004: 271). Particularly the first generation of Anglo-Saxon ethnographers of Greece did not establish connections with the establishment of *laografia* since they viewed their comparativist strategy as transcending folklorist ethnocentrism and deviating from the conception, so popular among folklorists and sociologists, that peoples can be studied under the titles of their national flags as geographical entities.[17] As one of the leaders of the Oxford School, Julian Pitt-Rivers (1963a: 10) put it: 'The communities of the Mediterranean possess both more similarities between different countries and more diversities within their national frontiers than the tenets of modern nationalism would have us believe... . A social anthropology of the Mediterranean must start with these diversities rather than with the stereotypes of national "cultures"'. Generally speaking, the British school exercised an 'epistemological protectionism' (Davis 1977). It supported the insularity of a tradition combining structural analysis and intensive fieldwork and remained indifferent to peripheral traditions such as folklore (Albera and Blok 2001: 27).

KKEA: The Institutionalisation of Cosmopolitan Social Anthropology

There was however an important and didactic exception to the multiple fragmentation of the Greek anthropological scene. In 1960 John Peristiany, an Oxford anthropologist and an Africanist, in his capacity as UNESCO expert, became director of the *Kentro Koinonikon Epistimon Athinon* (KKEA, Athens Centre for Social Sciences, later to be known as EKKE). John Peristiany was born in Greece, raised in Cyprus, and originally trained in law before becoming an anthropologist. After receiving a doctorate in law at the University of Paris, he went to London to join Bronislaw Malinowski's seminar in social anthropology at the London School of Economics, and later completed his PhD at Oxford. In the late 1930s, he conducted

[17] This is not to say that there were not any interchanges: Demetrios Loukatos reviewed Campbell's *Honour, Family and Patronage* (Loukatos 1964), while Campbell (1964: vi) acknowledged his debt to Chatzimichali's work and also reviewed Kakouri's *Dionysiaka* in *American Anthropologist* (Campbell 1965).

research among the Kipsigis in Kenya, but in the 1950s, he shifted his research interests to Europe and particularly to his native Cyprus (Campbell 1995). Peristiany founded KKEA under the auspices of UNESCO while securing also the financial support of the French government (Argyriadou 2003; Rafail 2003).

The foundation of the Athens Centre for Social Sciences was linked to the predominance of modernisers in the block of conservative forces that participated in the Karamanlis government and was a symptom of the progressive currents that surfaced in the 'short decade of the 60s' (Rigos et al. 2008). The centre's formal establishment, just after the triumph of Konstantinos Karamanlis in the 1958 national elections, was part of the decisive turn of the government towards western Europe, the radical improvement of Greek-French relations, and the beginning of negotiations with the European Economic Community. The centre's establishment signalled a wider interest in indigenous social and economic research as a precondition of policy (Andreadis 1966).[18]

The establishment of the Centre for Social Sciences was symptomatic, in other words, of political and ideological trends that were transcending the big polarities of the early 1950s. It was a marginal institution, officially recognised yet not part of the state and deriving recognition primarily from its international affiliations. It brought together diverse categories of people: foreign scholars, Greek liberal intellectuals, and senior academics (including Stratis Andreadis and Michalis Goutos) who enjoyed the patronage of members of the authoritarian regime, and a younger generation of Greek social scientists with connections to the Left. It constituted an emergent 'middle ground' on which the edifice of the social sciences was finally erected.

Peristiany's anthropological authority had put its mark on this highly cosmopolitan and very influential project. In KKEA Peristiany brought together scholars working in a broad disciplinary spectrum that included social anthropology, sociology, human geography, and demography. In this sense KKEA could be regarded as the first important step in the institutionalisation of Greek social anthropology (Papataxiarchis 2003a). Yet, the ethnic division of scientific labour in this project is quite suggestive of the concept of social anthropology that prevailed in the post-war decades. There was a national division of research labour. The main national groups of senior researchers were British anthropologists, French human geographers, and a few Greek sociologists. No other Greek besides Peristiany, who was initiated in anthropology through fieldwork in Africa and was well inte-

[18] In the same period major research centres, such as the Centre for Economic Research and Planning (KEPE), the Royal Research Centre, Dimokritos, and the Doxiadis School of Ekistics were also founded.

grated in the British academic community, did or trained to do anthropological work. In the post-war imperial model the only room left for natives was that of an 'insider's sociology'. Of course all young researchers were Greek. Among them were some of the leading members of the group that regenerated the Greek social sciences in the university after the fall of the junta.[19]

In theoretical terms, the Athens Centre for Social Sciences pursued a broad alliance of disciplines under the aegis of Durkheimian 'comparative sociology', following Radcliffe Brown's definition of anthropology (Peristiany 1965a). In this dynamic paradigm, colonial type anthropology, in close association with human geography, played a key role. Peristiany used the KKEA to forward his own comparative agenda of establishing an anthropological movement focused on the values of 'honour and shame' that he regarded as emblematic of the wider region of the Mediterranean. Many commentators have since criticised the demarcation of the Mediterranean as a distinct ethnographic region as an 'exercise in the legitimation of academic authority' (Pina-Cabral 1989: 401, following Herzfeld 1980). Here I should add that this move proved to be particularly beneficial both for the Centre and Greek anthropology. Peristiany together with Julian Pitt-Rivers organised a number of international conferences[20], which took place mostly in Athens in the late 1950s and early 1960s and were sponsored by UNESCO, the Wenner-Gren Foundation, and the Greek Ministry of the Presidency.[21] These initiatives were extremely successful in forging strong links between the centre and the international anthropological community, in bringing together local and foreign researchers, and in establishing an important research tradition with far reaching effects.[22] Greece as a research site occupied from the start a prominent place in the upcoming anthropology of the Mediterranean. No doubt, as Peristiany put it, this was 'a small miracle'!

In wider political and ideological terms and in the context of the authoritarian, repressive democracy that prevailed in the two post-war decades, KKEA constituted a 'niche of intellectual freedom' as well (Argyriadou 2003: 247). Its quasi-international status, the contractual character of em-

---

[19] Among the more senior were sociologists Maria Iliou, Ioanna Lambiri-Dimaki, Kalliopi Moustaka, Titos Patrikios, Dimitris Tsaousis, Constantinos Tsoukalas, and Vasilis Filias. Among the junior researchers were Stathis Damianakos, Gerasimos Notaras, Koula Kasimati, and Kosmas Psychopaidis.

[20] See Pitt-Rivers 1963b; Peristiany 1965b, 1967 and 1968.

[21] See Argyriadou 2003: 284-89. It is interesting that from 1958-61 the responsibility of the Ministry of the Presidency was held by the philosopher and politician Konstantinos Tsatsos.

[22] The contrast between the cosmopolitanism of KKEA and the ethnocentric bias that dominated in the alternative historiography pursued by Constantinos Dimaras and his students in the Centre of Neo-Hellenic Research of the National Research Centre (that was founded in 1960) is striking (see Karamanolakis 2008: 88-90).

ployment that allowed flexibility in the handling of 'declarations of *ethnikofrosyni*' and its mixed, yet limited, financial sources contributed to an idiosyncratic work environment, with seminars and open theoretical discussion. Although the epistemological umbrella that permitted this blooming of empirical research was provided by structural functionalism, the intellectual atmosphere that pervaded in the centre varied in the direction of ideological trends that predominated in the wider Left. The young Greek researchers of KKEA were following an academic trajectory that the coming dictatorship shifted in radical directions.

The Greek Dictatorship (1967-1974): A Setback for the Social Sciences

The military coup of 1967 was a serious setback on the efforts to establish the social sciences. During the seven years of the dictatorship anti-communism reached a climax. The regime promoted the 'Hellenic-Christian Civilisation' as its central ideological motto. This was coupled by a strong nativism – captured in the slogan *Ellas Ellinon Christianon* (Greece of Greek Christians) – that clashed with the European identity of the modernising project to which the development of social research was historically attached. Nativism in association with an emphasis on the 'rural' figured highly in the imagination of the junta thus providing fertile ground for the development of ethnocentric kitsch focusing on the triptych: 'fatherland-religion-family'. The introvert perspective was further facilitated by the alienation and the isolation of the regime in the European context, particularly after the process of entering the European Economic Community stopped.[23] In these circumstances the role of academic *laografia* as 'national science' was reinforced while the ongoing modernisation of the ideological field and the subsequent institutionalisation of social sciences were temporarily cancelled.

KKEA, as a cosmopolitan centre of social research, was one of the victims of the junta.[24] The dictatorial regime fired Peristiany, stopped financing the centre for some months, and replaced the members of the governing board. At the end of 1967 the staff was also fired or forced to leave and the Centre was renamed *Ethniko Kentro Koinonikon Ereunon* (National Centre for Social Research, EKKE) under the direction of the sociologist Ilias Dimitras. The new director, who later served as minister in the dictatorial regime, tried to use the centre as an ideological tool of the dictatorship, but

[23] On the ideological overtones of the dictatorial regime, see the contributions in the collective volume edited by Athanasatou, Rigos and Sefereiadis (1999).
[24] See Argyriadou 2003: 290-97 and National Centre for Social Research 1986.

he failed as research and publishing activity at the centre actually slowed to a minimum.

Most of the Greek researchers of KKEA (Konstantinos Tsoukalas, Titos Patrikios, Gerasimos Notaras, Kosmas Psychopaidis, Nikolas Voulelis, and others) became active in the struggle against the military junta, either within or outside Greece. A number of them were persecuted and forced into hiding or were jailed for political activities against the junta. Others went into exile in the academic metropoles of western Europe (mainly in France and Germany) (Tsoukalas 2003). There they continued their studies in social sciences, philosophy, or history and integrated themselves into the larger group of left-wing diasporic intellectuals who had left Greece after the Civil War. In the climate of the uprisings of the 1960s, they were enmeshed in the intellectual movements of the time and particularly the engagement of French Marxism with structuralism and, in this capacity, they contributed to the radicalisation of Greek diasporic consciousness.

In short, the dismantling of KKEA meant the abrupt end of the short renaissance of the social sciences. The dynamism that had been accumulated in the academic fringes of Greece was transferred to the diasporic communities where the exiled intellectuals moved. Informal intellectual activity initially suffered a setback. 'Social science', in particular, was persecuted since the 'social' was treated with suspicion as suggesting affiliation with socialism and the Left. It started recovering in the early 1970s with the development of the student movement. In the context of the struggle against the dictatorship the social sciences were linked to a new demand for critical self-knowledge. They quickly adopted a critical mark and a special connection with European Marxism, characteristics that are reflected in the rich publishing activity of that period.

On the other hand, the dictatorship did not disrupt fieldwork in Greece by foreign anthropologists, although individual projects were affected by fluctuations in the regimes' international relations.[25] Quite the contrary, from the middle 1960s until the early 1970s, a second generation of foreign ethnographers conducted field research in Greece. The number of successfully completed PhDs in American and British institutions based on ethnographic fieldwork in Greece increased from 3 (all in the United States) in the 1960s, to 21 (15 in the United States and 6 in Great Britain) in the 1970s (Papataxiarchis 2005: 218). Several of these students developed into well-known scholars, including the British-trained anthropologists Juliet du Boulay, Michael Herzfeld, Renee Hirschon, Margaret Kenna, and Mike

[25] Once again the Cyprus crisis affected the course of ethnographic fieldwork. For example, Michael Herzfeld was forced to stop his field research in the border region of Rhodes and leave the island in the summer of 1974.

Lineton who were all students of John Campbell or Paul Sterling.[26] American anthropologists who conducted fieldwork in Greece during this time include Peter Allen, Russell Bernard, Perry Bialor, Mary Clark, Richard Currier, Loring Danforth, Jill Dubisch, Hamish Forbes, and Susannah Hoffman.

Foreign ethnographers closely followed the works of Campbell and Friedl, and mainstream anthropology more generally, adding new dimensions related to the study of migration, gender, class, and ritual practices, and coping with the issue of change. Some of the American ethnographers, in particular, followed Friedl's perspective and focused on Greece as a peasant society. These anthropologists placed Greece in a wider comparative context that transcended the Mediterranean focus of the Oxford school (Dubisch 1998: 37-38). Yet the earlier ethnic division of anthropological labour continued to be reproduced as demonstrated in the volume *Regional Variation in Greece*, edited by Muriel Dimen-Schein and Ernestine Friedl (1976). At the conference that produced the volume, the only native Greek participants were sociologists (Jane lambiri Dimaki, Nicos Mouzelis, Constantina Safilios Rothschild, Constantinos Tsoukalas, and Dimitris Tsaoussis) who presented papers in the section 'The Peasant, the City and the State'.

The *Metapoliteusi* (1974-1986): Socio-centrism and 'Foreign' Ethnography of Greece by Greeks

The *Metapoliteusi*, as the restoration of the democratic regime is called, was a 'total rupture' with the past (Voulgaris 2001: 31-37). Despite its velvet character it produced deep structural changes in the political system as well as in institutions, including academia. Most importantly, it brought a major transformation in the ideological climate: *ethnikofrosyni* was replaced by a new sense of democratic self-centeredness and independence from foreign centres of influence, a reliance on national democratic political institutions (primarily political parties) and a set of ideas that were informed by radical social thought. This sense of autonomy was coupled by an open, outward looking attitude and the revival of the move towards Europe (which was confirmed by formal entrance in the EEC in 1979).

The break with *ethnikofrosyni* seriously affected the balance of power between 'national' and 'social science'. A sense of the 'social', which included a democratic notion of the nation and was inspired by the historical consciousness of the Left, as well as by the quest of an embracing national

[26] During the same period Peter Loizos, a student of Raymond Firth at the LSE, also completed his PhD research in Cyprus.

self-knowledge, came to the forefront and gradually dominated the public arena.[27] Exiled intellectuals who returned from Paris, London, or other major European academic centres, also brought with them a brand of European Marxism, combining the theoretical products of the dialogue between Marxist and structuralist thought. In this new ideological climate, the social sciences were restructured in the direction of Marxist socio-centrism. The new socio-centric paradigm was nationally based and involved a wide range of disciplines including sociology, social history, social anthropology, geography, political science, social psychology and social/historical *laografia*. At that time, all of these disciplines were poorly instituted and not clearly demarcated from each other.

This broad, 'progressive', interdisciplinary alliance was reminiscent of the synthesis that Peristiany had created in KKEA. Yet there were important differences. *First*, the revival of social sciences was realised in the context of a paradigmatic shift from structural functionalism to structural Marxism. *Second*, in the new theoretical context history and sociology came together in a Greek brand of historical sociology which eventually played a hegemonic role in the new paradigm. *Third*, social anthropology, in its cosmopolitan identity and the backing it enjoyed from foreign ethnographers, lost the central position that it had enjoyed in KKEA. At the same time, the community of ethnographers specialising on Greece was enriched with the first native scholars.

Academic *laografia*, on the other hand, experienced a crisis and internal diversification. New versions of *laografia* – which were inspired by French Marxism or anthropological structuralism and partially revised the continuity thesis (and *laografia's* functional relation with the national project) – emerged in the academic peripheries (Thessaloniki and Ioannina) (Nitsiakos this volume, Chryssanthopoulou this volume). The new currents in *laografia* were more socially or historically minded, some were more open to dialogues with social anthropology, and all of them were inspired by the radical democratic spirit of the era. A grassroots folkloric movement often involving specialists in *laografia* also spread in the Greek countryside. In the new socio-centric paradigm, progressive students of *laografia* and *koinoniki anthropologia* were marginal and seen as specialists on rural society.

Between 1974 and 1986 the increasing number of ethnographers studying Greece shifted the comparative framework further away from the Mediterranean area as conceptualised by Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers. As the

[27] On the changing attitudes of leftist historiography towards the nation and intellectual moves that prepared the reconfiguration of the 'social' after the restoration of the democracy, see Apostolidou 2003.

rural community became the standard loci of ethnographic fieldwork, particularly among the largest group of American ethnographers (Dimen-Schein and Friedl 1976), the strategies of comparison changed. The new comparative frameworks incorporated the epistemological critique of the 'honour and shame' complex and Mediterranean anthropology (Herzfeld 1980 and Llobera 1986) and addressed the nation-state or variations within regions. The newer ethnographic studies also expanded further the research horizons outlined by Campbell in *Honour, Family and Patronage.* Kinship and extra-domestic sociality occupied the centre of attention - replacing Campbell's own emphasis on values - and were approached from new gendered perspectives. The atomistic family was studied in its various forms, in terms of its gendered constitution and functional extension, in combination with marriage, residence, and property arrangements, but also in relation to economic and ecological parameters (Loizos and Papataxiarchis 1991). Also, in the study of politics there was a significant shift from the village-state relations to the micro-politics of gender (Dubisch 1986). In the 1970s and early 1980s, Greece turned into one of the most prolific ethnographic laboratories in southern Europe for the study of patriarchy (Papataxiarchis 2010b). In a way the cultural and socio-economic configurations of gender inequality had been ethnographically demonstrated by Campbell despite his commitment and that of some of his students to the complementarity thesis. Yet it was Friedl's landmark essay on 'The Position of Women' (1967) that initiated the most influential dialogue between feminism and anthropology that took place on Greek soil (Dubisch 1998).

During this period, there were important demographic and ethnic changes in the composition of the anthropological community as well. American ethnographers in close contact with their British colleagues dominated in numbers and provided the theoretical tone. A much smaller group of French ethnographers (Handman 1985; Piault 1985) also entered the scene, as did some Greeks. The first generation of Greek social anthropologists were introduced to the discipline either directly, through studying anthropology at the major anthropological centres in Britain, France, or the United States, or indirectly, through sociology or *laografia*. The emergence of this first generation of native Greek anthropologists who did their ethnographic fieldwork in Greece in the late 1970s and early 1980s reflected changes in metropolitan anthropology, where the prospect of 'anthropology at home' looked possible, yet not fully legitimate.[28] The emergence of native Greek anthropologists also reflected major changes in the Greek academic scene, as

[28] During these 'years of innocence' there were collective initiatives at the margins of the academy bringing together scholars from the various constituencies of the socio-centric paradigm.

the upcoming social sciences moved out of special research institutions and gained institutional representation in the universities.[29]

Let me add my personal account as a young anthropologist of this era. I was initiated into *koinoniki anthropologia* by Sotiris Dimitriou - a civil engineer by profession, self-made anthropologist and public intellectual, and prolific writer on anthropology, art, and culture. Because of his involvement in the Resistance against the Nazi occupation of Greece and his Marxist political beliefs, Dimitriou had experienced both confinement in the notorious military prison-camp of Makronisos and voluntary exile in Africa. He proposed an idiosyncratic Greek version of *koinoniki anthropologia* that owed a lot to Lekatsas and anthropological evolutionism.[30] As a radical university student in the middle 1970s, I viewed social anthropology as a Marxist, critical alternative to the formalist, ultra-conservative, and highly ethnocentric academic 'national science'. Students like me wanted to change Greek society: the empirical focus of social anthropology and its openings to Marxism looked very promising for all those who were looking for credible, critical, systematic self-knowledge. I also remember a great distaste for folkloric kitsch; as a core symbol of the dictatorial regime it represented all we wanted to discard. Social anthropology's focus on alterity and its comparative perspective were both intriguing and refreshing. Yet doing fieldwork in Greece was a one-way option: anthropology was meant to serve self-knowledge – where the self was defined in national terms. Needless to say that the programmatic commitment to adjusting anthropology to produce self-knowledge and the loyalty with which I served it put me in a lot of trouble as I tried to convince my respected teachers at the London School of Economics, where I did my undergraduate and graduate studies, that home anthropology was a methodologically legitimate option. Over the years, my commitment to home anthropology has also left a residual nostalgia for the lost chance of intercultural fieldwork as, in the course of my studies and after fieldwork, I learned to truly appreciate the cognitive advantages that Malinowski gained on his long trip to the Trobriand Islands!

---

[29] After 1974 EKKE (the renamed KKEA) resumed its role as a major agent of social research in Greece. Its research agenda was shaped in accordance to the upcoming socio-centric paradigm with an emphasis on sociology, yet it never reached the prestige it held during the Peristiany era. In 1978 it was joined by the small, anthropologically-minded Centre for the Research of Greek Society of the Academy of Athens.

[30] Sotiris Dimitriou was highly influential in spreading the word of anthropology to the Greek public and shaping successive generations of Greek anthropologists despite the fact that he was situated at the academic margins. His work deserves systematic attention in its own merit but also because it is symptomatic of the clandestine intellectual undercurrents that were so vibrant, particularly in periods of political repression.

The first generation of native Greek social anthropologists situated their studies within the socio-centric paradigm. The division of labour between *koinoniki anthropologia* and the rest of the disciplines was based on the Marxist dualistic model of 'base' (i.e. economic and social relations) and (cultural) 'superstructure'. The 'base' was the concern of economic and social history and sociology (specialising in 'modes of production'). The study of social arrangements was divided between sociology, which analysed them at the macro-level (e.g. through studies on migration or the state) and anthropology, which functioned as a micro-sociology of kinship (a development of the 'insider's sociology' in Peristiany's project). 'Culture' which was conceived in a reductionist way as 'popular' and carrying endemic resistant qualities fell under the jurisdiction of democratic *laografia* and rural sociology.

Despite the programmatic 'demystification of the history of Neohellenism' (Svoronos 1977: 7) and the subsequent rejection of the 'cultural continuity' thesis, the new progressive inter-disciplinary alliance rested on the mutual engagement between 'nation' and 'society'. The mutual identification of 'nation' and 'society' was reinforced by the neo-Marxist sociological classification of Greece within the world system, a classification that overvalued social homogeneity and 'wholeness' at the expense of social class differentiation. It was further reinforced by the more conventional talk about the 'national bourgeoisie' or the lack of it. This residual ethnocentrism limited the comparative tone of the socio-centric paradigm and accounted for a new type of self- knowledge.[31]

It is in the context of the upcoming paradigm and in connection to the new university structures that we can speak of the first (after the short KKEA parenthesis) proper synthesis between social anthropology (based on the foreign ethnography of Greece) and Greek social thought. Most of the first generation of Greek ethnographers of Greece looked forward to the deeper understanding of Greek society that was promised by both structuralism (in Levi-Strauss's style) and Marxism. This theoretical identity distinguished the work of Greek ethnographers vis a vis the work of their foreign counterparts, and qualified their position in the context of wider theoretical rethinking that was taking place particularly within Anglophone anthropol-

[31] Ethnocentrism was more prominent among the Marxist historians and the progressive folklorists. Marxist historians, such as Nicolaos Svoronos (1976), juxtaposed to the ultra-conservative ideology of Helleno-Christianity the notion of a resistant nation. Svornos's described the Greek nation as pre-modern (i.e. it historically emerged in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), as a nation that survived conquests because of its 'resistant spirit', and as a nation made of 'communities' (i.e. in culturally distinctive types of sociality and social organisation in which the 'spirit of resistance' was maintained).

ogy. Greek anthropologists were also more committed to the study of family and kinship and more historically minded than their foreign counterparts.

Even though the social sciences began to expand in the mid-1970s, 'national science' continued to dominate in central academic institutions. In 1981, the Socialist Party (PASOK) came into power, with huge effects on state (including academic) institutions. Structural changes in higher education were among the top priorities of the new government, and they undertook the modernisation of the universities and institutionalisation of the social sciences.[32] The reform of higher education was a key moment for the social sciences. It was informed by the spirit of democratisation: the 'feudal' structure of the 'chair' was abolished and replaced by the institution of 'Department' governed by a 'General Assembly' in which all components of the academic community shared decision-making power. The reform was followed by the expansion of the Greek university system, particularly in the peripheries where the reaction of the conservative academic establishment could easily be overcome.

The proper form of accommodation for the social sciences had been debated since 1974 when Dimitris Tsatsos, a professor of constitutional law, became Junior Minister of Education in the first transitional 'government of the 70 days' and formed a committee of social scientists to propose a new university structure for the social sciences. The committee included scholars, mostly of the exiled diaspora, who specialised in a broad range of social disciplines. In its published report, the committee suggested the foundation of departments of 'Sociology', 'Political Sciences', 'History and Culture', 'Social Anthropology', 'Psychology', and 'Economic Sciences' (Filias 1976). This project never materialised in the form that was initially conceived. Yet it inspired the academic establishment of the social sciences in the new universities that developed across the country throughout the 1980s with the implementation of Law 1268/1982 (Papataxiarchis 1999). This is how in 1986 the first Greek Department of Social Anthropology came into existence at the University of the Aegean. Both John Peristiany and sociologist Constantinos Tsoukalas were actively involved.

Epilogue

In the 1980s it appeared that *koinoniki anthropologia* and *laografia* might come together, but the rapprochement between the two fields did not last. Nationalist pressures throughout the Balkans, especially over the 'Macedonian question', revived old forms of ethnocentrism in *laografia*, and the

[32] On the effects that the modernisation of the state-controlled institutions of higher education had on social anthropology in the course of the 1980s, see Gefou-Madianou 2000.

increase of power that *koinoniki anthropologia* experienced after its institutional accommodation widened the gap between the two fields once again.

During the Balkan crisis some of the followers of *laografia* were entrenched around the old 'orthodoxy', thus retreating to more fixed positions.[33] This was a setback: it put a brake to the reconfigurations of academic *laografia* in the direction of the social sciences and certainly contributed to the reproduction of its traditionalist strongholds in the old Philosophical School of the University of Athens.[34] Epistemological considerations assumed secondary significance as *laografia* –which went on being perceived by many as a 'patriotic discipline' deriving its impetus mostly from the folklorist grassroots movement and the support that museums and folkloric collections enjoy by the localities and the state - remained committed to the politics of national identity. Academic *laografia* was mostly stuck in methodological confusion, often oscillating between a largely unconvincing anthropological identity (sometimes called *ethnologia*) and more traditionalist versions, explicitly faithful to the old Romantic canon (Papataxiarchis 2003b). As an effect it failed to remake its alliances in the direction of the thriving social sciences, but instead remained enclaved in its historical homes: in philological and philosophical schools and departments, where it is being taught side by side with disciplinary siblings such as archaeology, philology, or history.[35] On the other hand, however, attempts for a dialogue and a synthesis with social anthropology were sustained by small but dynamic groups pursuing *koinoniki laografia* together with *koinoniki anthropologia* in the Universities of Thessaloniki and Ioannina.

If failure to pursue a deep, sustained methodological and theoretical rethinking has proved to be an important limitation of attempts to revise and refashion Greek *laografia* after the restoration of democracy, another equally

---

[33] The recent position taken by the dean of Greek *laografia*, the philologist Michalis Meraklis, is suggestive of the retreat to 'orthodox' positions. Since the 1960s, Meraklis tried to shift *laografia* in a 'progressive' direction and even coined the term '*koinoniki laografia*'. Yet in one of his recent books, *The Advocacy of Laografia* (2004), Meraklis adopted a defensive position and devoted his book 'to those who dispute her'. According to his view in today's globalised world *laografia* is under siege by hostile, threatening forces. Cosmopolitan anthropology is included in these forces.

[34] Even today in the University of Athens folklore is taught in the section (i.e. a sub unit of the department) of 'Byzantine philology and *laografia*'.

[35] Today only in the University of Thrace *laografia* indirectly enjoys the status of a qualifier of departmental identity. There, under the rubric *ethnologia, laografia* goes on being taught in connection primarily to a racialist version of physical anthropology and an ultra conservative version of ethnocentric history (Papataxiarchis 1999: 238-241). Undergraduate courses in *laografia* are also offered in departments of Philology and Education as part of Humanities. Courses in physical anthropology are offered at the Medical School of the University of Athens.

important factor of the limited success of such attempts relate to *koinoniki anthropologia* itself. The reorientation of *laografia* was surpassed by the institutional accommodation of *koinoniki anthropologia* and its spread in the peripheries of the Greek university in the course of the late 1980s and early 1990s. The modernist legacy, the theoretical sophistication, the methodological rigor, and the comparative concerns of *koinoniki anthropologia* constituted a disciplinary identity that made it highly compatible with the ongoing processes of 'Europeanisation' and 'modernisation' (*eksychronismos*). In particular, its compatibility with the outwards looking model of self-knowledge, which institutionally prevailed after the formal entry of Greece in the European Community (EC), as much as its international status as one of the major social science disciplines offered to *koinoniki anthropologia* a relative advantage during the restructuring of the Greek university system.

Instruction in *koinoniki anthropologia* as an independent academic course was first offered in Panteion University in 1982. Yet the discipline of *koinoniki anthropologia* experienced a long period of institutional expansion at departmental level after the major academic reform of the early 1980s. The foundation of the first anthropological department in the University of the Aegean was followed by a new Department of Social Policy and Social Anthropology in Panteion University and the upgrading of social anthropology as a core discipline in the Department of History, Archaeology, and Social Anthropology in the University of Thessaly. The development of the discipline in departments and schools specialising in the social sciences, in the Universities of Crete, Macedonia, and elsewhere followed.[36] Postgraduate programs in social anthropology further contributed to the radical shift of the institutional centre of ethnographic fieldwork in Greece from foreign anthropological departments to Greek ones (Papataxiarchis 2005).[37]

In these institutional conditions and in the context of ethnographic praxis, Greek social anthropology has moved away from Marxist sociocentrism and gradually shaped a distinct, rather iconoclastic, disciplinary identity, which heavily relied on the shaping influence of intellectual exchanges between Greek and foreign ethnographers of Greece and included

[36] Departmental identities emerged through successive changes in the course of time. For a systematic presentation of the state of anthropological affairs in the Greek university system at the beginning of the twenty-first century, see Panopoulos 2003.

[37] Social anthropology is also taught in departments and schools of Education, Musicology, Cultural Studies, or Balkan Studies all around Greece and practised in various research centres, including the National Centre for Social Research and the Centre for the Research of Greek Society of the Academy of Athens.

various forms of the constructivist perspective.[38] The productive application of anthropological constructionism in the study of Greek society – particularly in relation to gender and sexuality, sociality, or national identity - consolidated the modern profile of the discipline. It further contributed to the assumption by social anthropologists of an important role in the 'cultural turn' and in the, mainly indirect, anthropological involvement in major disciplinary (e.g. historiographical) battles, and to a greater alienation from *laografia*. As *koinoniki anthropologia* was entering maturity, it eventually developed its anti-essentialist reflexes and gradually occupied a central position in a counter-paradigm to both 'national science' and 'social science'.

What is the heuristic value of including Greece in a volume that examines primarily Balkan anthropologies under socialist rule? By being the only non-socialist Balkan country for the crucial period under investigation, Greece offers a counter-example around which a number of comparative remarks could be productively drawn. Most important, the Greek case highlights through its comparative contrast to the rest of the Balkans the role of state socialism in entrenching anthropology within the national project. Without underestimating the significant degree of internal differentiation of anthropology in the 'socialist' context, there is no doubt that there official folklore had the upper hand. This has not been the case in 'capitalist' Greece, where 'social science' – with backing from the state – emerged as a genuine alternative to 'national science'. The formal democratic regime (that from very early on was involved in the project of European unification) and the multifarious intellectual connections and exchanges between Greece and western Europe had a decisive influence in the formation of the empirical social sciences in Greece. Among them *koinoniki anthropologia* probably profited most from these exchanges. In such circumstances it certainly gathered the symbolic capital, later the intellectual energy, and more recently the institutional support in order to supersede the national canon and emerge with a distinct identity in a slowly, yet increasingly, homogenised anthropological scene.

[38] On the modernist identity of anthropology taught in Greek anthropology departments and its perception by students, see Bakalaki 2006.

References

Agelopoulos, G. 2010. Contested territories and the quest for ethnology. In F. Birtek, N. Diamandouros, T. Dragona, and C. Keyder (eds.), *Spatial Conceptions of the Nation*, pp. 181-191. London: Tauris.

Albera, D., and A. Blok. 2001. Introduction: The Mediterranean as a field of ethnological study. In D. Albera, A. Blok, and C. Bromberger (eds.), *L' Anthropologie de la Méditerranée*, pp. 15-37. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.

Alivizatos. N. 1986. *Oi Politikoi Thesmoi se Krisī. Opseis tis Ellīnikīs Empeirias*. Athens: Themelio.

Allbaugh, L. G. 1953. *Crete: A Case Study of an Underdeveloped Area*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Andreadis, S. 1966. Koinōnikī asynecheia kai provlīmata oikonomikīs anaptyxeōs stīn Ellada. *Epistīmonikī Skepsī* 1: 27-40.

Apostolidou, V. 2003. *Logotechnia kai Istoria stī Metapolemikī Aristera*. Athens: Polis.

Argyriadou, E. 2003. Ereunītes, ereunes kai organōsī sto Kentro Koinōnikōn Ereunōn Athīnōn (1959-1967). In I. Lampriri-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinōnikes epistīmes kai prōtoporia stīn Ellada, 1950-1967*, pp. 239-304. Athens: Gutenberg.

Athanasatou, G., A. Rigos, and S. Sefereiadis (eds.). 1999. *Ī Diktatoria, 1967-1974: Politikes Praktikes, Ideologikos Logos, Antistasī*. Athens: Kastaniotis.

Avdela, E. 2002. *Dia Logous Timīs: Via, Synaisthīmata kai Axies stī Metemfyliakī Ellada*. Athens: Nefeli.

Bakalaki, A. 1997. Students, natives, colleagues: Encounters in academia and in the field. *Cultural Anthropology* 12: 502-526.

———. 2006. A different kind of knowledge? Learning anthropology in the Greek university system. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 24: 257-283.

Bošković, A., and T. H. Eriksen. 2008. Introduction. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies: Anthropological Practice on the Margins*, pp. 1-19. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Bournazos, S. 2009. To kratos tōn ethnikofronōn: Antikommounistikos logos kai praktikes. In Ch. Chatziiosif (ed.), *Istoria tīs Elladas tou 20ou Aiōna: Anasygkrotīsī, Emfylios, Palinorthōsī 1945-1952*, pp. 9-47. (Vol. D2). Athens: Vivliorama.

Campbell, J. K. 1964. *Honour, Family and Patronage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1965. Review of A. Kakouri, *Dionysiaka. American Anthropologist* 68.

——. 1992. Fieldwork among the Sarakatsani, 1954-55. In J. de Pina-Cabral, and J. K. Campbell (eds.), *Europe Observed*, pp. 148-165. London: MacMillan.

——. 1995. John Peristiany 1911-1987: A personal appreciation. In S. Damianakos, M. E. Handman, J. Pitt-Rivers, and G. Ravis-Giordani (eds.), *Brothers and Others: Essays in Honour of John Peristiany*, pp. 17-20. Athens: EKKE and Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

Cowan, J. K. 1995. Being a feminist in contemporary Greece: Similarity and difference reconsidered. In N. Charles, and F. Hughes-Freeland (eds.), *Practicing Feminism: Identity, Difference, Power*, pp. 61-85. London: Routledge.

Davis, J. 1977. *People of the Mediterranean. An Essay in Comparative Social Anthropology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Couroucli, M. 1978. Oi anthrōpologikes ereunes stīn Ellada. *Synchrona Themata* 2: 83-90.

Demetracopoulou-Lee, D. 1962. Greece. In M. Mead (ed.), *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*, pp. 57-96. New York: Mentor Books.

Dimen-Schein, M., and E. Friedl (eds.). 1976. *Regional Variation in Modern Greece and Cyprus.* (Vol. 268). New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.

Dubisch, J. (ed.). 1986. *Gender and Power in Rural Greece.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

——. 1998. Europe through the back door: Doing anthropology in Greece. In S. Parman (ed.), *Europe in the Anthropological Imagination*, pp. 34-45. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Filias, V. (ed.). 1974. *Attiko Panepistimio*. Athens: Kochlias.

Friedl, E. 1962. *Vasilika: A Village in Modern Greece*. New York: Holt.

——. 1967. The Position of Women: Appearance and Reality. *Anthropological Quarterly* 40: 97-108.

Gefou-Madianou, D. 1993. Mirroring ourselves through western texts: The limits of an indigenous anthropology. In H. Driessen (ed.), *The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing: Confrontations of Western and Indigenous Views*, pp. 160-81. Saarbrücken: Breitenbach.

——. 2000. Disciples, discipline and reflection: Anthropological encounters and trajectories. In M. Strathern (ed.), *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, pp. 256-278. London: Routledge.

Handman, M. E. 1983. *La violence et la ruse: Hommes et femmes dans un village grec*. Paris: Edisud.

Hann, C. 2007. Reconciling anthropologies: Reflections on an unremarked centenary. *Anthropology Today* 23: 17-19.

Herzfeld, M. 1980. Honour and shame: Problems in the comparative analysis of moral systems. *Man* (N.S.) 15: 339-351.

———. 1982. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1987. *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karamanolakis, V. 2008. Istoria kai ideologia stī dekaetia tou '60. In A. Rigos, S. I. Sefereiadis, and E. Chatzivasileiou (eds.), *Ī 'Syntomī' Dekaetia tou '60*, pp. 84-94. Athens: Kastaniotis.

Kofas, J. V. 1989. *Intervention and Underdevelopment: Greece during the Cold War*. London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Koumaris, J. G. 1925. Ī anthrōpologia ōs panepistīmiakon mathīma. *Iatrikī* III, 3 και 4. (Inaugural lecture).

———. 1955. Greece: An Anthropological Review for 1952-1954. *Yearbook of Anthropology* 1: 471-480.

Krimpas, K. 1993. O darvinismos stīn Ellada: Ta prōta vīmata. In K. Krimpas, *Thrausmata Katoptrou*, pp. 81-108. Athens: Themelio.

Kyriakidou-Nestoros, A. 1978. *Ī Theōria tīs Ellinikīs Laografias: Kritikī Analysī*. Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and Education – Mōraitīs School.

Kyrtsis, A. A. 1996. *Koinōniologikī Skepsī kai Eksyghronistikes Ideologies ston Ellīniko Mesopolemo*. Athens: Nisos.

Lampiri-Dimaki, I. 1987. To chtes kai to sīmera tīs koinōniologias stīn Ellada. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Ī Koinōniologia stīn Ellada Sīmera*, pp. 15-53. Athens: Papazisis.

Lekatsas, P. 1951. *Ī Katagōgī tōn Thesmōn, tōn Ethimōn kai tōn Doxasiōn*. Athens: Vivlio Neoellinikou Logou.

Loizos, P., and E. Papataxiarchis (eds.). 1991. *Contested Identities: Gender and Kinship in Modern Greece.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Loukatos, D. 1964. Review of *Honour, Family and Patronage*. *Balkan Studies* 5: 363-377.

Manitakis, N. 2009. Xenes kratikes ypotrofies. In Ch. Chatziiosif (ed.), *Istoria tīs Elladas tou 20ou Aiōna: Anasygkrotīsī, Emfylios, Palinorthōsī 1945-1952*, pp. 133-157. (Vol. D2). Athens: Vivliorama.

Mavrogordatos, G. T. 1983. *Stillborn Republic. Social Coalitions and Party Strategies in Greece, 1922-1936*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McNeil, W. H. 1957. *Greece: American Aid in Action 1947-1956*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.

Meraklis, M. 2004. *Synīgoria tīs Laografias*. Athens: Foundation of Angeliki Chatzimichali.

Mihăilescu, V., I. Iliev, and S. Naumović. 2008. Introduction. In V. Mihăilescu, I. Iliev, and S. Naumović (eds.), *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*, pp. 1-17. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

National Centre for Social Research (collective). 1986. *Ethniko Kentro Koinōnikōn Ereunōn*. Athens: EKKE.

Nikolakopoulos, E. 2001. *Ī Kachektikī Dīmokratia: Kommata kai Ekloges, 1946-1967*. Athens: Patakis.

Nitsiakos, V. 2004. Gia tī laografia kai tīn koinōnikī anthrōpologia, xana. In *Opseis tīs Anthrōpologikīs Skepsīs stīn Ellada*, pp. 263-274. Athens: Greek Ethnological Society.

Panopoulos, P. 2003. Between self and others: The academic establishment of Greek anthropology. In D. Dracklé, I. Edgar, and T. Schippers (eds.), *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, pp. 193-205. New York: Berghahn Books.

Papataxiarchis, E. 1999. Gia tīn panepistīmiakī apokatastasī tīs koinōnikīs anthrōpologias stīn Ellada. In D. Alexandropoulos (ed.), *Prooptikes kai Mellon tōn Koinōnikōn Epistīmōn stīn Ellada*, pp. 227-246. Rethymno: University of Crete.

———. 2003a. Ī koinōnikī anthrōpologia stī metapolemikī Ellada: Ta prōta vīmata. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinōnikes Epistīmes kai Prōtoporia stīn Ellada*, 1950-1967, pp. 115-154. Athens:Gutenberg.

———. 2003b. To parelthon enōnei oso kai chōrizei: Ī anthrōpologia anamesa stīn istoria kai tī laografia. In V. Kremmydas (ed.), *To Paron tou Parelthontos: Istoria, Laografia, Koinōnikī Anthrōpologia*, pp. 65-75. Athens: Society of Studies.

———. 2005. Un moment pluriel: L'ethnographie grecque au tournant du siècle. *Ethnologie Française* 35 (2): 213-227.

———. 2010a. Reconfiguring Greek ethnography in a changing world. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 18 (2): 419-430.

———. 2010b. Ī ethnografikī praxī kai ta oria tīs: John Campbell se schesī me tous synchronous kai tous progonous. *Synchrona Themata* 110: 44-56.

Papadopoulos, S. 1982. *Ī Chalkotechnia ston Ellīniko Chōro (1900-1975) kata tis Proforikes Martyries tōn Chalkourgōn: Symvolī stīn Ethnografikī Technologia*. Nauplio: Peloponnīsiako Laografiko Idryma.

Peristiany J. G. 1965a. Introduction. In E. Durkheim, *Sociology and Philosophy*, pp. vi-xxxii. London: Cohen and West.

Peristiany, J. G. (ed.). 1965b. *Honour and Shame. The Values of the Mediterranean*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

———. 1967. *The Masculine and Feminine in Mediterranean Societies*. Manuscript.

———. 1968. *Contributions to Mediterranean Sociology: Mediterranean Rural Communities and Social Change*. Hague: Mouton.

Piault, C. (ed.). 1985. *Familles et Biens en Grèce et à Chypre.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Pina-Cabral, J. de. 1989. The Mediterranean as a category of Regional Comparison: A Critical View. *Current Anthropology* 30: 399-406.

Piniatoglou, L. 1938. *Ī Archaikī Morfī tou Vasilikou Thesmou: Dokimion Koinonikīs Anthrōpologias*. Athens: Pyrsos.

Pitt-Rivers, J. 1963a. Introduction. In J. Pitt-Rivers (ed.), *Mediterranean Countrymen*, pp. 9-25.Hague: Mouton.

Pitt-Rivers, J. (ed.). 1963b. *Mediterranean Countrymen*. Hague: Mouton.

Prince Peter of Greece. 1963. *A Study of Polyandry*. Hague: Mouton.

Rafail, M. 2003. Pōs idrythīke to Ethniko Kentro Koinōnikōn Ereunōn. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinōnikes Epistīmes kai Prōtoporia stīn Ellada, 1950-1967*, pp. 223-238. Athens: Gutenberg.

Restrepo, E., and A. Escobar. 2005. Other anthropologies and anthropology otherwise: Steps to a world anthropology network. *Critique of Anthropology* 252: 99-128.

Rigos, A., S. I. Seferiadis, and E. Chatzivasileiou (eds.). 2008. *Ī Syntomī Dekaetia tou '60*. Athens: Kastaniotis.

Rogers, S. 2001. Anthropology in France. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30: 481-504.

Sanders, I. T. 1953. Village social organization in Greece. *Rural Sociology* 18 (4): 366-375.

———. 1962. *Rainbow in the Rock: The People of Rural Greece*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Saunders, G. R. 1984. Contemporary Italian cultural anthropology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 13: 447-66.

Schippers, T. K. 1995. A history of paradoxes: Anthropologies of Europe. In H. F. Vermeulen, and A. A. Roldán (eds.), *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, pp. 234-246. London: Routledge.

Sefereiadis, S., and E. Chatzivasileiou. 2008. Ī syntomī dekaetia tou '60: Gnōstikes kai istoriografikes proklīseis. In A. Rigos, S. Sefereiadis, and E. Chatzivasilreioiu (eds.), *Ī Syntomī Dekaetia tou '60*, pp. 11-37. Athens: Kastaniotis.

Silverman, S. 2000. Defining the anthropological Mediterranean: Before Aix 1966. In D. Albera, A. Blok, and C. Bromberger (eds.), *L' Anthropologie de la Méditerranée*, pp. 43-57. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.

Smothers, F., W. H. McNeill, and E. D. McNeill. 1948. *Report on the Greeks: Findings of a Twentieth Century Fund Team which Surveyed Conditions in Greece in 1947*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.

Stathakis, G. 2004. *To Dogma Truman kai to Schedio Marshall. Ī Istoria tīs Amerikanikīs Voītheias stīn Ellada*. Athens: Vivliorama.

Stocking, G. W. 1982. Afterword: A view from the center. *Ethnos* 47: 172-186.

Svoronos, N. 1976. *Episkopīsī tīs Neoellīkīs Istorias*. Athens: Themelio.

———. 1977. Prologos. In K. Tsoukalas, *Exartīsī kai Anaparagōgī*, pp. 7-13. Athens: Themelio.

Tountasaki, E. 2003. Anthrōpologia kai laografia: Apo tīn ekaterōthen adiaforia stīn ypo orous anagnōrisī amoivaiōn ōfelimatōn. *Dokimes* 11-12: 7-63.

Trubeta S. 2009. *Physical Anthropology, Race and Eugenics in Greece (1880s-1970s). The Science – The Actors – The Ideas*. Habilitation thesis (Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften, FU Berlin).

———. 2010. The 'strong nucleus of the Greek race': Racial nationalism and anthropological science. *Focaal—Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 58: 63–78.

Tsaousis, D. 1985. Ī koinōnikī anthrōpologia stīn Ellada. In G. Lienhardt, *Koinōnikī Anthrōpologia*, pp. 11-22. Athens: Gutenberg.

Tsoukalas, C. 1981. The ideological impact of the Civil War. In J. O. Iatrides (ed.), *Greece in the 1940s: A Nation in Crisis*, pp. 319-341. Hanover: University Press of New England.

———. 2003. Ī koinōnikī ereuna prin saranta chronia. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinōnikes Epistīmes kai Prōtoporia stīn Ellada, 1950-1967*, pp. 411-420. Athens: Gutenberg.

Voulgaris, G. 2001. *Ī Ellada tīs Metapoliteusīs 1974-1990. Statherī Dīmokratia Sīmademenī apo tī Metapolemikī Istoria*. Athens: Themelio.

Chapter 3

Multiple Encounters: Attempts to Introduce Anthropology in Greece during the 1940s – 1960s[1]

Georgios Agelopoulos

The development of socio-cultural anthropology in Greece is a post-1974 phenomenon related to the modernisation of Greek society and academia.[2] Before the 1960s, the study of others, alongside the study of 'traditional' Greek society, was the task of folklorists and historians (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978; Herzfeld 1982). After the fall of the military junta in 1974, Greek academia entered a process of modernisation. The three departments that currently provide undergraduate and graduate degrees in anthropology were established in universities where folklore had never been taught (University of the Aegean, Panteion University, and the University of Thessaly). Histories of the development of socio-cultural anthropology in Greece thus emphasise a post-1974 socio-political context (Gefou-Madianou 1993, 2000, 2009; Bakalaki 1997, 2006; Panopoulos 2003; Papataxiarchis 2003, 2005, this volume; Gizelis 2004). Some accounts (Papataxiarchis 2003, 2005, this volume; Gizelis 2004) reach back to the 1960s, when John Peristiany and John Campbell were directing the Athens Centre of Social Sciences (KKEA).

Although there is no doubt that folklore studies (*laografia*) and history engaged in their own way with the study of otherness, the available literature

---

[1] I am grateful to S. Trubeta and E. Papataxiarchis for their insights and the material they provided regarding the Greek Anthropological Society and the Athens Centre of Social Sciences. P. Pedersen was kind enough to provide me with his publications and advice on the life and work of Prince Peter. The editors of this volume, along with D. Madianou, A. Bakalaki, and the late P. Loizos offered useful comments. The archival material located at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (Gennadius Library) and at the Historical Archives of the University of Athens informed the analysis. This research was carried out with a grant from the University of Macedonia Research Committee.

[2] Except where stated otherwise, 'anthropology' refers in this paper to social and cultural anthropology. The terms physical anthropology, ethnography, ethnology, and folklore are introduced as emic categories. I use them according to the way those involved with them understood and conceptualised them.

ignores explicit efforts to introduce social or cultural anthropology in Greece in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. This paper focuses on the work of Peter of Greece and Denmark (1908-80), the contribution of the Greek Anthropological Society (1924-70), the relationship between psychoanalysis and social anthropology in 1940s-1950s Greece, and the establishment of the Athens Centre for Social Sciences in 1959. With the exception of the volume edited by Lampiri-Dimaki (2003) and the recent work of Trubeta (2009, 2010) and Papataxiarchis (this volume), little attention has been given to these matters. This chapter discusses the importance of the socio-political context for the incorporation of anthropological knowledge, and highlights both continuities and discontinuities in attempts to introduce anthropology.

Previous studies of the history of anthropology in eastern and south-eastern Europe have argued that politics and ideology have significantly influenced the development of social sciences, including anthropology (Mihailescu, Iliev, and Naumovic 2008). I shall argue more precisely that the introduction of social anthropology in Greece has to be understood in connection with the modernisation of the state. The state in this context needs to be perceived as a fragmented institution produced by the activities of different agents, who occasionally pursue partly conflicting strategies. However, this does not mean that there is no such a thing as an overall order reflecting the dominant socio-political power structures and modes of production. Such a conceptualisation of the state allows us to understand why Greece did not consistently follow the same modernisation agenda, including the pursuit of national homogenisation. In certain periods, the modernisation process required more flexible and pragmatic policies towards incorporating and encompassing that which was perceived as threatening.[3] In this respect, the argument of Mihailescu, Iliev, and Naumovic that in the Balkans 'home anthropology was a nation-building science' (2008: 2) can only be applied to the case of Greece in quite specific periods. Modernisation in this context refers to overcoming everything associated with the country's Oriental or Balkan past (Herzfeld 1987). Minorities and peasants in Greece were considered a remnant of these undesirable pasts.

I also argue that the introduction of anthropology in Greece from the early 1960s can hardly be classified as a process of developing an 'other anthropology' or a 'national anthropology', for the very simple reason that it

[3] Examples would include the educational policies proposed for the Slav-Macedonian speakers in Greek Macedonia in the 1920s (Michailides 1996), the policies adopted towards religious minorities in the interwar period, the political realism towards minorities promoted by Venizelos and some of his associates in the 1910s (Tsitselikis and Christopoulos 2008), and the study of otherness in Greek academia during the 1920s (Agelopoulos 2010a).

depended on the scholarly context of 'metropolitan anthropology'.[4] As in other countries of the European periphery, Greek anthropologists lack any 'itinerary separating them from the Anglophone and French mainstream anthropology' (Eriksen 2010: 169). The data I examine illustrate the close relationship between local and international developments. As Papataxiarchis argues (2003), the introduction of anthropology in Greece has been heavily influenced by the positioning of Greece as an anthropological object. However, a full account of the work of non-Greek anthropologists studying Greece is beyond the scope of this chapter.

The Domain of the Social Sciences in Interwar Greece

It is impossible to understand developments after the Second World War without taking account of key events of the interwar period. The study of the perceived 'other' was influenced by the establishment of the Greek Historical and Ethnological Society in 1882. In the first volume of the journal *Laographia* (*Folklore*)[5] published in 1909, Nikolaos Politis, one of the founders of that discipline in Greece, argued that *ethnologia* (ethnology) studies 'peoples living in a state of nature' while folklore focused on peoples 'sharing the same native land and its culture'.[6] Thus ethnology, analogous to *Völkerkunde*, undertook the study of distant others, while *laografia*, analogous to *Volkskunde*, focused on Greece (Megas 1967; Loukatos 1968; Meraklis 1971; Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978; Herzfeld 1982; Toudasaki 2003; and Nitsiakos 2008).

The distinction between Greeks and others, even if not drawn sharply by Politis, was crucially important from the point of view of defining the boundaries of the state. As a result of being on the 'winning' side during the first and the second Balkan Wars and the First World War, Greece almost doubled in size between 1912 and 1919. The 'New Lands' incorporated into Greece were populated by hundreds of thousands of people who were neither Greek speaking nor Greek Orthodox Christians. For almost a decade, the Greek state prioritised the integration of these people. Within folklore and physical anthropology, the earlier study of the otherness of these populations morphed into an exclusive focus on their sameness as Greeks. At the same

[4] I use 'other anthropology' in the manner of Bošković 2010. On 'metropolitan anthropology' see Hannerz and Gerholm 1982; Krotz 1997; Restrepo and Escobar 2005.

[5] The journal has been known internationally under this spelling, so I retain it here while referring to the discipline as *laografia*.

[6] Politis's distinction between 'peoples living in a state of nature' and peoples 'sharing the same native land and its culture' was never fully explained. It is worth noting that the second volume of *Laographia* included a paper on the customs and morals of the native populations of Madagascar (Scopelitis 1910)!

time, other disciplines and institutions focused on the differences of these same populations. For example, the School of Oriental Ethnology was created at the Greek University of Smyrna in 1920 (Agelopoulos 2010a), and a Balkan Languages Department[7] and a Chair of Jewish Religion were established at the University of Thessaloniki (Marketos 2007; see also An. 2000, Anastasiadis 2003). Together with the pioneering ethnographic studies of that period, these initiatives are best seen as modernist attempts to produce an institutional framework of internal colonialism for the incorporation of non-Greek populations inside the Greek state (cf Hannerz 2010: 216). The new departments did not interfere with the work undertaken by existing programs in folklore studies and also overlooked the 'problem of ruling fellow peasants' confronted by other 'national anthropologies' in the Balkans (Mihailescu, Iliev, Naumovic 2008: 11). Even though many of the peasants newly incorporated into the Greek state spoke some variant of Greek, they were not perceived by officials as co-nationals; their status within the Greek nation was questionable and assuring their belonging was beyond the scope of ambitions for most state officials. The efforts made by the Greek state to integrate its new populations also reflects what Jane Cowan describes as a 'dependency' based not so much on economic and political relations but on identity politics. That is, the modernising quest for ethnology in the 1920s was a process which reflected both the internal and external constraints experienced by Greece as a 'supervised state' that was expected to conform to new international norms of minority protection (Cowan 2007).

During the 1920s, societies devoted to the development of the social sciences were founded. The establishment of the Sociological Society and the Society of Social and Political Sciences were among the more important institutional developments of the 1920s, but few members of these societies were involved with empirical research projects (Lampiri-Dimaki 1987; Kyrtsis 1996: 122). They were members of the upper echelons of the bourgeoisie who held senior positions in the civil service, though several contributed to introducing the teaching of sociology at various Greek universities. After the Second World War, the most prominent of these scholars associated with conservative political forces and were elected as Fellows of the Academy of Athens. Two were ministers in the government which later established the Athens Centre for Social Sciences. Although some folklorists, notably Stilpon Kyriakides and Georgios Megas (see Nitsiakos, this volume), participated in the Sociological Society, *laografia* as such had no

[7] This department should not be confused with the Institute of Balkan Studies that was formed in Thessaloniki during the 1950s as a Cold War-era institution supervised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

impact on the developments in other social sciences (Lampiri-Dimaki 1987: 31-32; Kyrtsis 1996: 173).

The 1940s and the 1950s: Classical Studies, Physical Anthropology, Ethnology, Psychoanalysis, and the Discovery of Social Anthropology

The introduction of anthropological theories from the 1940s onwards was the work of scholars coming from various academic fields. One of the first was Panagis Lekatsas, a Marxist philologist and newspaper columnist, who was marginalised for political reasons. He was interested in applying anthropological ideas from Britain, France, and Germany to the study of ancient Greek society in fields such as religion, kinship systems, and death rituals (Lekatsas 1946, 1951, 1957, 1971). He did no ethnographic fieldwork, but provided an alternative to the hegemonic nationalist discourse of contemporary archaeologists and historians. Later, in the 1960s, this earned him plaudits from those on the Left, but at the time it was enough to disqualify him from holding any academic position (Papataxiarchis this volume).

Other Greek scholars came into contact with British social anthropology from the late 1930s. Some of these were associated with the Chair of Physical Anthropology at the University of Athens; the Greek Anthropological Society (*Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia*) founded in 1924 by Ioannis Koumaris and operated until 1970; and the Anthropological Museum at the University of Athens founded in 1886 by Clon Stéphanos).[8] Although these scholars incorporated some social anthropology, their work was more heavily influenced by the racial theories of interwar German physical anthropology and British evolutionism (Trubeta 2009, 2010). Ioannis Koumaris, who held the Chair of Physical Anthropology at the University of Athens from 1925 to 1950, introduced physical anthropology to broader scientific circles (Trubeta 2009: 16-17). The main challenge faced by the Greek Anthropological Society was to balance scientific neutrality (as upheld by the dominant interwar positivism) and Greek national interests. Due to political developments, this contradiction intensified towards the end of the 1940s. According to Trubeta,

> The initial interest in [physical] anthropology in Greece derived from a general interest in human evolution and the universal claim of this science to provide an enlightening world view and epistemic knowledge for humankind… . The idea of ancestry clearly marked such research. Greece was particularly interesting for anthropometric

[8] Clon Stéphanos (1854-1915) was a professor at the Medical School of Athens University.

> and racial anthropological investigations due to its association with two legacies: its ancient Hellenic and Ottoman heritage… . A modern science, as [physical] anthropology was thought to be, was able to provide solid knowledge for such national projects (ibid.: 224 – 51).

Thus, the activities of the Anthropological Museum, the Chair, and the Society 'provided a terrain in which biologistic, racial and racist models of approaching human life, history and society found fertile ground, especially up to the end of the Second World War' (ibid.). His preoccupation with race partly explains why Koumaris failed to attract any PhD students after the Second World War. The Chair of Physical Anthropology remained vacant for many years after his retirement.

Although the Society's primary focus was on physical anthropology, for Koumaris *anthropologia* embraced not only physical anthropology and prehistoric archaeology but also ethnology, folklore, and popular art (Papataxiarchis, this volume). Some sociologists from the Archive of Social and Economic Sciences (founded in 1921) and Konstantinos Karavidas[9] joined the Society and applied the term 'ethnology' (*ethnologia*) to distinguish between physical anthropology and the study of cultures. However, from the early 1940s, following developments in the Anglophone literature, the term 'social anthropology' (*koinoniki anthropologia*) came into use in the discussions and debates organised by the Society (Piniatoglou 1943). Prominent folklorists including Megas and Kyriakides joined this Society too, drawn by Koumaris's nationalist agenda and his attempts to 'prove scientifically' the racial continuity of Greeks. As Trubeta explains, 'the motivation of scholars with diverse backgrounds to join the Anthropological Society was abetted above all by the character of [physical] anthropology as a modern science that was thought able to offer scientific answers to topical societal questions…' (Trubeta 2009: 224-51).

From the 1930s-50s, a small group of the Athenian haute bourgeoisie came into contact with both psychoanalysis and social anthropology. Lazaros Piniatoglou, for example, published an analysis of Pythagorian taboo prohibitions (1942) that showed his familiarity with the works of Freud, Malinowski, and Frazer. The haute bourgeoisie's familiarity with these works derived from the personal acquaintance of Maria Bonaparte of

[9] Konstantinos Karavidas (1890-1973) was a leading figure of rural community studies in interwar Greece. His main fieldwork sites were in the wider geographical region of Macedonia, in Greek Thrace, and in the Smyrna/Izmir region in Turkey. Karavidas studied law at the University of Athens, and became involved in politics and journalism as a promoter of communalism; he also held senior positions in the public sector where he endorsed agricultural development projects. He is considered the founding scholar of fieldwork research in rural Greece (Agelopoulos 2010a and 2010b).

Greece (1882-1962) with Freud and Malinowski. Maria was the great-granddaughter of Napoleon's brother, and had married George of Greece and Denmark. Disorders in her personal life led her to consult Freud in 1925. She was analysed by him, later studied psychoanalysis under his supervision, and became a major benefactor (Bertin 1982). From 1932, Maria was also a close friend of Malinowski (Wayne 1995: 219; Frederiksen 2008: 30), and her interest in clitoridectomy prompted Malinowski to arrange a meeting between Maria and Jomo Kenyatta in Paris in 1935 (Frederiksen 2008: 28). Later that year, Maria's son Peter was befriended by Kenyatta in the seminar room of the London School of Economics (LSE), when Kenyatta presented his paper on clitoridectomy among the Kikuyu (Frederiksen 2008: 31; see also Pedersen 2005, Pedersen and Van Beek 2007). Both Freud and Malinowski subsequently had a great influence on Peter.

Peter was born in Paris on 3 December 1908. He was educated at the Lycée Janson de Sailly with Claude Lévi-Strauss among his classmates. He studied at the University of Paris (1927-34) and received his doctorate in law in 1934 (Pierre 1935). In 1928, Peter met Géza Róheim (1891-1953) and developed an interest in Australian aboriginals. Following his studies with Malinowski at the LSE in 1934-35, he was forced to return to Greece for training as a military officer (1935-37). After this Peter travelled to the Himalayas and South India to do fieldwork, accompanied by his spouse, Irina Ovchinnikova. Ovchinnikova was wealthy, but disliked by the royal family for many reasons, including the fact that she had been a divorced 'white' emigre in the wake of the Russian Revolution. The disputes regarding this marriage functioned as a pretext serving the intense internecine conflicts within the royal family, Peter was forced to forfeit his rights to the throne in both Greece and Denmark. After adventurous war service and further prolonged fieldwork in north-eastern India, Peter finally completed his PhD at the LSE under the supervision of Raymond Firth in 1959. He published extensively on polyandry and Himalayan societies in several languages, including Greek (1961a; 1961b; 1961c; 1962a; 1962b, 1962c; 1963a; 1963c). Peter was mainly influenced by early twentieth century evolutionism and the functionalism of Malinowski, but he also attempted, in a rather superficial way, to incorporate psychoanalytic perspectives. Peter is more importantly remembered for his tireless promotion of the discipline.

Peter and Maria Bonaparte were influential and wealthy enough to support ethnographic missions in various parts of the world (Pedersen 2004-05; Pedersen 2005; Frederiksen 2008).[10] Peter promoted social anthropology

[10] In rapid succession, Peter headed the Third Danish Expedition to Central Asia in 1950-52, the Danish Scientific Mission to Afghanistan, and the Henning Haslund-Christensen Memorial Expedition in 1953-54 (Pedersen 2005: 7).

in Greece by giving lectures in various settings from the late 1950s onwards. In 1957 Peter addressed the Senate of the University of Athens with a lecture on 'The Influence of the Hellenistic Period in Central Asia'. After this his promotional activities intensified, for which he gained increasing public attention. In 1957, he was awarded an honorary doctorate from the University of Athens, and in 1959 he was also awarded an honorary LLD from the University of Thessaloniki. In 1958, Koumaris, who had been retired for eight years, submitted a letter to the Senate of the University of Athens proposing Peter for the vacant Chair of Physical Anthropology. Peter's candidacy had the support of politicians such as Grigorios Kasimatis, the last Minister of Education in a conservative government of the 1960s, who stressed the importance of 'opening the gates of our universities to the call of social anthropology', and mentioned Peter's work specifically in one of his lectures in 1963 (Greek Anthropological Society 1963: 11-12). But Peter was not appointed to replace Koumaris. His knowledge of physical anthropology was limited, a fact which was noted by the university's Medical School, but the more important obstacles were his conflict with other members of the royal family and the lack of support from the centrist government of Georgios Papandreou. Although Peter was apparently keen to become an academic, the royal family opposed the idea because they did not wish Peter to settle down permanently in Athens (Peter 1962a: 50-51; Gizelis 2004: 30).

In just three years (1959-62), Peter gave numerous public lectures in Athens stressing the importance of anthropology for Greece. He gave four lectures at the University of Athens, two at the Anthropological Society, three at the Athens Higher School of Economics, one at the Academy of Athens, one at the Athens Royal Theatre, and an unknown number of lectures in the public schools of the Athens haute bourgeoisie (1961a; 1961b; 1961c). In March 1962 he delivered three keynote lectures on the development of anthropological theory (1962a; 1962c). These lectures were later published in English (1969). It seems that the last of his public lectures in Athens was given in 1963 at the Greek Archaeological Society (1963c). These various lectures reveal a failure to take account of the international literature of the 1950s. Peter stressed the value of comparison (1962c: 13), but simplistically endorsed the superiority of Western civilisation. It has also to be admitted that Peter's remarks concerning the continuity of Greek civilisation, nation, and culture rarely exceeded the common rhetorical tropes of his time.[11] He carried out no research in this field. Nonetheless, by

[11] Peter claimed that environmental and historical factors contributed to the formation of what he called the 'Greek character'. This 'character' was shared by both modern Greeks and ancient Hellenes. His understanding of the Greek character referred to 'two main features: individuality [and] rationality' (Peter 1952: 29). Such an analysis is closely related to his

insisting that all societies have culture (*politismos*) (1962c, 1963c) he was casting doubt on the world view of Greek nationalists, who identified culture exclusively within the Western world and its Greek-Roman and Christian origins.[12]

In the last of his 1962 lectures, Peter went out of his way to praise the work of John Peristiany, the director of the recently established Athens Centre for Social Sciences, classifying him as an adherent of the 'sociological anthropology' paradigm (Peter 1962a: 45-46). This was meant positively since Peter, following Malinowski, considered social anthropology to be 'a comparative sociological science' (1963c: 13). Peter's public acknowledgments of the Centre counteracted the dominant negative stereotypes of the social sciences held by Greek conservative politicians at the time.

In addition to publishing on the importance of anthropological knowledge for Greek society (1961a, 1969, 1963c), Peter engaged in discussions and cooperation with other anthropologists working in south-east Asia (e.g. Grottanelli 1977) as well as with foreign anthropologists who worked in Greece in the 1950s and the 1960s, among them Ernestine Friedl and Margaret Kenna (Peter 1963b; Kenna 1970). A member of the Greek Anthropological Society since 1940, his decades of public engagement came to an end in 1967 when the military dictatorship was established. He spent the last years of his life as a banker, living mostly in Denmark. He died in Paris at the age of 72 in 1980.

A final assessment of Peter as an anthropologist is not easy. His monograph *The Science of Anthropology* received some rather negative reviews. Kenna wrote that 'it might have been better if this book had been left in Greek' (1970: 145). The *American Anthropologist* reported that 'the ethnographic portrayals of the various peoples among whom [Peter] worked are scanty and inadequate' (Rohner 1970: 616). However, this same reviewer did recognise the importance of the book 'to convince the students that anthropology has significance for Greece' (ibid.). Indeed, the publicity generated by Peter for anthropology also had an impact on folklore studies.

---

dualistic explanation of the cultural clash between the West and the East (Peter 1952). However he does not offer any empirical data referring to the continuity of the 'Greek character'. In most of his writings, even in his travelling diaries (1941), his references to modern Greek culture are extremely limited. His references to Hellenic civilisation usually serve only to underpin his manichaestic dichotomy between the West and the East and do not seriously engage with the continuity thesis of the Greek nation.

[12] Gefou-Madianou argues that perceptions attributing a higher status to Greek civilisation played an important role in delaying the establishment of social anthropology in Greek academia (Gefou-Madianou 2009). Such perceptions present a hurdle to the acceptance of the very idea that all peoples have a 'culture'. Bakalaki (2006) puts forward a similar argument in her analysis of difficulties faced in teaching social anthropology in Greek universities.

In the mid-1960s, as Greece became a popular anthropological object for British and American anthropologists (see Papataxiarchis, this volume), Georgios Spyridakis, Professor of Laografia at the University of Athens, proposed a 'laboratory' (*eryastirio* or *spoudastirio*) of social anthropology within his own department in the Faculty of Philosophy. However, the 1967 coup put an end to these plans (Gizelis 2004: 30).

Modernity at Last: The Establishment of Greek Social Anthropology in the 1960s

Despite the efforts of Peter and others in the 1940s and 1950s, anthropology remained at the margins of academia and outside public discourse until the early 1960s. The post-Civil War decade (1949-59) was characterised by the complete political and cultural domination of conservative ideology. This went hand-in-hand with political repression and overseas migration. Liberal ideas began to gain ground in the early 1960s. The centrist party of Georgios Papandreou came to power in February 1964. Socio-democratic and more extreme leftist ideas flourished among the youth, intellectuals, and artists, incorporating influences from 1960s social movements elsewhere in Europe and the Americas. The centrist government did its best to raise living standards and to transform the educational system, establishing several new universities.

With the exception of Lekatsas, the scholars who had promoted anthropology during the 1940s and 1950s were associated with conservative upper class royalists. Some, including Peter himself, were suspected of harbouring Nazi sympathies during the Second World War.[13] Even if this

[13] Peter was accused in 1943 by the British military authorities of pro-Nazi sympathies (Travis 1999). This is rather questionable given his active participation in the battle of Crete, in reconstructing the Greek Army in Egypt, in commanding its elite unit *Ieros Lochos*, and in fighting in North Africa and Italy. Most of the accusations regarding Peter's political views hint, to the contrary, at pro-Soviet sympathies. In a confidential 1944 report of the British Embassy of Athens to the Foreign Office, Peter's wife Irina 'was said to have a wild dream of a Christian Orthodox Communist Greece combined with the preservation of the monarchy (obviously with her husband as King)' (Pedersen 2004-2005: 189). This is probably one of the reasons why the royalists of Greece limited Peter's involvement in the Greek Civil War. In 1948, at the high point of the Greek Civil War, Peter generously contributed to financing the independent investigation of the murder of George Polk, an American journalist who 'was about to reveal incriminating reports about the Greek government and its American masters' (Pedersen 2004-2005: 191). Finally, in 1957 Peter was accused by the Indian government of being a Soviet agent (Pedersen and M. Van Beek 2007: 44). In my opinion, such claims do not really refer to Peter's political views. Beyond any doubt he was a royalist. What needs to be taken into consideration was his public appreciation for Stalin and Lenin as those who imposed the 'Western' civilisation upon the 'Asiatic' people of the USSR (see, for example,

was far-fetched, their discourse was completely misaligned with the new liberal social, political, and cultural agendas of Greek society in the 1960s. Their scholarship seemed outdated and they failed to recruit followers.

After the end of the Greek Civil War (1946-49), the implementation of the Marshall Plan required a solid knowledge of local socio-economic as well as cultural conditions (Gizelis 2004: 26). A number of ethnographic research projects conducted by American academics in Greece during the early 1950s helped to meet this need (Papataxiarchis: this volume). As in other societies as the Cold War deepened, anthropology became a part of 'the search for social order' (Patterson 2001). The most notable of these scholars were Dorothy Lee and Irwin Sanders, who both had inside knowledge of rural Greece dating back to pre-war years. Dorothy Lee was of Greek origin (her maiden surname was Demetracopoulou) and had studied under the supervision of Margaret Mead. After publishing ethnographic 'tales' and 'anecdotes' concerning perceptions of religion and the supernatural in Greece (1947, 1951), she later undertook more sustained fieldwork in the countryside (1955). The American sociologist Irwin Sanders had been familiar with the situation in rural Greece since the late 1920s (Sanders 1954-55: 124). He travelled extensively in the Greek-Yugoslav border region in the vicinity of Florina and Bitola in the 1930s. Nowadays he is best known for his community studies in interwar Bulgaria, but he returned to Greece for systematic fieldwork in the region between Epiros and western Greek Macedonia just after the end of the Greek Civil War (Sanders 1954-55, 1962). None of these American researchers engaged with native scholars and their impact on the development of the social sciences in 1950s Greece was close to zero.

Rural development was also one of the main reasons behind UNESCO's establishment of the Athens Centre for Social Sciences in 1959. This was part of a larger project launched in 1953 when Greece was included in the list of countries where the social sciences were to be re-established (Rafael 2003: 224). UNESCO set up a special committee in Greece to investigate the possibilities. The committee invited three internationally-known consultants to Athens: Henri Mendras, George Gurvitch, and Clement Heller. Meanwhile, a group of professors from the Faculty of Law at the University of Athens established the Greek Centre for Sociological Studies (*Elliniko Kentro Koinoniologikon Meleton*) in 1954. This institution had only limited impact, but in 1957 it did manage to publish the first social science journal to appear in Greece since the Second World War. Its very name *Koinoniologiki Erevna* (Sociological Research) denoted an approach

---

Peter 1952: 117, 134). In addition, claims to Peter's pro-Soviet sympathies aimed to undermine his attempts to become king.

quite different from the sociological debates of interwar Greece.[14] Other academics established a research centre for economics and development, among them Andreas Papandreou and Xenofon Zolotas, both of them later prime ministers. Finally, in 1959 the government voted through the law to establish the Athens Centre for Social Sciences (cf. Papataxiarchis, this volume).[15] The Oxford-trained Africanist John Peristiany (1911-87) was appointed as the first director. Peristiany was born in Greece but grew up in Cyprus and was educated in Paris (PhD in Law), London (LSE), and Oxford. He had been a member of the Greek Anthropological Society since May 1939.

The Centre overcame the ethnocentric limitations of the Greek Anthropological Society and attracted a number of young liberal and left-wing researchers interested in the study of social sciences, including social anthropology. Their political agenda, the epistemological paradigms they followed, and their enthusiasm played a crucial role in establishing the foundations for the development of sociology, social anthropology, geography, and social policy studies (Damianakos et.al. 1994; Lampiri-Dimaki 2003). As John Campbell has written, Peristiany 'gathered a nucleus of Greek social scientists, embarked on research projects, invited foreign scholars, initiated the building of a substantial working library and generally let it be known in academic circles and government departments that the Centre existed' (2003: 434-35; see also Peristiany 1963, 1965; Campbell 1994). In the process the term ethnology was gradually abandoned. None of the social scientists working at the Athens Centre for Social Sciences was associated with *laografia*. The foreign anthropologists who did fieldwork in Greece in the 1950s and 1960s had quite different epistemologies, and the Centre offered them a forum to communicate with native scholars outside folklore (cf. Papataxiarchis, this volume). The 1967 military coup abruptly changed the work of the Centre.[16]

---

[14] For an overview of the development of sociology in Greece during the 1940s-1980s see Lampiri-Dimaki 1996 and Kokosolakis 1998. The chief editor of *Koinoniologiki Erevna* was later invited by Peristiany and undertook the post of chief editor of *Sociological Thinking* (*Koinoniologiki Skepsi*), the journal of the Athens Centre for Social Sciences (Sorokos 2003: 397).

[15] See also Argiriadou 2003. Panagiotis Kanellopoulos, a German-trained professor of sociology at the University of Athens and one of the two leading scholars of the Society of Social and Political Sciences during the 1920s, was a deputy premier at this time. He threatened to resign from the parliament and cause a political crisis when some ultra-conservatives argued against the need for social science in Greece (Sorokos 2003: 398-399).

[16] The collapse of Greek social science between 1967 and 1974 period resembles the situation provoked in Turkey by the 1971 and the 1980 military coups (see Tandoğan 2010: 98; Demirer 2010).

A Tabula Rasa Anthropology?

Between 1967-74, there were few publicly visible developments towards the establishment of social anthropology. The academics who established anthropology in Greece after 1974 completely disassociated themselves from the work of the Greek Anthropological Society, Prince Peter, the folklorists, and the Greek Historical and Ethnological Society. This new generation of Greek anthropologists identified with the work of foreign anthropologists in their country and drew on the networks built up by the Athens Centre for Social Sciences. This was not a planned strategy but rather the result of changes both in the socio-political context and in epistemological agendas. Building anthropology in Greece on a tabula rasa basis, that is connecting the discipline to a democratic 'socio-centrism' rather than to the compromised conservatives of the previous generation, enabled the emergence of 'an anthropology without guilt' (Peirano 2007). Those trained in the United States, Great Britain, and France could draw on this intellectual capital and situate themselves as 'native anthropologists' of an already legitimate anthropological subject, Greece. After 1974, only the works of Lekatsas and Karavidas were positively acknowledged as embryonic native forms of anthropological discourse.[17] After 1974, those teaching *laografia* in universities also became more closely aligned with the anthropological agenda or disappeared.[18]

Looking back over the mid-century, we can see that the elites who dominated Greek politics and academic life from the early 1930s favoured conservative ideologies that identified the Greek nation-state as ancient and ethnically homogenous. Even as some elements of the state were modernised after the Second World War, research on the historical, social, and cultural aspects of Greece were expected to venerate the country's traditions and heritage. For this reason, various attempts to consolidate social anthropology in the 1940s and 1950s all failed. The discussions about *koinoniki anthro-*

[17] For the case of Karavidas see Agelopoulos 2010a and 2010b.

[18] The ethnocentric agenda prevailed in folklore studies during the 1967-74 dictatorship. As a result, folklore studies faced a setback during the 1980s when the political winds again shifted (Papataxiarchis, Nitsiakos, this volume). A number of senior academics employed in the 'Sections' or 'Laboratories' of Folklore Studies in the universities of Thessaloniki and Ioannina gradually adopted a more anthropological orientation (Nitsiakos 2008, Papataxiarchis ibid.) to such an extent that their teaching and research agendas refer to anthropology rather than to folklore studies. The only remaining centres of folklore research in present-day Greece are parts of the Academy of Athens and the School of Philosophy at the University of Athens. It is worth mentioning that there is no department offering an undergraduate program in folklore studies in Greece. For detailed analyses see Papataxiarchis, Chrysanthopoulou, and Nitsiakos in this volume.

pologia in the Greek Anthropological Society, Koumaris's correspondence with the authorities at the University of Athens, Kasimatis's public intervention, Peter's numerous lectures and other activities in Greece, and Spyridakis's proposal for a laboratory of social anthropology all lacked any obvious utility in the eyes of entrenched powerholders.

After 1959, the governments of Konstantinos Karamanlis and Georgios Papandreou were forced by the pressure of strong liberal and leftist social movements to offer modernising visions for the state. The study of otherness was revived and assigned to those who were able to document it ethnographically. By this time, several foreign anthropologists had demonstrated the utility of anthropological knowledge. However, the modernising agenda in the 1960s did not focus on ethnic or national minorities as it had in the 1920s, but on the Greek peasantry, still considered by urban elites to be the epitome of oriental backwardness. Neither the scholars of the Greek Anthropological Society, Peter, nor the folklorists had the 'know-how' to help with this task. Enmeshed between changing perceptions of otherness in a 'supervised state' struggling for modernisation, between networks of scholars stretching between Athens, London, Oxford, Vienna, Berlin, and Paris, the development of anthropology in mid-twentieth century Greece offers useful insight into the general transformations of Greek academia and society.

References

An. 1989. *Ethniko Kentro Koinonikon Erevnon*. Athens: E.K.K.E. Publications.

An. 2000. *Filosofiki Scholi Panepistimiou Thessalonikis*. Thessaloniki: University Studies Press.

Agelopoulos, G. 2010a. Contested Territories and the Quest for Ethnology. In F. Birtek, N. Diamandouros, T. Dragona, and C. Keyder (eds.), *Spatial Conceptions of the Nation*, pp. 181-191. London: Tauris.

–––––. 2010b. Ethnography and national priorities in the post-Ottoman context. (Paper presented at the conference *Beyond Essentialisms: Challenges of Anthropology in the 21st Century*. University of Ljubljana, 25-27 November 2010).

Anastasiadis, G. 2003. *To Panepistimio Thessalonikis afigeitai tin istoria tou (1926-1973)*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press.

Argiriadou, E. 2003. Erevnites, erevnes kai organosi sto Kentro Koinonikon Erevnon Athinon. In I. Lampiris-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinonikes Epistimes*

kai Protoporia stin Ellada. 1950-1967, pp. 239-304. Athens: E.K.K.E. and Gutenberg.

Bakalaki, A. 1997. Students, Natives, Colleagues: Encounters in Academia and in the Field. *Cultural Anthropology* 12 (4): 502-526.

———. 2006. A Different Kind of Knowledge? Learning Anthropology in the Greek University System. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 24: 257-283.

Bertin, C. 1982. *Marie Bonaparte: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bošković, A. 2010. Anthropology in Unlikely Places: Yugoslav Ethnology between the Past and the Future. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other people's anthropologies*, pp. 156-168. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Campbell, J. K. 1994. John Peristiany 1911-1987. A Personal Appreciation. In S. Damianakos, M. E. Handman, G. Ravis-Giordani, and J. Pitt-Riers (eds.), *Les amis et les autres. Mélanges en l'honneur de John Peristiany*, pp. 17-20. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.

———. 2003. The Social Sciences Centre, Athens, 1962. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Social Sciences and Vanguard in Greece 1950-1967*, pp. 431-437. Athens: E.K.K.E. and Gutenberg.

Cowan, J. 2007. The Supervised State. *Identities* 14: 545-578.

Damianakos S., M. E. Handman, G. Ravis-Giordani, and J. Pitt-Rivers. (eds.). 1994. *Les amis et les autres. Mélanges en l'honneur de John Peristiany*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.

Demirer, S. O. 2010. Anthropology as a Nation-Building Rhetoric: The Shaping of Turkish Anthropology (from 1850s to 1940s). *Dialectical Anthropology* 34 (1): 1-19.

Eriksen T. H. 2010. The Otherness of Norwegian Anthropology. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other people's anthropologies*, pp. 169-185. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Frederiksen, B. F. 2008. Jomo Kenyatta, Marie Bonaparte and Bronislaw Malinowski on Clitoridectomy and Female Sexuality. *History Workshop Journal* 65: 23-48.

Gefou-Madianou, D. 1993. Mirroring Ourselves through Western Texts: The Limits of an Indigenous Anthropology. In H. Driessen (ed.), *The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing*, pp. 160-177. Saarbrücken: Breitenbach.

———. 2000. Disciples, Discipline and Reflection: Anthropological Encounters and Trajectories. In M. Strathern (ed.), *Audit Cultures*, pp. 256-278. London: Routledge.

——. 2009. I anthropologia sti skia tou ellinikou politismou: I anaptyxi mias epistimis ston akadimaïko choro. In D. Gefou-Madianou (ed.), *Opseis Anthropologikis Erevnas*, pp. 61-106. Athens: Hellinika Grammata.

Gizelis, G. 2004. I anthropologia stin Ellada: Provlima taftotitas. In G. Gizelis (ed.), *Opseis tis Anthropologikis Erevnas kai Skepsis stin Ellada*, pp. 21-42. Athens: Greek Ethnological Society.

Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia. 1963. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1963*. Athens: Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia.

Grottanelli, V., G. Ausenda, B. Bernardi, U. Bianchi, Y. M. Bodemann, J. Goody, A. Jablonko, D. I. Kertzer, V. Lanternari, A. Marazzi, R. A. Miller Jr., L. Laurencich Minell, D. M. Moss, L. W. Moss, H.R.H. Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark, D. Pinto, P. Scotti, T. Tentori. 1977. Ethnology and/or Cultural Anthropology in Italy: Traditions and Developments [and Comments and Reply]. *Current Anthropology* 18 (4): 593-614.

Hannerz, U., and T. Gerholm. 1982. The Shaping of National Anthropologies. *Ethnos* 47 (Special Issue).

Hannerz, U. 2010. Anthropology's Global Ecumene. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies*, pp. 215-230. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Herzfeld, M. 1982. *Ours Once More. Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

——. 1987. *Anthropology through the Looking Glass. Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kenna, M. 1970. *The Science of Anthropology*: A Series of Lectures by Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark. *Man* 5 (1): 144-145.

Kokosolakis, N. 1998. Politics and Sociology in Greece, 1950-1998. *International Sociology* 13 (3): 325-343.

Krotz, E. 1997. Anthropologies of the South: Their Rise, their Silencing and their Characteristics. *Critique of Anthropology* 17 (3): 237-251.

Kyriakidou-Nestoros, A. 1978. *H theoria tis Ellinikis Laografias*. Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and Education – Moraitis School.

Kyrtsis, A. A. 1996. *Koinoniologiki Skepsi kai Eksynchronistikes Ideologies ston Elliniko Mesopolemo*. Athens: Nisos.

Lampiri-Dimaki, I. 1987. To chthes kai to simera tis koinoniologias stin Ellada. In I. Lampiris-Dimaki (ed.), *I Koinoniologia stin Ellada Simera*, pp. 15-56. Athens: Papazisis.

——. 1996. Sociology in Greece: Trends and Prospects. *South European Society and Politics* 1 (1): 121-130.

——. (ed.). 2003. Koinonikes Epistimes kai Protoporia stin Ellada. 1950-1967. Eidiko Afieroma. Giati. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinonikes Epistimes kai Protoporia stin Ellada. 1950-1967*, pp. 25-54. Athens: E.K.K.E. and Gutenberg.

Lee-Demetracopoulou, D. 1947. Greek Tales of Priest and Priestwife. *The Journal of American Folklore* 60 (236): 163-167.

——. 1951. Greek Personal Anecdotes of the Supernatural. *The Journal of American Folklore* 64 (253): 307-312.

——. 1955. Greece. In M. Mead (ed.), *Cultural Patterns and Technical Change*, pp. 57-96. New York: Mentor Books.

Lekatsas, P. 1946. *I proelliniki mitriarchia kai i "Oresteia"*. Athens: Vivlio Neoellinikou Logou.

——. 1951. *I katagogi ton thesmon, ton ethimon kai ton doxasion*. Athens: Vivlio Neoellinikou Logou.

——. 1957. *H psychi – I idea tis psychis kai tis athanasias tis kai ta ethima tou thanatou*. Athens: The Athens Publishing Institute.

——. 1971. *Dionysos. Katagogi kai exelixi tis dionysiakis thriskeias*. Athens: The Moraitis School.

Loukatos. D. 1968. *Laografia – Ethnografia. Stoicheia Didaskalias kai apopseis apo ton enarktirio logo tis edras tou*. Ioannina: Filosofiki Scholi Ioanninon.

Marketos, S. 2007. I idrysi tou Panepistimiou Thessalonikis: mia politiki epilogi. (Paper presented at the conference *University and Reforms in Greece*, University of Athens, 7-8 June 2007).

Megas, G. 1967. Laografia, Ethnografia, Ethnologia. *Laografia* 25: 39-42.

Meraklis. M. 1971. Oi theoritikes katefthynseis tis laografias meta to Deftero Pagkosmio Polemo. *Laografia* 27: 3-23.

Mihăilescu, V., I. Iliev, and S. Naumović. 2008. Introduction. In V. Mihăilescu, I. Iliev, and S. Naumović (eds.), *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II*, pp. 1-18. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Michailides, I. 1996. The Case of the Macedonian Abecedar. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 14 (2): 329-343.

Nitsiakos, B. 2008. *Prosanatolismoi. Mia kritiki eisagogi sti Laografia*. Athens: Kritiki.

Panopoulos, P. 2003. Between Self and Others. The Academic Establishment of Greek Anthropology. In D. Dracle, I. R. Edgar, and T. K. Schippers (eds.), *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*, pp. 193-205. New York: Berghan Books.

Papataxiarchis, E. 2005. Un moment pluriel. L'ethnographie grecque au tournant du siècle. *Ethnologie française* 35: 213-227.

——. 2003. I koinoniki anthropologia sti metapolemiki Ellada. Ta prota vimata. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinonikes Epistimes kai Protoporia stin Ellada. 1950-1967*, pp. 115-154. Athens: E.K.K.E. and Gutenberg.

Patterson, C. T. 2001. *A Social History of Anthropology in the United States*. Oxford: Berg.

Pedersen, P. 2004-2005. Out of India: Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark and the Greek Royal Family. *Dansk etnografisk forening* 46-47: 181-200.

——. 2005. Prince Peter, Polyandry and Psychoanalysis. In J. Bray (ed.), *Ladakhi Histories: Local and Regional Perspectives*, pp. 293-308. Leiden: Brill.

Pedersen, P., and M. Van Beek. 2007. Prince Peter's Film from Ladakh 1938. In J. Bray, and N. Tsering Shakspo (eds.), *Recent Research on Ladakh*, pp. 43-50. Leh: Jammu and Kasmir Academy of Art, Culture and Languages.

Peirano, G. S. M. 2007. Anthropology with No Guilt – A View from Brazil. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies*, pp. 186-198. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Peristiany, J. 1963. *Contributions to Mediterranean Sociology: Mediterranean Rural Communities and Social Change*. Paris: The Hague & Mouton.

——. 1965. *Honour and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Prince Pierre de Grèce. 1935. *Les Coopératives agricoles danoises et le marché extérieur*. Paris: Recueil Sirey.

Prince Peter of Greece. 1941. *Ap' Athinon eis Kalkouttan*. (2nd ed.). Athens: Printing Co P. A. Dialisma.

——. 1952. *The Eternal Question: A Study of Present-day World Trends*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger.

——. 1961a. Apo ta meletas mou epi tis Anthropologias. I praktiki simasia tis epistimis aftis dia tin Ellada. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1961* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 42-57.

——. 1961b. Eisagogi eis tin epistimin tis anthropologias. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1961* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 9-22.

——. 1961c. Eisagogi eis tin ethnologian. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1961* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 24-38.

——. 1962a. H synchronos Ethnologia. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1961* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 37-51.

——. 1962b. The Ceremony of Breaking the Stone. *Folk. Dansk etnografisk Tidsskrift* 4: 65-70.

——. 1962c. I istoriki exelixis tis Ethnologias. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1962* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 12-22.
——. 1963a. *A Study of Polyandry*. La Haye: Mouton & Co.
——. 1963b. *Vasilika*: A Village in Modern Greece by Ernestine Friedl. *Man* 63: 200.
——. 1963c. Mia epistimoniki theoria tou politismou. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1963* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 12-23.
——. 1969. *The Science of Anthropology. A Series of Lectures*. La Haye: Mouton & Co.
Piniatoglou, L. 1942. To Pythagoreia Tampou. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1942* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 36-39.
——. 1943. Koinoniki Anthropologia (Techni) kai Psychanalysis. *Praktika Synedrion tou Etous 1943* (Elliniki Anthropologiki Etairia), pp. 46-49.
Rafael, M. 2003. Pos idrythike to Ethniko Kentro Koinonikon Erevnon. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Koinonikes Epistimes kai Protoporia stin Ellada. 1950-1967*, pp. 223-238. Athens: E.K.K.E. and Gutenberg.
Restrepo, E., and A. Escobar. 2005. Other Anthropologies and Anthropology Otherwise. *Critique of Anthropology* 25 (2): 99-129.
Rohner, P. R. 1970. *The Science of Anthropology* by Prince Peter of Greece. *American Anthropologist* 72 (3): 616-617.
Sanders, I. T. 1954–5. The Nomadic Peoples of Northern Greece. Ethnic Puzzle and Cultural Survival. *Social Forces* 33: 122-129.
——. 1962. *Rainbow in the Rock. The People of Rural Greece*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
Scopelitis, G. 1910. Moeurs et coutumes de Madagascar. *Laografia* B': 3-27.
Sorokos, S. 2003. Koinoniki Epistimi kai Erevna sti metapolemiki Ellada. In I. Lampiri-Dimaki (ed.), *Social Sciences and Vanguard in Greece 1950-1967*, pp. 403-410. Athens: E.K.K.E. and Gutenberg.
Tandoğan, Z. 2010. Anthropology in Turkey: Impressions for an Overview. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies*, pp. 97-109. Oxford: Berghahn Books.
Toudasaki, E. 2003. Anthropologia kai Laografia. *Dokimes* 11-12: 7-63.
Travis, A. 1999. Prince Philip's Cousin 'Subverted War against Nazis'. *The Guardian* 10.8.1999.
Trubeta, S. 2009. *Physical Anthropology, Race and Eugenics in Greece (1880s-1970s). The Science – The Actors – The Ideas*. Habilitation thesis. (Fachbereich Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften, FU Berlin).

——. 2010. The ‘Strong Nucleus of the Greek Race’: Racial Nationalism and Anthropological Science. *Focaal - European Journal of Anthropology* 58: 63-78.

Tsitselikis D., and D. Christopoulos. 2008. Apo tin empeiria tis ‘Kritikis Politeias’ kai tis ‘Megalis Ideas’ ton archon tou 20ou stin ‘polypolitismiki koinonia’ ton archon tou 21ou aiona. In D. Christopoulos (ed.), *To anomologito zitima ton meionotiton*, pp. 33-67. Athens: KEMO – Kritiki.

Wayne, H. 1995. *The Story of a Marriage: The Letters of Bronislaw Malinowski and Elsie Masson*. (Vol. II). London: Routledge.

Chapter 4
Folklore in Greece (1945-1991): The Political Dimension of its Orientation and Institutionalisation

Vassilis Nitsiakos

Folklore appeared in Greece at the end of the nineteenth century, when the term *laografia* was introduced by Nikolaos Politis in 1884.[1] It was established as an autonomous discipline in the beginning of the twentieth century, when the Hellenic Folklore Society was founded (1908) and the first volume of the journal *Laographia* was published. In this journal Nikolaos Politis (1852-1921), the founder of folklore studies in Greece, published a seminal article under the homonymous title '*Laografia*', by which the foundations of the discipline were laid (Politis 1909).

Politis knew European ethnology very well and used one particular dimension of the theory of evolutionism, namely survivalism, to advance the idea of continuity of the Greek nation and its culture from ancient times to the present. Thus, *laografia* developed as a national discipline in terms of its orientation as well as its subject matter. This became a dominant tradition, which continued to characterise research as well as academic teaching during the interwar period, when its conservative orientation was even more enhanced. Both representatives of interwar *laografia*, Stilpon Kyriakides and Georgios Megas followed the romantic nationalist paradigm emphasising its patriotic character (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978). In the pages that follow, I examine the work and political positions of these two major figures in folklore studies.

[1] N. Politis published his first study *Meléti peri ton Vion ton neoteron Ellinon: Neoelliniki Myfologia't* (*Study on the Life of Modern Greeks: Modern Greek Mythology*) vol. I, in 1871, while he used for the first time the term *laografia* meaning a specific discipline in 1884 in an article that was published in the journal *Deltion tis Istorikis ke Ethnologikis Eterias tis Ellado* (*Bulletin of the Greek Historical and Ethnological Society*).

Thessaloniki: The Case of Stilpon Kyriakides

Professor Stilpon Kyriakides (1887-1964), had a career that spanned several major shifts in Greek political, social, and intellectual climate (see Papataxiarchis and Agelopoulos this volume). In 1968, one of his books, originally written in 1943, was translated into English and published. The tone of the book is completely different from his pre-war publications, and I quote the opening passage at length to give a sense of how Kyriakides's intellectual and political allegiances shifted as he addressed multiple audiences, and in the wake of political change:

> This monograph was written in March, 1943, as a criticism and rebuttal to what the German occupation forces wrote during World War II to indoctrinate their soldiers. They said that the modern Greeks had no connection whatsoever with the ancient Greeks but that, for the most part, they were descendants of the barbaric Slavic tribes which flooded Greece during the Middle Ages. This assertion recalled the old theory of Fallmerayer, which was discarded long ago even by Slavic scholars themselves.
>
> Unfortunately, well-known German scholars advocated these theories for the sake of temporary friendship with the Bulgarians. The ulterior motive for these so-called 'scholarly publications' was to prevent the simple-minded among the German soldiers from expressing possible sympathy and admiration toward the modern Greeks as descendants of the ancient Greeks. They also tried to evoke contempt and derision toward the Greeks who fought in Albania and in the mountains of Macedonia with a valour worthy of their ancient forbears.
>
> Apart from this the writer was motivated by another insult against the Greek people. This insult was presented by Alfred Rosenberg, the Nazi theoretician of National Socialism, in his notorious book *Der Mythus des 20 Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1936). In that book (p. 35), this top Nazi also proclaimed the extinction of the ancient Greeks in much the same way Fallmerayer had done, calling their descendants weak Levantines (Kyriakides 1968: 47).

So begins the preface of *Language and Culture of Modern Greeks* (1946). The book's English translation appeared in the second year of the Colonels' dictatorship (1967-74), published by the Institute for Balkan Studies in Thessaloniki. The institute published this work together with the translation from German of a lecture that Kyriakides had delivered in 1936 in Munich, where he had been invited by the German Academy and some other institutions.

The two studies are written in a completely different spirit. *Language and Culture of Modern Greeks* is conditioned by a patriotic spirit and reflects the political commitment of the author, while the earlier talk is characterised by the comparative method and has no trace of nationalism. This contradiction generally characterises the writings of Kyriakides. His articles and books that were written with pure scholarly intention are characterised by the absence of nationalistic and emotional tone, while what was written in the context of his political engagement is highly politicised and emotional.

Kyriakides was a student of Nikolaos Politis, and succeeded his teacher as a leader in the developing field of folklore. From 1918-26, he was director of the Folklore Archive in Athens. Then, in 1926, Kyriakides was elected to the Chair of Ancient Greek Religion and Private Life and Greek Folklore at the University of Thessaloniki (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 95). He was therefore the first person in Greece to hold a university teaching position whose title included the word 'folklore'. Nikolaos Politis had held the Chair of Mythology and Greek Archaeology at the University of Athens, and taught folklore as part of his remit there (Meraklis 2004).

Kyriakides's inner 'division' constituted an oscillation not only between patriotic duty and scholarly ethics but also between folklore and history. When foregrounding his political commitments, Kyriakides often turned to history. For Kyriakides, Greece's historical claims to Thrace and Macedonia were of personal importance because his family had originated in Thrace). Thrace and Macedonia were annexed to Greece at the end of the Balkan Wars (1912-13), but Greece's northern neighbours, including Bulgaria, challenged the annexation. During the Second World War, Bulgaria had sided with the Nazis and occupied a large part of Thrace and Macedonia in the spring of 1941 (Flaiser 1987: 101-27). This occupation, among other elements of Germany's campaign in the Balkans, accounts for the position that Kyriakides took in *Language and Culture of Modern Greeks*.

During and after the war, Kyriakides was active in promoting the Greek identity of Macedonia, and shaped his theoretical and methodological positions in ways that supported his ideological position. In 1942 and for twelve consecutive years after, he was elected President of the Society for Macedonian Studies. This association focused its research and publishing activities on 'Macedonian issues' and the Institute for Balkan Studies was later created on its foundations in 1953. The main purpose of the later institute was to oppose 'Bulgarian-Slavic propaganda' about Macedonia.

In 1942, Kyriakides also wrote *Language and Culture of Modern Greeks* as an answer to German scholarly-propaganda. As soon as Greece was conquered by the Germans, German historians who functioned as organic intellectuals of the regime brought back, together with the theory of

Lebensraum (living-space), Fallmerayer's theory concerning the Slavicisation of modern Greeks. To the German argument of German living-space, Kyriakides opposed the argument of Greek living-space. The book, however, did not appear until 1946 because it had been banned by German censorship (Kyriakides 1946; Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 129).

Kyriakides's answer to the racist view of the German historians about the non-continuity of the Greeks was founded not on a biological, but on a cultural basis. He spoke of cultural continuity. It is interesting in this respect that Kyriakides was led by his patriotic commitment to building his own theory about the form and historical origins of modern Greek culture. He links modern Greek language with culture by tracing both back to late antiquity, a period in which 'Macedonian Hellenism', whose contribution to the formation of modern Greek culture he considers important, is included (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 128-30). Thus, the 'Macedonian question' and the problem of Greece's northern border did not simply make Kyriakides turn to history, but also decisively shaped how he constructed his own theory about the origins of folk culture and the 'historical method' that he promoted (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 111-47).

Both before and after the Second World War, Kyriakides's work shows an intense politicisation, which exceeds the bounds of patriotism. In the aftermath of the Greek Civil War (1946-49), Kyriakides gained a reputation for his strong conservatism and anti-communism. Immediately after the liberation of the country from German occupation in 1946, at the Pan-Hellenic Congress for National Rights, organised in Thessaloniki, Kyriakides played a key organisational role and delivered a speech entitled 'The Northern Limits of Hellenism'. Subsequently, he continued his activities as a member of the government's National Committee by lecturing and broadcasting about national issues. His anti-communism was already evident in the monograph *The Family*: *Materialist Theories and Contemporary Lessons in Ethnology Regarding the Origin of the Family*, published in 1939 on the basis of a lecture delivered to the students of the School of Philosophy at the University of Thessaloniki (Kyriakides 1939). In this study, Kyriakides attempted to refute Marx and Engels' argument on the origin of the family, countering that the natural character of the family had been consecrated by the Church. Kyriakides had a broad knowledge of developments in European ethnology and anthropology, which he often criticised (Kyriakides 1939: 31-37). To his students, he spoke sympathetically about many of the trends, especially functionalism and Malinowski, but he insisted on the importance of a diachronic perspective and on developing his own 'historical approach' (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 126).

Athens: The Case of Georgios Megas

While all this was taking place in Thessaloniki, the first Chair of Folklore in a university was founded in Athens during the Greek Civil War. It was occupied by Georgios Megas, another folklorist well-known in the international academic community, mainly due to his studies in folk tales.

On November 24, 1947, in the midst of the Civil War, Megas delivered his inaugural lecture as Professor of Folklore in the ceremonial hall of the University of Athens. The lecture was titled, 'The Study of Folklore, Its Aim and Subject Matter (Η σπουδή της Λαογραφίας. Σκοπός και έργον αυτής)' (Megas 1951). Megas concluded his speech as follows:

> in these days of spiritual confusion and laxity of our national unity, Folklore has to perform this great educational project: to restore the individual to the fertilising, spiritual and natural sources of the fatherland and reconnect him in body and soul to the Homeland. Nowhere else are service to science and service to the Nation and to the young generation combined in such harmony and perfection as in the field of Folklore. And more than anywhere else, this combination means service to the future of our people (1951: 32).

The reference to spiritual confusion and the loosening of the bonds of national unity clearly implies the influence of Marxist ideas and the division of the nation caused by the Civil War. The patriotic-national duty, as Megas means it, is linked to the repulsion of both external and internal enemies, a commitment also held by Kyriakides, as mentioned above. This sense of duty to the homeland produced contradictions within Megas's work. He wrote many texts on strictly scholarly grounds that cannot be considered nationalistic, but in others, his writing was strongly ideological and acquired nationalist and conservative overtones.

Megas's insistence on the national orientation of *laografia* originated during his period of study in Germany in the late 1920s. Megas was attached to the objectives of the German Romantic tradition, connected with the concept of the 'self-awareness of ethnicity' (Gk: *aftepignosis tis ethnotitos*), following the ideas of the German folklorist W.H. Riehl (Megas 1951). Megas wrote, 'according to Riehl, Folklore cannot be considered a science at all, unless it puts at the centre of its scattered investigations the idea of the nation... . Folk spirit and folk soul are, according to Riehl, the moving instructive forces, which constitute the only parameters that allow us to comprehend the essence of a people, a tribe, or a human society' (Megas 1951:13).

Megas was inspired by Riehl's insistence that the study of folklore should be turned, scientifically, to understanding the paths of development that were unfolding before each human community in the present. Riehl had

no students and few followers, so the emphasis that he placed on using folklore to combat both socialism and Marxism was poorly explicated. According to Megas, Riehl thought that 'research carried out on contemporary social conditions with a firm belief in the nature and character of a people will necessarily lead to the consolidation of a conservative social policy' (Megas 1951: 13-14). Other German folklorists, however, turned to ethnology for inspiration, and took up a concern with social psychology.

In his publications and other work Megas opposed the integration of folklore with ethnology or social and cultural anthropology. In fact, he reacted fiercely to such a proposal made by the Cypriot Theodore Papadopoullos (Papadopoullos 1970). Megas defended the right of folklore to continue its existence as an independent discipline with a distinct subject and a clear goal related to the 'self-awareness of the nation' (Megas 1971: 352). Megas continued to follow developments within German folklore studies, and used the example of its post-war crisis to strengthen his own critique that the shifting of disciplinary boundaries was tantamount to the politicisation of science:

> It is true that even in West Germany Folklore has been going through a crisis recently. The crisis comes from within, expressed by a new group of reformers who are under a strong influence of a powerful nowadays Sociology. While for the older and middle generation Folklore was a historical discipline, or a discipline of the history of culture, or a discipline pertaining to the character of a culture (χαρακτηρολογική [haractirologiki]), for the junior critics it is a social science (*Sozialwissenschaft*), and folklorists are sociologists *per definitionem* (*Sozialwissenschaftler*)... . But the reformers reach the point of denying the very existence of 'people'... .
>
> Of course, Folklore is a social science as well, but not *only* a social one. As a science of the living, present man, Folklore can and should aim not only at the present but also at the future of society and contribute as much as possible to social advancement. But the reformers do not confine themselves to this and define one single purpose for Folklore: to collaborate in transforming the existing system … thus betraying their ideological stance... . The doctrine of these reformers is that there is no science without politics… ! Responding to this doctrine, Walter Havernick, a professor in Hamburg and one of the older generation who lived in the days of National Socialism without being swallowed up by its 'ideology', stresses that he cannot understand how he must now bow under the yoke of another party… (Megas 1971: 351-53).

Megas concluded his defence of Folkore's distinct identity with an appeal to the folklorist's duty to the nation:

> And we, who do not deal only with theory, but practise our work in folklore out of commitment to the people to whom we belong, continue to set as the ultimate purpose of our discipline the knowledge of folk life and soul and through this the awareness of our national Being, on which consciousness of National Unity is founded (Megas 1971: 352-53).

Despite the intense nationalism in many of his writings, Georgios Megas was also a meticulous folklorist and field researcher. He introduced systematic field research at the Folklore Archive and his ethnographic studies of houses, settlements, and material culture in rural Greece are among some of the most interesting studies produced by the archive's researchers. Megas's reflections on his own research are surprisingly devoid of explicitly nationalistic rhetoric. Commenting on one of the studies he conducted in Thrace, for example, he wrote:

> When I began these studies in the area of Didymoteicho twenty-five years ago, my goal was different: to investigate the manners and customs related to the religious practices of the people. But as I entered the houses, I confronted many issues concerning economy, the layout and arrangement of space, animals' stabling, storage of grain and its protection from damp and mice, issues whose solution is not only to be sought in climate, soil, biological and historical reasons, but is directly linked to another factor which dominates and controls all the others, man. So I felt an attraction pulling me to the house as living place and as the work of the hands of peasants who built it, following a system of social reciprocity (Megas 1949: 2).

Though his concluding sentence tugs at the idea of the nation and its soul, the emphasis is much more clearly on Megas's favourable impressions towards ethnography and situationally-determined research.

New Directions

Kyriakides and Megas were larger-than-life figures who dominated folklore in Greece between the 1930s and the 1970s. However, during the 1960s an interesting shift took place, initiated by Demetrios Loukatos and Demetrios Petropoulos, two senior scholars of the same generation as Kyriakides and Megas. Loukatos (1908-2003) and Petropoulos (1906-79) had studied as postgraduates in France, and adopted ethnological theories and methods which they introduced into Greek folklore. From the beginnings of their careers, each man incorporated ethnography in his research, teaching, and publications. The influence of these two folklorists was invisible in the early

stages of their careers. In 1952, Petropoulos published an article titled 'The Study of Ethnography in Greece' in the journal *Midwestern Folklore* (Petropoulos 1952) which signalled his growing influence. Loukatos and Petropoulos only received professorships late in their careers: Loukatos was Professor of Folklore at the University of Ioannina (1964-69), and later taught folklore at the universities of Crete (1978-81) and Patras (1984-85); and he held Kyriakides's chair as Professor of Ancient Greek Religion and Private Life and Greek Folklore at the University of Thessaloniki (1961-72). In his 1961 inaugural lecture as Professor of Folklore at the University of Ioannina, entitled 'Folklore-Ethnography', Loukatos set a new agenda for folklore which emphasised ethnography and the possibility of urban folklore studies, without discarding older concerns for the nation.[2]

> We need, as already shown, a 'Greek Ethnography' for a broader study of the life of the nation, that is not only peasant life but urban life as well, not only earlier ways of life but recent and ongoing ones, too. We even need an 'Ethnographic Folklore', which will not only be connected with its relative disciplines, but will also multiply its interests, turning its attention to other aspects, leading also to the self-knowledge of the nation (Loukatos 1968: 14).

These developments were stopped in a violent manner by the imposition of dictatorship in 1967. Loukatos himself resigned from his position at the University of Ioannina in 1969, protesting against the lack of academic freedom under the new regime. A few years later, in 1973, another senior folklorist, Alki Kyriakidou-Nestoros, was dismissed from the University of Thessaloniki for her political affiliation with the Left.

Folklore on the Left

In 1974, democracy was restored in the country and a new era began. A wind of democratisation started blowing in the universities, while Marxist ideas gained great momentum in society as well as in academia. In the field of folklore studies two new figures (re)appeared to occupy the Chairs of Folklore at the universities of Thessaloniki and Ioannina. Alki Kyriakidou-Nestoros, the daughter of Stilpon Kyriakides, returned to the University of Thessaloniki, and Michalis Meraklis was elected Professor of Folklore at the University of Ioannina in 1975, filling the position that had been left open after Loukatos's departure.

---

[2] Loukatos was the first Greek folklorist to address urban folklore in his book, *Contemporary Folklore* (*Folklorica Contemporanea*) (1963). See Alexakis 2008 and Avdikos 2008 for discussions of the specific contribution made by this research to the development of Greek folklore.

These two senior academics contributed decisively to the reorientation and renewal of folklore studies. They both belonged to the Left and their thinking was influenced by Marxism. Their studies abroad before the events of 1967 also had been crucial for their academic formation. Kyriakidou-Nestoros studied in the United States and France, thus becoming acquainted with American socio-cultural anthropology and with French ethnology. She had been Claude Levi-Strauss's student in France and was influenced by his theory of structuralism. Michalis Meraklis studied in Germany, where he was influenced by the new school of thought which appeared at that time and gave folklore a sociological orientation expanding its scope to urban areas and putting particular emphasis on the folk culture of the working class (Meraklis 1971). Meraklis's work also bears the influence of structuralism and structural-functionalism, as these theories were diffused not only in Germany but also in Greece, especially after the 1960s.

The aforementioned academics tried to integrate the Marxist perspective within the anthropological and social-historical orientation of folklore. Kyriakidou-Nestoros attempted to achieve this aim in a systematic way, both through her teaching and through her overall academic and research practice. In a manual distributed to students in 1980 entitled *Folklore and the Humanities* she included chapters on the history of anthropological theories (evolutionism, functionalism, and structuralism) and also referred to dialectic materialism and its applicability to the study of folk culture (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1980). She also published a book entitled *Claude Lévi-Srauss and His Work* (1977b) and wrote the introduction to the Greek edition of *The Savage Mind* (1977a). Until her death in 1988, Kyriakidou-Nestoros insisted on using the term 'folklore' to describe her research, but in practice she prepared the ground for the introduction of social anthropology in Greece. The transition was gradual; in 1976, when she entered the University of Thessaloniki as Extraordinary Professor, her chair bore its original title of Ancient Greek Religion and Private Life and Greek Folklore; when she became Full Professor in 1979, the name of the chair changed to Folklore. As a result of this preliminary work, at the University of Thessaloniki today the term 'social anthropology' appears next to 'folklore'. At the University of Ioannina, Meraklis continued along the same and similar lines to those initiated by Loukatos, with the result that the vast majority of the teaching staff in the Sector of Folklore has adopted an anthropological perspective and an ethnographic method of research.

Epilogue

The political orientations reviewed in this paper have continued to affect folklore in Greek universities in the twenty-first century. At the University

of Athens, the discipline generally adhered to earlier folklorist teaching and research approaches until 2011 when a position in social folklore was established. Meanwhile graduates of the School of Philosophy who are interested in folklore generally pursue postgraduate studies in social anthropology, mainly in Britain, France, or the United States. When they return to Greece they work either in folklore departments or in the newly created departments of social anthropology. Thus, while there has been a substantive intellectual convergence of folklore and social anthropology, their institutionalisation has proceeded in a rather competitive environment (Alexakis 1993). The dialogue between them is conducted in a piecemeal fashion, particularly at conferences, but it has not so far produced a consensus

Contrary to the strong claims sometimes advanced by social anthropology graduates, ethnological-anthropological theory has been present in Greek academic folklore since its beginning and continues to affect folklorists' thought in one way or another. Anthropology has been introduced either formally or informally in academic syllabuses of folklore studies, the most advanced case being that of the Department of History and Archaeology at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. There are thus many elements of camouflage and dissimulation in play. Younger scholars need to recognise these complexities, and the political aspects that continue to condition them, as they take the dialogue forward.

References

Alexakis E. 1993. Social Anthropology and Greek Folklore. *Proceedings of the Congress "Social Research in Greece Today"*, pp. 23-47. Athens: National Centre for Social Research.

——. 2008. I Galliki Ethnologiki Sholi kai o D. Loukatos. In *Loukatos and Greek Folklore, Workshop Proceedings*, pp. 18-32. Academy of Athens: Hellenic Folklore Research Centre.

Avdikos E. 2008. D. Loukatos. Apo ti theoria stin praksi. In *Loukatos and Greek Folklore, Workshop Proceedings*, pp. 40-50. Academy of Athens: Hellenic Folklore Research Centre.

Flaiser, H. 1987. *Stemma kai svastika*. Athens: Papazisis.

Kyriakides S. 1946. *Glossa kai Laikos Politismos ton Neoteron Ellinon*. Athens: Syllogos pros Diadosin ton Ellinikon Grammaton.

——. 1968. *Two Studies on Modern Greek Folklore.* Thessaloniki: Institute of Balkan Studies.

——. 1939. *I Oikogenia*. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki.

Kyriakidou-Nestoros, A. 1977a. *Eisagogi sto O Cl. Levi-Strauss kai to ergo tou*. Athens: Papazisis.
———. 1977b. *O Cl. Levi-Strauss kai to ergo tou*. Athens: Papazisis.
———. 1978. *I Theoria tis Ellinikis Laografias*. Athens: Moraitis.
———. 1980. *Laografia kai Anthropistikes Spoudes*. Thessaloniki.
Loukatos, D. 1963. *Folklorica Contemporanea* (in Greek). Athens.
———. 1968. *Laografia – Ethnografia*. Ioannina: University of Ioannina
Megas, G. 1949. *I Elliniki Oikia*. Athens.
———. 1951. I Spoudi tis Laografias. Skopos kai ergon aftis. *Platon* 3 (a): 1-32.
———. 1971. To pedion kai to Periehomenon tis Laografias dhia tou orismou aftis. *Laografia* 27: 349-354.
Meraklis, M. 1971. Oi theoritikes katefthinsis tis Laografias meta ton Deftero Pagkosmio Polemo. *Laografia* 27: 3-23.
Meraklis N. 2004. *I Synigoria tis Laografias*. Athens: Angeliki Chatzimichali Foundation
Papadopoullos, T. 1970. To pedion kai to Periehomenon tis Laografias dhia tou orismou aftis. *Annual of the Centre for Scientific Research* (Nicosia) III: 1-62.
Petropoulos, D. 1952. The Study of Ethnography in Greece. *Midwestern Folklore* II (I): 15-20.
Politis, N. 1909. Laografia. *Laografia* 1: 3-18.

Chapter 5

Folklore Theory and Practice in Greece, 1945-1991: The Contribution of the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre of the Academy of Athens

Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou

The multivocality that exists among various national strands of anthropology (Bošković and Eriksen 2008: 2) can also be found within the anthropological traditions of one and the same country. The 'stories' of these traditions are rendered differently by their past and present practitioners and narrators depending on ideological and educational background and scholarly pursuits. Structural and personal factors combine to determine how these people understood their position in the academic and social world of their times and how they implemented these understandings through their research and public engagement.

In this chapter I present the development of folklore studies in Greece during the period 1945-91 by focusing on the main academic folklore institution in Greece, the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre of the Academy of Athens – henceforth referred to as the Folklore Centre. I deal with the centre's contribution to the shaping of research practices and traditions in the discipline of folklore over the period in question; its input into Greek education at all levels, from primary to tertiary education; and its continuous renewal and transformation through contact with related disciplines, such as ethnology, history, sociology, and social anthropology. Particular attention will be paid to methods of fieldwork and to the classification and analysis of folkloric and ethnographic materials, as practised by the centre's researchers. I then attempt to show how these theoretical trends and practices were transferred and applied to education, in particular at the university level.

Folklore and social anthropology have coexisted on the Greek academic scene institutionally since the 1980s. Despite the fact that they share an interest in the same area of study, that is Greek society and culture, their relationship has been bedevilled by antagonism and there has been little formal collaboration between the two (cf. Agelopoulos, Nitsiakos, and Papataxiarchis in this volume). The dialogue between folklore and anthro-

pology in Greece has not progressed very far, despite the fact that numerous Greek anthropologists have a background in folklore or work in folklore institutions.[1] I believe that a better – and more sympathetic - acquaintance with the world of folklore studies, as practised in the main folklore research institution, will contribute towards a deeper understanding of folklore and folklorists by Greek anthropologists, thus facilitating future exchanges.

As will become clear, one of the differences between folklore and anthropology in Greece is that folklore historically relied upon philological, that is literature and text-related, methods of dealing with the subject matter of oral literature (cf. Papataxiarchis, this volume). It still uses such methods, though to a much smaller degree. My academic background combines the humanities (first degree in classics) and the social sciences (doctorate in social anthropology). This enables me to approach the humanities-derived, philological methods of folklore in a neutral and even positive spirit as I attempt to evaluate their contribution to the systematic exploration of Greek folk culture.

Beyond this personal experience, however, I feel that the practitioners of folklore and of anthropology need to appraise the problematic relationship between folklore and anthropology in Greece in the context of long-term international epistemological discourse concerning the relationship between these two disciplines and the respective views that each side holds in regard to the other. This issue becomes more complicated if we consider the different relationships and uses of folklore and anthropology, under various national names, in various parts of the world. Both disciplines have been often entangled with political ideologies and developments, not unlike the patterns documented for east-central and southern Europe (e.g. Hann, Sárkány and Skalník 2005: 4-9; Kiliánová 2005; Bošković 2008).

Despite the fact that the same persons, such as Edward Tylor, Andrew Lang, James Frazer, and Franz Boas helped to found both disciplines in the United States and the United Kingdom, the disciplines developed within different traditions, those pertaining to literature and to the social sciences respectively. By 1969 anthropologist Ruth Finnegan, whose interest in oral literature brought her in contact with folklorists' work, noted: 'Among academic anthropologists and fieldworkers the term 'folklore' [has come] to be reserved as a synonym for the old evolutionist and uncritical position held by earlier writers in the subject, and [is] now totally rejected. […] It is not

[1] For further discussion see Alexakis 1982, 1993, 2001, 2003, forthcoming; Papataxiarchis 2003; Tountasaki 2003; Meraklis 2004. On the general development of folklore studies in Greece during the first half of the twentieth century, see Loukatos 1950; Avdikos 2009: 61-111, 169-227), and Alexiadis 2009; for the period after the Second World War, see Meraklis 1971; Loukatos 1988; Alexiadis 2003; and Avdikos 2009: 229-351.

surprising in view of this that 'folklore' has become almost a term of abuse among social anthropologists today' (Finnegan 1969: 62 in Newall 1980: xxvi-xxvii). Even today studies reflecting on the position of folklore vis-à-vis other social sciences, note the 'status anxiety' of the discipline and its lack of 'grand theory', and urge practitioners to further develop folklore's particular merits, concentrating on questions of 'how' rather than 'why'. Most folklorists agree that they have a strong tradition of combining ethnography with public practice (Noyes 2008).

However, folklore and anthropology have not remained two closed worlds with no communication between them during the twentieth century. In 1972, Richard Dorson noted strong influence flowing from the social sciences into American folkloristics, a trend he called 'contextual' (Dorson 1972: 45-47), while Honko also wrote about similar changes in Finnish folklore research (Honko 1979: 149-52). Cross-fertilisation between the two disciplines has occurred in Greece, too, with folklore being the main beneficiary of this process, especially after the 1980s. There is still scope for mutual exchanges in the context of a productive, interdisciplinary dialogue between the two.

My analysis rests primarily on insights gained through personal involvement in the Folklore Centre as a researcher for seven years (2004-11). It also rests on published sources, in particular on a study of the Folklore Centre's journal, the *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore*, published since 1939 and renamed *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique* in 1966. This yearbook presents much of the work carried out at the centre, including scholarly articles, bibliographies, and reports on field research. I have also drawn on interviews I conducted with researchers, many now retired, who worked in the centre during the period covered in this paper.[2] Finally, my current position in the Department of Philology (Greek Language and Literature) at the University of Athens, has led me to reflect upon the flow of ideas and research methods between the Folklore Centre and Greek universities, especially as they relate to the emphasis placed on fieldwork, and on the role played by folklore in Greek education and public life.

[2] In particular, I would like to express my thanks to former colleagues Eleftherios Alexakis, Aikaterini Polymerou-Kamilaki, Eleni Psychogiou, and Greek-American ethnomusicologist Sotiris (Sam) Chianis, for allowing me to share their insights relating to the development of folklore in the Folklore Centre. I am also grateful to Renée Hirschon, Eleftherios Alexakis, and Eleni Psychogiou for their helpful comments on this paper.

Central Figures and Ideas in Greek Folklore

The development of folklore studies in Greece is inextricably tied up with the activities of Nikolaos Politis, founder of the Hellenic Folklore Society in 1908; of the society's journal, *Laographia* in 1909; and of the Folklore Archive in 1918, renamed the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre in 1966. Politis was also Professor of Greek Archaeology and Mythology at the University of Athens. Nikolaos Politis established folklore as an academic discipline in Greece and gave it the unique name that distinguishes it from related disciplines in the Balkans and in the rest of Europe, *laografia*. This term derives from the words '*laos*' (folk) and '*grafo*' (to write, to describe), and it replicated the German *Volkskunde* (see also Alexakis forthcoming; Alexiadis 2010). The aim of *laografia*, in Politis's own words, was to examine 'the traditional manifestations by means of words, practices or actions, of the Greek people's spiritual and social life …' (Politis 1909: 4). From the start, then, *laografia* was perceived and practised in terms of its double character: the study of oral literature linked it to literature (*filologia*) and the humanities, while its ethnographic aims to describe material culture, social organisation, and cosmological beliefs and practices linked it to the social sciences. Of course, Greek folklore was not alone in its association with philology (Elchinova 2008: 72).

Politis (1909) classified the subject matter of *laografia* into two major categories: 'monuments of the word', referring to oral literature and culture, and 'traditional practices or actions'. The first category included: folk songs, incantations, riddles, blessings, greetings, curses, proverbs, myths, funny stories, folk tales, legends, and terms relating to the history of various communities (e.g. place names, family and personal names, animal names, and the secret linguistic codes of specific groups). Traditional practices and actions included: the house, food and diet, dress, social organisation (including topics such as community administration, kinship, relations between community members, migration and life abroad, women's position in society, social stratification, spiritual kinship, and distinctive sub-groups), children, life-cycle rituals, occupations, customary law, religion and ritual, cosmology, folk medicine, oracles, magic and superstitions, games, dance and music, musical instruments, and folk art (Politis 1909: 6-10). The importance of 'monuments of the word' justified placing folklore in departments of Greek language and literature; besides, in this period there was no alternative, since the social sciences did not exist in Greece.

Politis's initial classification of Greek folklore has been maintained in its basic principles, with further expansions and clarifications introduced by his students and successors. Stilpon Kyriakides distinguished between three categories in the study of Greek folk culture, namely material life and cul-

ture, spiritual life, and social life (Kyriakides 1937: 12-13). Georgios Megas, on the other hand, proposed 'the knowledge of the psychological idiosyncrasy of a people as the main and final aim of folklore research' (Megas 1951b: 30). Megas was influenced by Wilhelm Riehl, a German journalist and folklorist. In his introductory lecture at the University of Athens, he quoted Martin Waehler's description of Riehl's ideas: 'folklore observation places the people at its centre, that is the fact that they are divided into families, clans and classes, in economic, political and religious communities'. Riehl characterised this aspect of his theory as 'social folklore' (*soziale Volkskunde*) (Waehler 1947: 120, cited in Megas 1951b: 30, n. 48). This people-centred approach within Greek folklore, expanded and informed by a sociological approach, was introduced more emphatically into folklore studies in the 1970s by Megas's student Michalis Meraklis[3], and was consolidated as *koinoniki laografia* (social folklore) in Greek universities in the 1990s (Meraklis 1976). Megas himself had applied a sociological and holistic approach to the study of houses in Thrace in research conducted there as early as 1922 (Nitsiakos in this volume).[4]

Although Greek folklore has cultivated the 'social' dimension of its subject matter from its inception, under the terms of 'social life' (*koinonikos vios*) and 'material life' (*ylikos vios*) or 'material culture' (*ylikos politismos*), it often appears otherwise. Greek folklorists have also remained faithful to the term *laografia*, which remains unchallenged as a symbol of the discipline, of its history, and distinctive academic development in Greece (see also Alexakis 2013).

Aims of the Folklore Archive and Centre

Nikolaos Politis led the establishment of the Folklore Archive, which was formally created by Law 1304 in 1918. Its mission to preserve and study national heritage was set out in the founding charter:

> The Folklore Archive, by means of an organized and permanent service, under the enlightened supervision of specialists, will collect the treasures of inestimable value of our national heritage, thereby preserving them from rapidly encroaching extinction, and ensure their publication. Thus it will provide scholarly research with a character

[3] Meraklis has continued to be an influential figure in Greek folklore studies; since 2002 he has been President of the Hellenic Folklore Society.

[4] Demetrios Petropoulos, trained in folklore and ethnology in France, researcher at the Folklore Centre (1943-61), and later Professor of Folklore at the University of Thessaloniki, attributed the changing orientations of this period to the 'new social conditions created by the catastrophe of war and displacement of the Greek population of Asia Minor and Eastern Thrace to continental Greece' (Petropoulos 1952: 16).

> derived from the Greek spirit. This spirit, although variously tested through struggle, enslavement and liberation, has retained its original form and unity (Hellenic Folklore Research Centre 2006: 6; official translation).

This excerpt, with its references to the 'Greek spirit' in the second and third sentences, shows the influence of German folklore studies and theories pertaining to the spirit and soul of the folk. Politis was also influenced by Edward Tylor's theory of 'survivals' and applied it selectively to stress continuities between ancient and modern Greek cultures in an effort to assist Greek nation-building (Politis 1909: 6; see also Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 91-110; Herzfeld 1982: 97-122; Chryssanthopoulou 2012). This concern for survivalism also shows in the centre's founding charter, written in a deliberately archaic style of Greek, which the official English translation also attempts to render.

In 1927, the Folklore Archive was incorporated as one of the first research centres of the Academy of Athens. Through the interwar period, the aims of the Folklore Archive were gradually expanded and developed in communication with international developments in folklore studies. In 1944, the Academy verified the Archives' Regulations, which were formulated by Georgios Megas in accordance with the decree of the first international conference on the study of folk tales held in Lund, Sweden in November 1935. In the aims that Megas set forth for the Folklore Archive, researchers were to 'enrich unpublished material drawn from oral tradition through fieldwork' and 'to classify into separate archives the folklore material which has been extracted so that it is accessible to researchers by subject', in addition to publishing the *Annuaire* (Hellenic Folklore Research Centre 2006: 8-9). In 1966 the Folklore Archive was renamed the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre by Law 4545/1966 (Spyridakis 1969: 4). All these activities, with the exception of classifying material on file cards (*apodeltiosi*), which in the late 1980s gave way to digital databases, are still carried out by the centre's researchers nowadays.

The Folklore Archive and later Centre also sponsored active fieldwork. With the exception of Politis, no major academic folklorist employed an 'armchair approach' to the study of Greek culture. Stilpon Kyriakides, Georgios Megas, Demetrios Petropoulos, Demetrios Economides, Demetrios Loukatos, Georgios Spyridakis, Stefanos Imellos and others who served as researchers or directors of the Folklore Archive were all involved in systematic fieldwork in various parts of Greece. The first 'fieldwork mission' (*laografiki apostoli*) of the Folklore Archive was conducted in 1920 by its then-director, Stilpon Kyriakides in Komotini, Thrace, where he spent fifty days (Karamanes 2012). The directors of the Folklore Archive ensured the

meticulous recording of fieldwork conducted by researchers every year, and after 1939, reports containing a summary description of the various kinds of data they collected were published in the archive's *Annuaire*. From 1958, two years after Georgios Spyridakis became director of the Folklore Archive, these reports became more detailed, conveying a good picture of the fieldwork techniques, priorities, and findings of the researchers.[5]

The Archive's Work

Laografia has often been described as exclusively pursuing the agenda set-out for the Folklore Archive in its founding charter. However, the link of Greek folklore with antiquity ceased to be the main focus of the discipline very early on, and was never an exclusive preoccupation even for researchers at the archive. Politis did not mention the connection with ancient Greek culture at all in his seminal article of 1909, and his followers studied modern Greek culture in its own right and declared the need to do so in their publications. Even Kyriakides, though very interested in cultural continuity and the historical origins of Greek culture, did not link modern Greek cultural phenomena to antiquity indiscriminately (see Nitsiakos, this volume; Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 111-47).

The term 'national' (*ethnikos*), used by folklorists as late as the 1970s, did not necessarily imply a 'nationalistic' orientation within folklore studies. Folklorists frequently used *ethnikos* to invoke the Greek people as a whole: '[Folklore] aims primarily to [the study of] elements characterising the totality of a people or of its groups that were developed in an organic manner, while attempting to discover the spiritual idiosyncrasy of the "unknown" man of a specific people, not of all humans, in general. This very aim renders *laografia* fundamentally a national science' (Megas 1951b: 20-21). In this quote, Megas distinguished the level of analysis to which folklore aspires, but did not link it to a particular political or ideological project. In the 1970s, the meaning of the term *ethnikos* was also imagined as pertaining to the geographical entity of Greece, thus potentially being ethnically and culturally plural (Avdikos 2009: 75-76).[6] Among folklorists, the dominant emphasis on the Greek people *per se* was not seen as conflicting with the

[5] On the history and activities of the Folklore Archive/Centre during the first fifty years of its operation see Orlandos 1969.

[6] This position is clearly demonstrated by Demetrios Loukatos in his *Introduction to Greek Folklore*: 'Folklore and the cultural study of human activities ought to pursue national research aiming at achieving national stability and improvement; however, it should have as its parallel goal the encounter with other national cultures, which will also be studied and contribute to the universal good, under the auspices of a responsible and caring anthropology' (Loukatos 1978: 22-23, cited in Avdikos 2009: 75).

tradition of comparative research, initiated by Politis himself and continued by his successors.[7] Stilpon Kyriakides, Georgios Megas, Demetrios Loukatos, Demetrios Economides, and Georgios Spyridakis, along with other researchers at the Folklore Centre and university professors, all employed the comparative method in studying aspects of Greek oral literature and society (see, for example, Kyriakides 1938: 145; Economides 1951, 1958; Megas 1951c, 1978; Spyridakis 1973; and Loukatos 1974, 1980). Folklorists also followed developments in other countries through the *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* which regularly published folklore bibliographies including references to foreign peoples.[8] The centre twice hosted the proceedings of the International Society for Folk Narrative Research in 1964 and 2009 (Megas 1965; Hellenic Folklore Research Centre 2009).

Although early Greek folklore studies have been accused of dealing with the study of Greek culture and society in a generalised, topic-related manner (*limmatografiki methodos*), analysing institutions and phenomena on a national, pan-Hellenic basis, this is an inaccurate description of the work done by the researchers at the Folklore Archive.[9] Archive researchers recorded various aspects of folk culture and social life in different parts of Greece, rural and urban, paying attention to local characteristics and identities. The 'fieldwork missions' of the 1930s were carried out among a wide variety of populations, including Asia Minor refugees resettled in urban and rural areas, internal migrants settled in Athens, and speakers of languages and idioms other than Greek. The first volume of the *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* even draws attention to the diversity of communities studied by the archive's 'compilers' (*taxinomoi*).[10] Maria Lioudaki conducted 'systematic fieldwork in the urban settlements of Nea Ionia, Philadelphia, and Nea Kokkinia, Athens, where she studied the folklore of refugees from Sinope,

---

[7] See, for example, his four volumes on Greek proverbs, in which he compares Greek proverbs to proverbs from other parts of the world (Politis 1899-1902). For further discussion of the use of the comparative ethnological method by Politis see Alexakis 2012.

[8] For example, Economides 1960 contained references to the folklore of the Balkans, other parts of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas.

[9] The accusation boiled down to one of taking data out of context: see in particular Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1978: 44, 153, 168. Responding to these criticisms, Meraklis notes that 'segmentation and classification of material into file cards according to topic is the necessary precondition of any scholarly study'. (Meraklis 2007: 123). Collecting data with the help of questionnaires and later classifying information into file cards does not imply that the researcher-collectors were oblivious to the physical and social surroundings of the people interviewed. Context, however, was not always rendered explicit in their manuscripts due to the conditions and priorities of their fieldwork, as discussed below.

[10] Until the 1960s, researchers were called compilers, de-emphasising the amount of creative research they actually conducted.

Inepolis, and the villages of Bithynia, using questionnaires created for this purpose by the Director [Megas]' (Megas 1939: 155-56).

Folklorists at the Folklore Archive and other institutions continued to study and record regional Greek communities, refugees, and minority populations despite the state's changing political agendas. In the 1960s, this emphasis was particularly pronounced. Musicologist Stavros Caracassis, for example, who conducted fieldwork in the area of Kavala, northern Greece, drew attention to the origins of his informant singers in his classification of songs and dances: 'a) 182 songs were sung by indigenous inhabitants of Macedonia; b) 78 songs were sung by refugees from Pontus; c) 37 songs by refugees from Thrace; d) 48 songs by refugees from Asia Minor in general' (Caracassis 1962: 422). The same concern that all groups and varieties of Greek culture and identity be recorded and studied also guided the work of student collectors in the School of Philosophy at the University of Athens, where Georgios Spyridakis, Professor of Folklore from 1962 to 1972, set up the Archive of Manuscript Collections of Folklore Material in 1965. Spyridakis's assistant Maria Milingkou-Markantoni also noted that folklorists made an effort to capture the wide representation of rural and urban groups from all over Greece, from the diaspora, and from Cyprus before and after the Turkish invasion of the island in 1974 (Milingkou-Markantoni 2010).

These examples show that ethno-cultural, regional, and local variations were clearly regarded as worthy of study by folklorists from early on in the history of the discipline. Politis did write about Greek culture at the national level, but he, too, was well aware of the importance of local differences and recorded them meticulously without generalising. When Eleni Psychogiou, a former researcher at the Folklore Centre, was involved in creating a database for the collection of folk songs[11], she and her colleague Miranda Terzopoulou also used Politis's notes written on file cards a hundred years before. In these file cards Politis had meticulously classified the beginnings of songs, their names, the motifs they used, and the places and topics to which they referred (personal communication; see also Terzopoulou and Psychogiou 2002, 2004). The use of questionnaires and the classification of data derived from fieldwork fed into each other in the work of folklorists, sometimes at the expense of attention to context. However, the centre was always concerned to represent all areas and groups. On their return from the field, the centre's researchers applied themselves to the preparation of their manuscripts. Today the Folklore Centre's Manuscript Archive consists of about 8,000 mostly unpublished manuscripts containing a wide range of oral folklore and ethnographic material.

[11] The database was intended to provide supplementary contextual information from various sources that could be linked with songs that had been recorded without such information.

Public Folklore

In addition to manuscripts deriving from fieldwork carried out by the Folklore Centre's researchers, the centre also holds collections of material submitted by persons with an interest in Greek folklore. Some of them are the outcome of annual competitions involving the collection of folklore material that the Folklore Centre has systematically organised since its inception. In these competitions, non-academic folklore researchers deposited their collections at the centre. The best were awarded prizes by the Academy of Athens, including monetary prizes, and were subsequently published. Other manuscripts, however, were submitted to Nikolaos Politis personally and, after his death, to the Folklore Archive. Most of these comprised oral folklore and ethnographic material collected by primary and secondary school pupils under the guidance of their teachers, initiated by the Ministry of Education.

Another example of the Folklore Centre's public engagement in rendering its resources available to the general public is a series of publications of fieldwork materials, edited by the centre's researchers. Many volumes in this series, *Sources on Greek Folk Culture*, are funded by the municipalities and regional associations of the area covered in that volume (for example, Chianis 2010). Together, these examples reveal the strong links between Greek academic folklore and non-specialists who are co-interested in establishing relationships of exchange and a sense of common purpose.

At the root of this phenomenon lies the fundamental idea that folklorists were part of the folk and under an obligation to return the results of their researches to the people of Greece, who had provided the data for them. As Megas put it, 'And we [folklorists], who do not deal only with theory, but practise our work in folklore out of commitment to the people to whom we belong, continue to set as the ultimate purpose of our discipline the knowledge of folk life and soul ...,' (1971: 352-53; see Nitsiakos this volume). This kind of 'engaged *laografia*', involving large public audiences, may be contrasted with the ivory tower in which much academic anthropology has been confined (Eriksen 2006: 23, 32).

Archival Holdings

The Folklore Centre has always collected audio materials. In 1927 it absorbed the National Music Collection, founded in 1914, 'to preserve and collect the songs, dances and musical instruments of the Greek people' (Hellenic Folklore Research Centre 2006: 11). Since 1950, when Spyridon Peristeris became the first musicologist to be employed by the centre, systematic field research and recordings of traditional music and music events have taken place, resulting in a total of about 30,000 reels and cassettes of

musical material, now digitised. The National Record Collection, established in the Folklore Centre in 1966, has ensured that copies of records and CDs of folk and popular music have been deposited by record companies in its archive as part of the State Archives (Hellenic Folklore Research Centre 2006: 11, 13).

In 1962 Director Georgios Spyridakis founded the Cinematographic Section for Folk Culture Topics, subsequently enriched by researcher Georgios Aikaterinides, who filmed a wide range of rituals throughout Greece. Since the 1980s researchers have been recording musical and ritual events using digital and video cameras and have deposited these recordings in the centre's Cinema Archive. The centre's Photographic Archive consists of about 40,000 photographic prints and negatives, mostly linked to manuscripts produced by research staff members, but also in separate collections donated to the centre.

Recently, the greater part of the archive of the Folklore Centre was digitised, processed, and entered in databases as part of a program entitled 'Developing a National Documentation Centre for Popular Culture', carried out by the Folklore Centre during the period 2004-08 (Hellenic Folklore Research Centre 2008). This program also included the production of a multimedia *Atlas of Greek Folklore* and an educational interactive DVD entitled *Travelling in Greece for Folklore Research* (2008). *Travelling in Greece* is aimed at educators and students, whom it takes on a virtual tour of various locations where the researchers of the Folklore Centre have conducted fieldwork. The *Atlas of Greek Folklore* derives from a research project carried out between 1966 and 1975 at the Folklore Centre as part of an initiative among folklore institutions across Europe to create the *Ethnological Atlas of Europe* (Imellos and Demetropoulos 1975).[12] Data was gathered from 4,500 questionnaires completed mainly by primary school teachers and was used to map the distribution of variation in the ritual fires of the annual cycle, types of agricultural tools, and other aspects of ritual and material culture throughout Greece.

Both researchers and interested members of the public can now access the manuscript catalogue of the Folklore Centre through its online portal. The portal (www.kentrolaografias.gr) also provides access to the 29 digitised volumes of the *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore*, later renamed the *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique*, and to publications of the centre including the three main questionnaires employed by researchers of the Folklore Centre in fieldwork (Spyridakis 1962; Megas 1975;

[12] The digital version of the *Atlas of Greek Folklore* (*Atlas tis Ellinikis Laografias*) (Polymerou-Kamilaki and Karamanes 2008) contains additional material (texts, photographs, and music) from the centre's archive referring to the traditional festal calendar.

Imellos and Polymerou-Kamilaki 1983). The centre has used the internet to enhance its links with various regional cultural associations, especially those active in urban areas of Greece that serve populations from the countryside or of 'other' background, such as the descendants of Greek refugees from Asia Minor or the Pontus. From a total of approximately 6,000 regional and cultural associations throughout Greece and the Greek diaspora, 850 have responded to the Folklore Centre's questionnaires and provided detailed information on their history and activities. This expanding database 'constitutes a source of information of a folkloric, ethnological, historical and social character' (Karamanes and Potiropoulos 2008: 25). The Folklore Centre has also assisted the Educational Brotherhood of Tzourtzia, Athamania (central Greece), a regional cultural association established in 1893. The Brotherhood's rich archive has been digitised and uploaded to the centre's website, thus making much important information available to the academic and general public (Polymerou-Kamilaki 2008: 17).

Archivists and Researchers: Tradition and Renewal after the 1950s

In this section I look more closely at the Folklore Centre's role as an archive. The often derided, and certainly misunderstood, detailed classification of oral folklore and ethnographic material carried out by the centre's researchers has been intimately connected with the need to offer assistance to academic and lay collectors in their fieldwork. Such work, often regarded as pedantic and laborious, was considered necessary for the production of detailed questionnaires for researchers, teachers, and students to gather folkloric information. Thus an important part of the researchers' work until the late 1980s consisted in extracting ethnographic and oral folklore information from manuscripts and classifying it on file cards (*deltia*). This indexed material was used by researchers, under the guidance of their directors, in the production of questionnaires, such as the *Topics in Greek Folklore*, compiled by Megas in several issues and widely used in folklore research even in the 2000s. In Megas's words, the aim of these questionnaires was 'to guide collectors of folklore material, as they provide a concise depiction of topics of folklore research further explained through the quotation of characteristic examples ... [and] to help them collect and classify the material in a scholarly manner' (Megas 1951a: 327). In 1953 Megas reported that 3,000 copies of *Topics in Greek Folklore* were dispatched to the supervisors of primary schools: 'They were compiled towards this end by the Director of the Archive, to be distributed to those teachers better qualified for this task. And we hope that educationalists, who are themselves children

of this folk, will pay attention to the Academy's appeal and to the Ministry of Education's suggestion, and will collaborate with us systematically to investigate the homeland's folklore' (Megas 1953: 161-62).

The following year 233 manuscript collections of folklore material were sent to the Folklore Archive, most of them in response to the Ministry's invitation and to the questionnaires, together with another 43 compiled by Megas's students at the University of Athens (Megas 1956: 324). Such was the network of exchange established between the Folklore Centre and teachers throughout Greece, and a key expression of the engagement of Greek society with *laografia* that the centre instituted and has maintained to the present day. The manuscripts sent back to the Folklore Centre also enriched the information included in Megas's subsequent questionnaires by adding new aspects and classifications of cultural phenomena.

Megas's detailed questionnaire comprised three extensive sections: (1) Topics relating to social organisation; customary law; the child; children's games and sports; marriage and death; (2) Witchcraft and magic; oracles; astrology; folk meteorology; folk medicine; (3) Religion; religious customs; occasional and periodic rituals of the annual cycle; farming customs (as an appendix). It was supplemented by a more concise questionnaire produced by Georgios Spyridakis who succeeded Megas as Director of the Folklore Centre (1956-69). Spyridakis re-grouped several of Megas's questions under three new headings: social life (*koinonikos vios*), intellectual or spiritual life (*pnevmatikos vios*), and material life, including arts and crafts (*ylikos vios*) (Spyridakis 1962). Both classificatory systems reflect the capacity of Greek *laografia* to engage with the social sciences; the collection and analysis of data does not only reflect an interest in oral literature.

Until the 1980s the *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* reported the number of file cards produced by each researcher and the number of manuscripts he or she had processed. The terms used to refer to the Folklore Centre's researchers until 1966 were s*yntaktes* and *taxinomoi*, both translatable as 'compilers'. Their main job was considered to be the compiling of file cards and bibliographies. Older researchers who worked at the centre recall the laborious nature of this work, but also claim that it provided them with the opportunity to acquaint themselves in depth with folklore material from all parts of Greece, which they were able to use in their own research and publications. Centre researchers produced some of the best classifications, models, and proto-databases of oral literature (for example, Demetrios Loukatos's 1951 and 1956 articles on the classification of Greek proverbs and riddles).

This itemised approach (*limmatografiki*) to the classification of folklore material also characterised its collection procedure during regular and

ad hoc fieldwork trips (*laografikes apostoles*) undertaken by research staff members well into the 1980s and even the 1990s. Even today the centre's researchers regularly carry with them Megas's questionnaires, as well as those later produced by Georgios Spyridakis, Stefanos Imellos, and Aikaterini Polymerou-Kamilaki, as handy memory aids for the topics to be investigated. However, this does not mean that researchers carried out their interviews with their informants simply by adhering narrowly to the items outlined in the questionnaires.

The methods of conducting fieldwork have changed significantly over the years as a consequence of developments in folklore theory and improvements in the equipment available. Fieldwork trips have always concentrated on the need to provide primary material for the Folklore Centre. Until the 1980s, fieldwork was of the 'extensive' kind (*ektatiki*). This meant that researchers had to cover as many villages as possible within a month (Alexakis 2006). Normally they visited four or five villages, where they conducted interviews, while also observing and describing material culture and ritual practices. Researchers kept notes on their interviews and recorded only songs, whilst the recording of rituals was spasmodic and participant observation was limited. This kind of fieldwork was seen as 'salvage folklore' (*sostiki laografia*) that was meant to produce a record of cultural and social life that was fast disappearing due to increasing economic and technological change (Loukatos 1950: 7). As one retired researcher explained to me, it was rather a 'scan-like' type of folklore (*sarotiki laografia*), as researchers attempted to capture the traditional culture of the place studied as a snap-shot, while also probing in depth into past forms of culture and social life.

Researchers at the Folklore Centre did not exist in a time warp, cut-off from society and from international academic developments. Like Politis himself, they communicated with foreign colleagues, belonged to international societies, exchanged ideas, facilitated and conducted joint projects, and organised international conferences (Chryssanthopoulou 2012). Foreign scholars often visited the centre and shared their theoretical insights with its researchers. When James Notopoulos, the Greek-American scholar of epic narrative songs visited Greece to conduct fieldwork, Megas asked the researcher Demetrios Petropoulos to accompany him to central and western Greece; Petropoulos collected folk songs alongside Notopoulos (Megas 1953: 161). As a young doctoral student in the late 1950s, the Greek-American ethnomusicologist Sotiris (Sam) Chianis used the Folklore Centre as his base and left copies of his recordings of folk songs from various parts of the country in its Archive. Chianis cultivated collegial relations with the centre's researchers, especially with the musicologist Spyridon Peristeris, with whom he exchanged ideas on methods for recording and transcribing

folk music. French neo-Hellenist Guy Saunier also spent much time conducting research in the song archive of the Folklore Centre that resulted in his publication of songs of laments and *xenitia* (life in foreign lands) (Saunier 1983). An example of involvement in international scholarly projects was the creation of the *Atlas of Greek Folklore*, described above, as a component in the production of the *Ethnological Atlas of Europe*. The atlas had required detailed information on material culture and this prompted then-director Stefanos Imellos and researcher Aikaterini Polymerou-Kamilaki to prepare a new questionnaire specifically on material culture (Imellos and Polymerou-Kamilaki 1983: ε΄).

In addition to foreign visitors, Greek researchers who had studied abroad, such as Loukatos and Petropoulos in the 1950s, Alexakis in the 1960s, and Terzopoulou in the 1970s, brought new ideas to the Folklore Centre.[13] Another stream of innovation flowed from the influence of German folklorists such as Wilhelm Brepohl and Hermann Bausinger, among others, whose sociologically-oriented emphasis on the study of industrial and urban society and its folklore was introduced to Greece by Michalis Meraklis (Meraklis 2004: 26-32; cf. Loukatos 1988). Alki Kyriakidou-Nestoros also influenced Greek folklorists through her writings that were influenced by both Lévi-Strauss's structuralism and by ecological anthropology (Kyriakidou-Nestoros 1979; see also Nitsiakos in this volume). This growing interest in the social sciences, and especially in anthropology, manifested itself during and after the demise of the dictatorship (see also Agelopoulos, Nitsiakos, and Papataxiarchis in this volume) and had a profound impact both on fieldwork methods and on the analysis of the material collected by the centre's researchers. New topics, such as gender relations, women's friendships, and commercial and cultural networks were explored in interviews and participant observation, thereby producing new bodies of contextually sensitive data. In music research, fieldwork shifted from a salvage approach involving the recording of informant performers in studios (in part dictated by the absence of electricity and the difficulty of carrying around heavy

[13] Similar innovations occurred in folklore studies around the world during these decades. In Finland, for example, where oral folklore had been pursued along the lines of the geographical-historical method, the 1960s and 1970s were characterised by changes of emphasis 'from epic to ritual poetry; from text to context; from archives to the field; from the human mind to informants and communities; from comparativism to regional studies; from old to new approaches' (Honko 1979: 149-152). In the United States, the 'contextual' movement among young folklorists during the same period included 'a leaning toward the social sciences, particularly anthropology, linguistics, and the cultural aspects of psychology and sociology; a strong preoccupation with the environment in which the folklore text is embedded; and an emphasis on theory' (Dorson 1972: 45).

equipment) to recordings *in situ*, which enabled a much better understanding of local musical idioms (Androulaki 2012).

From the 1980s, fieldwork became more thematically oriented and 'intensive' (*entatiki*) as individual researchers pursued their subjects of interest in consecutive fieldtrips (Alexakis 1993: 34-36; Alexakis 2006). Examples included the study of songs centring on female figures in life-crisis rituals by Eleni Psychogiou and by Miranda Terzopoulou, and of family and kinship by Eleftherios Alexakis (Terzopoulou and Psychogiou 1993b; Alexakis 2004; Psychogiou 2008). The use of tape recorders for the recording of all interview material improved the quality of the manuscript produced, especially with regard to the rendering of regional idioms and expressions, although it delayed the process of archiving and analysis.

The growing influence of feminist, sociological, and anthropological approaches, combined with the general democratic ethos of the period following the dictatorship (see Nitsiakos and Papataxiarchis in this volume), led some researchers to dispute the standardised taxonomies that had been developed at the centre and to attempt to introduce their own, more contextually sensitive analyses. Thus researchers Psychogiou and Terzopoulou refrained from publishing a second volume of folk lyric songs compiled in accordance with the centre's method of classification. They insisted that the function and meaning of a song were so context-dependent that classification according to the established principles was difficult and ultimately fruitless. Instead, in an article in the newly-established journal, *Ethnologhia*, they argued that the symbolic importance of songs could only be grasped through systematic, intensive, and contextually sensitive fieldwork (Terzopoulou and Psychogiou 1993a). In the 1990s the introduction of electronic technology enabled the two researchers to embark on the production of a song database, which allowed users to scan according to song titles, opening and key words, motifs, topics, concepts, and place and other names.

In general, Folklore Centre researchers cannot afford to be reflexive in their manuscripts, which are supposed to be 'factual'. However, as researchers have become more aware of the importance of context in recording and interpreting their data, and as they have made increasing use of semi-structured interviews, they have placed their own stamp on their manuscripts, thus emulating parallel trends in anthropology. Alexakis, for example, opted to publish ethnographic diaries from his fieldwork trips combining personal and ethnographic data in order to give fuller insight into the progress of his research and to provide sources of information for future historians (Alexakis 2007, 2010). Psychogiou, on the other hand, outlined a Braudelian sense of the *longue durée* in her analysis of rituals of death and rebirth in contemporary Greece. The last part of her book contains oral

folklore and ethnographic material recorded by herself during fieldwork at different periods in different areas of the Peloponnese and western Greece. She treats the subject of women's real and symbolic relationships with fertility and death on a long-term basis, paying close attention to the historical, geographical and sociological context of her data in order to provide 'a comparative framework and an ethnographic basis for [her] analysis' (Psychogiou 2008).

The Folklore Centre in Education: Creating a Paradigm for Folklore Studies in Greek Universities

The Folklore Centre, in the words of a researcher, has 'grafted' (*boliase*) many of its researchers onto Greek universities, thereby disseminating their theoretical practices at the tertiary level. Indeed, all of the directors of the Folklore Centre and many of its researchers also taught in university positions after their work in the centre, some offering their services to more than one institution. In addition to holding chairs at the universities of Thessaloniki, Athens, and Ioannina (see also Nitsiakos in this volume), they also served as presidents or committee members of the Hellenic Folklore Society, a scholarly institution created in 1908 by Nikolaos Politis to promote folklore as an academic subject in Greece.[14]

Communication between the Folklore Centre and the University of Athens was especially lively under the directorships of Megas and Spyridakis. They involved students in the collection of folklore material and oversaw the organisation of a university manuscript archive similar to the one at the Folklore Centre. During his time at the university (1947-62), Megas assigned research tasks to his students in the Department of Philology which he incorporated into his own research. The archive compiled by Megas and his students, the *Laografikon Frontisterion*, contained some 1,890 manuscripts of oral folklore and ethnographic material, including manuscripts produced by primary school teachers to whom he had given further training in folklore.[15] Megas assigned two types of research tasks to his students: either to write essays on aspects of ancient Greek religion and ritual, in

[14] The flow of personnel from the Folklore Centre to tertiary institutions continues down to the present with musicologist Efstathios Makris, anthropologist Marilena Papachristoforou, and myself recently accepting positions at Ionian University, University of Ioannina, and University of Athens respectively.

[15] Megas eventually donated the manuscript collection of the *Laografikon Frontisterion* to Michalis Meraklis. The manuscripts are now in the possession of the Hellenic Folklore Society which has published a catalogue of the contents (Varvounis and Kouzas 2007), and is undertaking the digitisation of the archive.

which they were asked to locate parallel examples from the Greek folk culture of their time; or, to collect oral folklore and ethnographic material from their places of origin. Among these manuscripts there exist interesting collections of material dating from the 1950s and 1960s from ethnically or sub-ethnically diverse groups such as the Pomaks of Thrace (local Muslim speakers of a distinct language) and Greek refugees from Istanbul (*Konstantinoupolites*) who came to Greece after their expulsion from Turkey following the events of September 1955. Megas's students went on to become teachers of Greek language, literature, and history in high schools, and continued to promote the ideas and approaches they had learned from him.

Megas's successor, Georgios Spyridakis, was most responsible for the organisation of folklore studies at the University of Athens. As Professor of Folklore between 1964 and 1972, Spyridakis created the university's Archive of Manuscript Collections of Folklore Material and the Spoudasterion Laografias (Folklore Study Centre and Specialised Library) (Spyridakis 1974). The archive, the largest of its kind in Greece after the Folklore Centre's archive, today possesses musical recordings, photographs, and about 4,000 manuscripts from various parts of the Greek-speaking world, including rural and urban areas, refugee groups, and the Greek diaspora. The archive particularly benefited from the contributions of Greek Cypriot students no longer able to live in Northern Cyprus after it was occupied by Turkey in 1974. Maria Milingkou-Markantoni, who assisted Spyridakis in organising the archive and served it with dedication until her death in 2008, introduced hundreds of students to the methods of field research and analysis; she published detailed catalogues of these Greek Cypriot manuscripts. Students would come to the Spoudasterion with members of their families to read the manuscripts and reproduce photos of their villages, houses, and people who had disappeared following Turkey's invasion (Milingkou-Markantoni 2010: 6-7). Visits organised for school children are also frequent.

Students collected oral folklore and ethnographic material, mostly following the categories and guidelines of the concise questionnaire prepared by Spyridakis (Spyridakis 1962). They were also encouraged to donate to the Spoudasterion objects used in everyday life or for decorative purposes in villages, thus gradually forming a museum collection of objects of folk culture. This, too, was a practice pioneered by the Folklore Centre, which possesses a rich collection of such objects. Such collecting in order to establish folklore museums was particularly encouraged by Megas, who collaborated towards these goals with Angeliki Chatzimichali, a long-standing committee member of the Hellenic Folklore Society from the mid-1950s. Chatzimichali had a background in the fine arts and devoted her time and money to travelling around Greece collecting objects of folk culture to create

a museum under the auspices of the Hellenic Folklore Society. In the 1960s Megas tried hard to establish an open air folklore museum 'to present folk culture according to the new [museological] methods in its complete and multifaceted manifestations' (Kouzas 2009: 108). A suitable plot was donated to the Hellenic Folklore Society by the Church of Greece, but further efforts were thwarted by the dictatorship (Kouzas 2009: 101-12).

Similar collections of manuscripts and traditional objects were created in the universities of Thessaloniki, Ioannina, Thrace, and in the Departments of Education at the universities of Athens and of the Aegean. Through these collections, for most of which published catalogues are available, students have participated actively in the collection of folklore material (see Vrelli-Zachou 2002; Kakaboura 2008; Varvounis et al. 2010). Many of these manuscripts are of great value, since by virtue of being local inhabitants the students had both a deep personal knowledge and access to a good range of informants. Students studying folklore at an undergraduate or postgraduate level in Athens are still invited to contribute manuscripts of oral folklore and ethnographic material to enrich the archive. New sections containing life stories and narratives have also been established, including autobiographical narratives provided by non-Greek migrants living in Greece, and by a great variety of 'internal others'.

Among folklorists, a willingness to modify strategies for data collection and analysis within the basic parameters of the Folklore Centre's questionnaires has been considered representative of a democratic ethos. For example, Milingkou-Markantoni described an incident from 1968 when she and Spyridakis supported a student's initiative to include autobiographical narratives provided by informants in a manuscript, as reflecting the democratic nature of folklore research, even during the time of the dictatorship. The resignations of Alki Kyriakidou-Nestoros and Demetrios Loukatos during the dictatorship also show that academic folklorists adhered to a democratic ethos. And the same ethos is ascribed to Spyridakis: 'Always faithful to his democratic principles, Spyridakis was the only professor, as far as I know, who did not appear at the General Meeting of the University's Professors organised by the dictator, Papadopoulos. He always fought for his ideas and values without making a noise about it' (Milingkou-Markantoni 2010: 23).

As university teachers, folklorists trained generations of primary and secondary school teachers to carry the mission forward, especially in the areas of language, literature, and local history (Meraklis 2001; Kakaboura 2002). All eminent folklorists have been enthusiastic educationalists, perhaps because most researchers at the Folklore Centre, including Megas, Lioudaki, Maria Ioannidou, Petropoulos, Loukatos, and Spyridakis served as

teachers in primary or high schools before working at the centre. As their careers developed, they maintained strong connections with primary and secondary education. As indicated above, collaboration between academic folklorists and teachers has been frequent, and teachers are particularly well-represented among Greece's lay folklorists. Centre directors have also promoted the importance of folklore to government institutions responsible for education and teacher training, and in response, circulars sent to teachers by the Ministry of Education and the Academy of Athens have requested that teachers collect and submit oral folklore and ethnographic information to the Folklore Centre. Finally, academic folklorists have encouraged each other to support the incorporation of folklore into primary and secondary education. In a letter sent to Loukatos in 1968, Megas mentioned his strenuous efforts to have folklore introduced into the curriculum of the teaching academies and urged Loukatos to continue his teaching at the Pedagogical Academy of Ioannina without remuneration (Kouzas 2009: 114). Loukatos, in turn, stressed that it was the folklorists' responsibility to educate and guide the inhabitants of both city and countryside in the new social conditions (Avdikos 2009: 260-261).

Laografia and Anthropology in Greece: A Quest for Creative Exchange

Today the Folklore Centre has come closer to anthropology than ever before in terms of methods of field research and analysis. Since the late 1990s, the centre's director, Aikaterini Polymerou-Kamilaki, has encouraged new specialisations for its researchers and an active involvement in public life. Its team of researchers is interdisciplinary, including folklorists, social anthropologists and ethnologists, historians, ethnomusicologists, and an ethnochoreologist. Their interests span the study of material culture, ritual, oral literature, migration history, urban folklore and anthropology, and song and dance events. The expansion and diversification of research reflects the changing orientations of folklore in Greece generally, with a growing interest in material culture, aspects of social and cultural life, and identities, and a less pronounced interest in oral literature. My own researches into Greek migration and the diaspora were welcomed and readily incorporated in the research agenda of the centre and I was encouraged to pursue the study of Greek diaspora in Australia and return migration to Greece (Chryssanthopoulou 2006, 2009). This diversity is combined with an intensified policy of opening up to the public. Through its collaboration with local authorities and with cultural associations, the Folklore Centre has been able to use its resources to promote cultural and educational projects such as exhibitions,

museums, radio programmes, and even the joint publication of archival material of historical and cultural value (as noted above). In this way, academic folklore has expanded its public role through the collaboration between people and institutions interested in maintaining, promoting, and studying their own local cultures.

Several researchers from the Folklore Centre, such as Alexakis and Andromachi Oikonomou, were also instrumental in the establishment of the Greek Society for Ethnology in 1992. The Society is not officially connected to the centre, but draws its members from across the social sciences. It organises lecture series on different topics of interest, publishes the only Greek anthropological journal, *Ethnologhia*[16], and publishes a book series on topics of anthropological interest (see Alexakis, Vrachionidou, and Oikonomou 2008, Avdikos et al. 2002). The Society facilitates intellectual exchange between foreign and Greek anthropologists of Greece, and has foregrounded questions of the discipline's development through various conferences. For example, in December 2001 the Society organised a conference with the National Centre for Social Research (EKKE) that brought together foreign and Greek scholars who had worked in Greece, especially during the pioneering years of the 1960s and the 1970s (Alexakis, Katsilieri and Oikonomou 2004).

Due to the ideological and political factors outlined in other contributions to this volume, folklore and anthropology have not collaborated institutionally in Greek academia to any great extent. As Papataxiarchis writes, social anthropology, introduced in Greece as an academic discipline in the 1980s, became 'anti-folklore and occupied the centre of a counter paradigm to "national" science' (see Papataxiarchis, this volume). However, as I have endeavoured to show, academic folklore in Greece ceased to be a 'national' science, in the sense of employing a nation-oriented or nationalist perspective long before the 1980s. Nevertheless, this reputation persists in separating folklore and anthropology.

Exchanges between the two disciplines have been one-sided, with folklore borrowing heavily from anthropological methods and concepts. The first institutional opening up of Greek folklore to a more sociological orientation came with the work of Michalis Meraklis and his introduction of 'social folklore' (*koinoniki laografia*) as a component of university training in folklore studies. Since the 1980s, all folklore students have been exposed to training in the methodologies of the social sciences. Under the rubric of 'social folklore', *laografia* has also been taught by anthropologists, who introduced their own orientations and interests in their teaching and research.

[16] Recently, it started publishing a second journal of interdisciplinary scope, *Ethnologhia on Line*.

This is manifested in numerous recent publications by folklorists and folklorist anthropologists writing about *laografia* from a reflexive perspective (see, among others, Nitsiakos 2008; Avdikos 2009; Puchner 2011: 213-338). An active supporter of anthropological trends within *laografia*, Eleftherios Alexakis has suggested the terms 'anthropological *laografia*', 'ethnosociology of Greece', or 'ethnology of Greece' to describe the orientations that have emerged with the impact of sociologically and anthropologically-trained folklorists on the subject since the 1980s.

Anthropology, however, has borrowed little from folklore. Most anthropologists generally consider the academic production by folklorists as too conservative and irrelevant to their own 'progressive' work (Avdikos 2009: 238-39). In many cases, anthropologists simply ignore the work that folklorists have done. Charles Stewart, who studied Greek religious beliefs and practices in Apeiranthos, Naxos in the 1980s has commented: 'Folklorists have published reports on every conceivable traditional practice in every corner of the Greek-speaking world over the past century and a half. An anthropology seeking to understand these social practices as they are transformed diachronically ignores this body of literature at its peril' (Stewart 2008: x). Vassilis Nitsiakos, similarly, has asked why the flow of ideas between the two disciplines has been so one-sided, especially given anthropologists' current emphases on reflexivity and the development of 'anthropology at home' (*anthropologia oikoi*). He wrote: 'Even now there does not seem to be emerging a true interest in *laografia* which, after all, belongs to a national intellectual tradition and has produced works useful to an indigenous anthropology over the past few decades' (Nitsiakos 2008: 52-53).[17]

Conclusions

In presenting the history and work of the Folklore Centre during the period 1945-1991, I have also touched on developments immediately before and after this period. I have shown the main features of Greek folklore theory and practice, that is fieldwork employing questionnaires and, later, participant observation and interviews, classification and archiving of oral folklore and ethnographic material, engagement with oral literature, social life and cultural beliefs and practices, all developed in the context of the Folklore Centre, before later being transferred and grafted onto folklore studies at the universities. I have also discussed folklorists' long-term involvement in education, the strong base of lay practitioners, and overall public engagement with Greek society.

[17] Cf. Alexakis 2003, 2013; Tsibiridou 2001: 46 in Avdikos 2009: 244; Gefou-Madianou 1993 and 1998.

A thorough investigation of academic folklore in Greece reveals a history of expansion into new areas of interest (such as urban folklore studies) and methodology (such as the gradual introduction of longer, intensive fieldwork and the use of sociologically and anthropologically-informed methods in academic teaching and research). The researchers and academics who worked at the Folklore Centre and at universities during the dictatorship were not involved in right-wing politics.

The reasons for lack of mutual recognition and collaboration between folklore and social anthropology in Greece are to be sought elsewhere: in competition over academic positions in universities and research centres, and for resources in general. Thus the segmentary character of Greek society, documented and studied by anthropologists (Herzfeld 1985: xi-xii; Chryssanthopoulou 1993: 6-14; Papataxiarchis 2006: 25-39), asserts itself vigorously in the social sciences, where it clearly hinders intellectual exchange. This need not be so. Greek anthropologists and folklorists could opt for interdisciplinary collaboration, whilst respecting each other's different epistemological backgrounds and idiosyncrasies, instead of perpetuating stereotypes about the other side. This process has already started, mainly through the initiatives of folklorists trained in sociology and anthropology, and it is beginning to manifest itself at an institutional level.

References

Alexakis, E. P. 1982. Schesi laografias kai istorias. In S. E. Prosopikou (eds.), *Epistimonikes Anakoinoseis*, pp. 81-91. Athens: Academy of Athens. (Conference organised by the Researchers' Association, 20.11-5.12.1979).

——. 1993. Koinoniki anthropologia kai elliniki laografia. Ena theoritiko kai methodologiko provlima. In *I koinoniki erevna stin Ellada simera. Praktika Synedriou tou Ethnikou Kentrou Koinonikon Erevnon*, pp. 34-47. Athens: National Centre for Social Research. (Proceedings of Conference organised by the National Centre for Social Research Employees Association, Athens, 11-13 January 1989).

——. 2001. From Fieldwork and Ethnography to Ethnology: A Difficult Path in the Balkan Countries. *Etudes et Documents Balkaniques et Mediterranéennes* 23: 5-9.

——. 2003. Anthropologia oikoi i laografia? Mia epistimologiki proseggisi. In *To Paron tou Parelthontos: Istoria, Laografia, Koinoniki Anthropologia*, pp. 39-63. Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and Education, Moraitis School.

——. 2004. Anazitontas tis oikogeneiakes domes sti neoteri Ellada. I periptosi tis polypyrinikis oikogeneias. *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique* 29-30 (1999-2003): 35-60.

——. 2006. Apo ti syllogi laografikou ylikou stin exeidikevmeni ethnografiki erevna diarkeias. Empeiries kai provlimata. Paper presented at Conference organised by the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre titled *To Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias kai i Epitopia Erevna*, Athens, 3.06.2006. (Forthcoming in the *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique*).

——. 2007. *Epirus. Ethnografiko Imerologio (1981-1983)*. Athens: Dodoni Publications.

——. 2010. *Oreini Sterea Ellada. Ethnografiko Imerologio (1984-1991)*. Athens: Dodoni Publications.

——. 2012. I sygkritiki ethnologiki methodos sti laografia i o Nikolaos Politis metaxy ethnismou kai anthropismou In A. Polymerou-Kamilaki (ed.), *Praktika tou Diethnous Epistimonikou Synedriou "O N. G. Politis kai to Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias*". (Proceedings of International Conference titled *Nikolaos G. Politis and the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre*, 4-7 December 2003), vol. I (23): 61-82. Athens: Hellenic Folklore Research Centre Publications.

——. 2013. I laografia os anthropologia kai i anthropologia os laografia stin Ellada. Mia kritiki apo mesa. (Proceedings of Centenary Anniversary Conference of the Hellenic Folklore Society [1909-2009], organised by the Hellenic Folklore Society and the Sector of Byzantine Literature and Folklore of the University of Athens, 11-13.03.2009). *Laographia* 42 (2010-2012): 61-82.

——., M. Katsilieri, and A. Oikonomou (eds.). 2004. *Opseis tis anthropologikis skepsis kai erevnas stin Ellada*. Athens: Greek Society for Ethnology.

——., M. Vrachionidou, and A. Oikonomou (eds.). 2008. *Anthropologia kai symvolismos stin Ellada*. Athens: Greek Society for Ethnology.

Alexiadis, M. A. 2003. Laografikes spoudes stin Ellada meta to Deftero Pagkosmio. In C. Veikou (ed.), *Panellinia Enosi Filologon, Seminario 29: "Laografia kai Istoria"*, pp. 15-39. Athens: Ellinika Grammata Editions.

——. 2010. *Elliniki kai diethnis epistimoniki onomatothesia tis Laografias*. 2nd ed. Athens: Institouto tou Vivliou – A. Kardamitsa.

——. 2013. Theorisi ton laografikon spoudon stin Ellada, proti periodos: 1907-1947. (Proceedings of Centenary Anniversary Conference of the Hellenic Folklore Society [1909-2009]), organised by the Hel-

lenic Folklore Society and the Sector of Byzantine Literature and Folklore of the University of Athens, 11-13.03.2009). *Laographia* 42 (2010-2012): 83-101.

Androulaki, M. G. 2012. To Kentro Laografias kai i Ethniki Mousiki Syllogi. Palaioi kai synchronoi prosanatolismoi tis mousikis erevnas. In A. Polymerou-Kamilaki (ed.), *Praktika tou Diethnous Epistimonikou Synedriou "O N. G. Politis kai to Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias"*. (Proceedings of International Conference titled "Nikolaos G. Politis and the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre, 4-7 December 2003), vol. I (23): 105-130. Athens: Hellenic Folklore Research Centre Publications.

Avdikos, E. G. et al. 2002. *Oi Roma stin Ellada*. Athens: Greek Society for Ethnology.

Avdikos, E. G. 2009, *Eisagogi stis spoudes tou laikou politismou: Laografies, laikoi politismoi, taftotites*. Athens: Kritiki Editions.

Bošković, A. 2008. Anthropology in Unlikely Places: Yugoslav Ethnology between the Past and the Future. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*, pp. 156-168. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Bošković, A., and T. H. Eriksen. 2008. Introduction: Other People's Anthropologies. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*, pp. 1-19. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Caracassis, S. 1962. Mousiki apostoli eis tin perifereian Paggaiou Makedonias (4 Avgoustou – 2 Septemvriou 1961). *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 13-14 (1960-61): 421-430.

Chianis, S. J. 2010 *Dimotika Tragoudia apo to Valtetsi Arkadias. Mousiki syllogi (1956, 1959) – Meleti – Metagrafi / Folk Songs from Valtetsi, Arcadia. Music Collection (1956, 1959) – Study – Transcription* (bilingual publication), vol. I. Athens: Academy of Athens Publications.

Chryssanthopoulou, V. 1993. *The Construction of Ethnic Identity among the Castellorizian Greeks of Perth, Australia.* PhD Thesis, Oxford University.

–––––. 2006. Polytopiki kai diachroniki erevna stous Kastellorizious tis Perthis Afstralias. Paper presented at Conference organised by the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre titled *To Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias kai i Epitopia Erevna*, Athens, 3.06.2006. (Forthcoming in the *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique*).

——. 2009. Gender and Ethno-Regional Identity among Greek Australians: Intersections. In E. Tastsoglou (ed.), *Women, Gender, and Diasporic Lives: Labor, Community, and Identity in Greek Migrations*, pp. 197-227. Lanham and Plymouth: Lexington Books.

——. 2012. O Nikolaos Politis kai oi Vretanoi allilografoi tou: Epistimonikes kai filellinikes antallages. In A. Polymerou-Kamilaki (ed.), *Praktika tou Diethnous Epistimonikou Synedriou "O N. G. Politis kai to Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias"*. (Proceedings of International Conference titled "Nikolaos G. Politis and the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre", 4-7 December 2003), vol. II (23): 1029-1043. Athens: Hellenic Folklore Research Centre Publications.

Dorson, R. M. 1972. Introduction. Concepts of Folklore and Folklife Studies. In R. M. Dorson (ed.), *Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction*, pp. 1-50. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Economides, D. S. 1951. Ta ellinika dimodi vivlia kai i epidrasis afton epi ton pnevmatikon vion tou roumanikou laou. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 6 (1950-51): 3-56.

——. 1958. I Agia Paraskevi eis ton vion tou ellinikou kai tou roumanikou laou. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 9-10 (1955-57): 65-104.

——. 1960. Vivliografia tis ellinikis laografias tou etous 1959. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 11-12 (1958-59): 347-396.

Elchinova, M. 2008. Sociocultural Anthropology in Bulgaria: Desired and Contested. In A. Bošković (ed.), *Other People's Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins*, pp. 70-82. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Eriksen, T. H. 2006. *Engaging Anthropology. The Case for a Public Presence*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Finnegan, R. 1969. Attitudes to the Study of Oral Literature in British Social Anthropology. *Man* (New Series) 4: 59-69.

Gefou-Madianou, D. 1993. Mirroring Ourselves through Western Texts: The Limits of an Indigenous Anthropology. In H. Driessen (ed.), *The Politics of Ethnographic Reading and Writing*, pp. 160-181. Saarbrücken: Breitenbach.

——. 1998. Anastochasmos, eterotita kai anthropologia oikoi: Dilimmata kai antiparatheseis. In D. Gefou-Madianou (ed.), *Anthropologiki theoria kai ethnografia: Synchrones taseis*, pp. 365-435. Athens: Ellinika Grammata Editions.

Hann, C., M. Sárkány, and P. Skalník. 2005. Introduction: Continuities and Contrasts in an Essentially Contested Field. In C. Hann, M. Sárkány, and P. Skalník (eds.), *Studying Peoples in the People's Democra-*

cies. Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe, pp. 1-20. Münster: LIT Verlag.

Hellenic Folklore Research Centre. History, Development Programmes, Modernisation/ Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias. Istoriko, Programmata Anaptyxis, Eksynchronismos. 2006. Athens: Academy of Athens Publications. (3rd ed., revised, bilingual publication).

Hellenic Folklore Research Centre. Developing a National Documentation Centre for Popular Culture. 2008. *"Information Society" Operational Program/ Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias. Anaptyxi Ethnikou Kentrou Tekmiriosis tou Laikou Politismou sto plaisio tou Epicheirisiakou Programmatos "Koinonia tis Pliroforias."* Athens: Academy of Athens Publications.(bilingual publication).

Hellenic Folklore Research Centre. Academy of Athens. 2009. 15th Congress of the International Society for Folk Narrative Research, Narratives across Space and Time: Transmissions and Adaptations, Programme and Abstracts (Athens, June 21-27, 2009).

Herzfeld, M. 1982. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology and the Making of Modern Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1985. *The Poetics of Manhood: Contest and Identity in a Cretan Mountain Village*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Honko, L. 1979. A Hundred Years of Finnish Folklore Research: A Reappraisal. *Folklore* 90: 141-152.

Imellos, S. D., and A. Polymerou-Kamilaki. 1983. *Paradosiakos ylikos vios tou ellinikou laou – Erotimatologio*. Athens: Academy of Athens, Hellenic Folklore Research Centre Publications.

Imellos, S. D., and G. K. Demetropoulos (eds.). 1975. *Atlas tis Ellinikis Laografias – Lefkoma I: Xylinon arotron, zygos, sidiroun arotron, arotriasis*. Athens: Academy of Athens Publications.

Kakaboura, R. 2002. *Pedagogika tis Laografias (Fakellos vivliografikou ylikou)*. Athens: University of Athens. Department of Primary Education. Sector of Humanities.

———. 2008. *Afigiseis zois. I viografiki proseggisi sti synchroni laografiki erevna*. Athens: Atrapos Editions.

Karamanes, E. 2012. Proseggiseis tou ylikou viou kata tin period tou Mesopolemou: To Laografiko Archeio. In A. Polymerou-Kamilaki (ed.), *Praktika tou Diethnous Epistimonikou Synedriou "O N. G. Politis kai to Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias"*. (Proceedings of International Conference titled "Nikolaos G. Politis and the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre", 4-7 December 2003), vol. I (23): 403-446. Athens: Hellenic Folklore Research Centre Publications.

——., and P. Potiropoulos. 2008. I psifiopoiisi tou Archeiou tis Filekpaideftikis Adelfotitas Tzourtzias tis Athamanias. In E. Karamanes, and P. Potiropoulos (eds.), *To Archeio tis Filekpaideftikis Adelfotitas Tzourtzias tis Athamanias kai I psifiopoiisi tou apo to Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias tis Akadimias Athinon. Praktika Epistimonikis Imeridas (Trikala, 15.11.2008)*, pp. 19-60. Trikala: Educational Brotherhood of Tzourtzia, Athamania.

Kiliánová, G. 2005. Continuity and Discontinuity in an Intellectual Tradition under Socialism: The 'Folkloristic School' in Bratislava. In C. Hann, M. Sárkány, and P. Skalník (eds.), *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies. Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*, pp. 257-271. Münster: LIT Verlag.

Kouzas, G. H. 2009. *Elliniki Laografiki Etaireia. I istoriki diadromi tis (1908-2008)*. Athens: Hellenic Folklore Society.

Kyriakides, S. P. 1938. Ti einai laografia kai eis ti dynatai na ofelisei i spoudi tis. *Laographia* 12 (1938-1948): 130-157.

Kyriakidou-Nestoros, A. 1978. *I theoria tis ellinikis laografias. Kritiki analysi*. Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and Education, Moraitis School.

——. 1979. *Laografika meletimata*. Athens: Nea Synora, A. Livanis.

Loukatos, D. S. 1950. I laografiki erevna ta prota peninta chronia tou aiona mas. *Nea Estia* 48: 1-11.

——. 1951. Zitimata katataxeos paroimion. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 6 (1950-1951): 245-296.

——. 1956. Themata kai symvola sta neoellinika ainigmata. In *Afieroma eis tin Ipeiron, eis mnimin Christou Souli*, pp. 183-214. Athens.

——. 1974. L' utilité des classements alphabétiques aux études comparatives et structurales des proverbes. *Proverbium Finnoise* 23: 884-887.

——. 1978. *Eisagogi stin elliniki laogafia*. Athens: National Bank of Greece Cultural Foundation Editions (MIET).

——. 1980. Sujets et elements communs d' experience et de sagesse populaires, dans les proverbes grecs et bulgares. *Praktika A΄ Ellinovoulgarikou Symposiou "Pnevmatikes kai Politistikes Scheseis"*, pp. 39-45. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.

——. 1988. Synchroni theorisi tis ellinikis laografias. I neoteri istoria tis erevnas kai i "istorikotita" ton laografikon thematon. *Synchrona Themata* 35-37 (December issue): 226-229.

Megas, G. A. 1939. Ektheseis ton ypo tou Laografikou Archeiou epragmenon kata tin teleftaian trietian. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 1 (1937-39): 150-167.

——. 1951a. Ektheseis ton ypo tou Laografikou Archeiou pepragmenon kata ta eti 1950 και 1951. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 6 (1950-1951): 325-331.

——. 1951b. I spoudi tis Laografias. Skopos kai ergon aftis. *Platon* Γ΄, issue Α΄: 1-32. (republished in *Laographia* 25 (1967): 3-38).

——. 1951c. O legomenos koinos valkanikos politismos. I dimodis poiisis. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 6 (1950-51): 297-324. (reprinted in *Laographia* 25 (1967): 418-444).

——. 1953. Ektheseis ton pepragmenon tou Laografikou Archeiou kata to etos 1952. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 7 (1952): 161-163.

——. 1956. Ektheseis ton ypo tou Laografikou Archeiou pepragmenon kata ta eti 1953 και. *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 8 (1953-1954): 324-327.

——. (ed.). 1965. IV International Congress for Folk-Narrative Research in Athens (1.9. – 6.9.1964). Lectures and Reports. *Laographia* 22. Athens: Hellenic Folklore Society.

——. 1971. Theodoros Papadopoullos. "To pedion kai to periehomenon tis Laografias dia tou orismou aftis". Kentron Epistimonikon Erevnon. Epetiris III 1969-1979. Prosfora eis Konstantinon Spyridakin. Nicosia 1970, pp. 1-62. (Article review). *Laographia* 27 (1971): 349-354.

——. 1975. *Zitimata Ellinikis Laografias*. (reprinted from the *Annuaire des Archives de Folklore* 1939-1949). Athens: Academy of Athens Publications.

——. 1978. *To elliniko paramythi: Analytikos katalogos typon kai parallagon kata to systima Aarne-Thompson (FFC 184). Tefchos Α΄: Mythoi zoon*. Athens: Academy of Athens Publications.

Meraklis, M. G. 1971. Oi theoritikes katefthynseis tis laografias meta ton deftero Pagkosmio Polemo. *Laographia* 27: 3-23.

——. 1976. Laos kai laikos politismos. *Nea Domi* 1 (1976): 69-70. (reprinted in *Laografika Zitimata*. Athens: Kastaniotis & Diatton 2004).

——. 2001. *Pedagogika tis Laografias*. Athens: Iolkos Editions.

——. 2004. *I Synigoria tis Laografias*. Athens: Chatzimichali Institute.

——. 2007. *Laikos politismos kai neoellinikos diafotismos*. Athens: Papazisis Publications.

Milingkou-Markantoni, M. 2010. Georgios K. Spyridakis (1963-1972). To Archeio Cheirografon Syllogon protogenous ylis kai to Spoudasterio Laografias (katathesis psychis). Article uploaded to the Folklore Centre's website, www.kentrolaografias.gr; (forthcoming in vol. 33 of the *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique*).

Newall, V. 1980. Introduction. In V. J. Newall (ed.), *Folklore Studies in the Twentieth Century. Proceedings of the Centenary Conference of the Folklore Society*, pp. xv-xxxvi. Suffolk and Totowa, N.J.: D. S. Brewer & Rowman and Littlefield.

Nitsiakos, V. 2008. *Prosanatolismoi: Mia kritiki eisagogi sti laografia*. Athens: Kritiki Editions.

Noyes, D. 2008. Humble Theory. *Journal of Folklore Research* 45 (1): 37-43.

Orlandos, A. 1969. I Pentikontaetia tou Kentrou Laografias (1918-1968). *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique* 20-21 (1967-1968): 9-14.

Papataxiarchis, E. 2003. To parelthon enonei oso kai chorizei: I anthropologia anamesa stin istoria kai ti laografia. In *To Paron tou parelthontos: Istoria, Laografia, Koinoniki Anthropologia*, pp. 65-75. Athens: Society for the Study of Modern Greek Culture and Education, Moraitis School.

–––––. 2006. Eisagogi: Ta achthi tis eterotitas. Diastaseis tis politismikis diaforopoiisis stin Ellada tou proimou 21ou aiona. In E. Papataxiarchis (ed.), *Peripeteies tis eterotitas. I paragogi tis politismikis diaforas sti simerini Ellada*, pp. 1-85. Athens: Alexandria Editions.

Petropoulos, D. 1952. The Study of Ethnography in Greece. *Midwest Folklore* II (I): 15-20.

Politis, N. G. 1899-1902. *Meletai peri tou viou kai tis glossis tou ellinikou laou: Paroimiai*, vols. A-D. Athens: Maraslis Library.

–––––. 1909. Laografia. *Laographia: Journal of the Hellenic Folklore Society* A: 3-18.

Polymerou-Kamilaki, A. 2003. Vrachy chroniko tis Ethnikis Mousikis Syllogi. In E. G. Makris (ed.), *Oi dyo opseis tis ellinikis mousikis klironomias. Afieroma eis mnimin Spyridonos Peristeri*, pp. 13-18. (No 18). (Proceedings of a Musicological Conference, Academy of Athens, 10-11 November 2000). Athens: Publications of the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre.

––––. 2008. To Kentro Laografias tis Akadimias Athinon kai I drastiriotita ton patridotopikon syllogon. In E. Karamanes, and P. Potiropoulos (eds.), *To Archeio tis Filekpaideftikis Adelfotitas Tzourtzias tis Athamanias kai i psifiopoiisi tou apo to Kentron Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias tis Akadimias Athinon. Praktika Epistimonikis Imeridas (Trikala, 15.11.2008)*, pp. 11-17. Trikala: Educational Brotherhood of Tzourtzia, Athamania.

Polymerou-Kamilaki, A., and E. Karamanes (eds.). 2008. *Atlas tis Ellinikis Laografias.* Athens: Hellenic Folklore Research Centre.

Psychogiou, E. 2008. *"Mavrigi" kai Eleni. Teletourgies thanatou kai anagennisis*. (No. 24). Athens: Publications of the Hellenic Folklore Research Centre.

Puchner, W. 2011. *Dokimia laografikis theorias*. Athens: Gutenberg.

Saunier, G. (ed.). 1983. *To dimotiko tragoudi tis xenitias*. Athens: Ermis Editions.

Spyridakis, G. K. 1962. *Odigiai pros syllogin laografikis ylis*. Athens: Academy of Athens Publications.

———. 1969. I proti pentikontaetia (1918-1968) tis leitourgias tou Kentrou Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias. *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches de Folklore* 20-21 (1967-1968): 3-4.

———. 1973. Peri tis kata to ear aioras eis ton ellinikon kai tous loipous laous tis chersonisou tou Aimou. *Annuaire du Centre de Recherches du Folklore Hellénique* 22 (1969-72): 113-134.

———. 1974. *Edra Laografias – Spoudasterion Laografias meta prosirtimenis laografikis syllogis tis Filosofikis Scholis tou Panepistimiou Athinon*. Syntomon Chronikon: 1964-1972. Athens.

Stewart, C. 2008. *Daimones kai diavolos stin Ellada*. Athens: Taxideftis Editions. (originally published in English by Princeton U.P. 1991).

Terzopoulou, M., and E. Psychogiou. 1993a. "Asmata" kai tragoudia. Provlimata ekdosis ton dimotikon tragoudion. *Ethnologhia: Periodical Publication of the Greek Society for Ethnology* 1 (1992): 143-165.

———. 1993b. Roloi fylon kai scheseis syggeneias mesa ap' ta gamilia tragoudia. *Revue des Études Neo-Helleniques* II (1-2): 89-124.

Terzopoulou, M. and E. Psychogiou. 2002. Psifiaki vasi dedomenon gia tin Ethniki Mousiki Syllogi tou Kentrou Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias tis Akadimias Athinon. In *Ekdotika provlimata kai apopseis. Theoria kai Praktiki. Praktika Synedriou sti mnimi tou G. P. Savvidi (Athens, 15-17.06.2000)*, pp. 65-71. Athens: Publications Spoudasterio Neou Ellinismou.

Terzopoulou, M. and E. Psychogiou. 2004. Psifiaki vasi dedomenon gia tin Ethniki Mousiki Syllogi tou Kentrou Laografias. *Epetiris tou Kentrou Erevnis tis Ellinikis Laografias tis Akadimias Athinon* 29-30 (1999-2003): 61-74.

Tountasaki, E. 2003. Anthropologia kai laografia: Apo tin ekaterothen adiaforia stin ypo orous anagnorisi amoivaion ofelimaton. *Dokimes* 11-12: 7-63.

Tsibiridou, F. 2001. I laografia os "klironomia" stin koinoniki kai politismiki anthropologia tou elladikou chorou. In C. Chatzitaki-Kapsomenou (ed.), *Ellinikos paradosiakos politismos: Laografia kai istoria. Syn-*

edrio sti mnimi tis Alkis Kyriakidou-Nestoros, pp. 38-46. Thessaloniki: Paratiritis Editions.

Varvounis, M. G., and G. H. Kouzas. 2007. *To Archeio tou "Laografikou Frontistiriou" tou G. A. Mega. Analytikos Katalogos*. Athens: Laographia. (Special Publications, No 12. Hellenic Folklore Society).

Varvounis, M. G., et al. 2010. *To "Laografiko Archeio" tou Tmimatos Istorias kai Ethnologias tou Dimokriteiou Panepistimiou Thrakis*. Athens: Laographia. (Special Publications, No 13. Hellenic Folklore Society).

Vrelli-Zachou, M. 2002. I didaskalia kai i erevna tis endymasias sto plaisio tou laikou politismou: Oi ergasies ton foititon sto Panepistimio Ioanninon (1992-2001). In M. Al. Alexiadis (ed.), *Thiteia: Timitiko Afieroma ston Kathigiti M. G. Merakli*, pp. 183-205. Athens: University of Athens and University of Ioannina.

Waehler, M. 1947. Volkskunde als Grundwissenschaft. *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, pp. 111-145. (ed. by H. Tardel, 21 [1947]). Bremen: Trüjen.

Chapter 6
Albanian Ethnography at the Margins of History, 1947 – 1991: Documenting the Nation in Historical Materialist Terms

Armanda Kodra – Hysa

In 1990, the Department of Ethnography (*Departamenti i Etnografisë*) at Tirana's Institute of Folk Culture (*Instituti i Kulturës Popullore*), founded in 1979, changed its name to the Department of Ethnology (*Departamenti i Etnologjisë*). In 2008 the Institute itself was renamed the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Art Studies (*Instituti I Antropologjisë Kulturore dhe Studimit të Artit*). However, these changes were not accompanied by any substantial disciplinary debate. During the 1990s only a few authors tried to come to terms with the development of Albanian ethnography and folklore, and the role of historical materialism as the guiding theoretical framework during the socialist period (Uçi 1997; Xhagolli 1997; Tirta 2003). In Albania, historical materialism was limited to the interpretations of Lenin, Stalin, and Enver Hoxha. Most Western Marxist philosophers, together with those in the Soviet Bloc after Stalin's death, were considered reactionary and could not be cited (Uçi 1997: 178; Tirta 2003: 21). In their analyses, Agron Xhagolli and Mark Tirta concluded that any problem in the way these disciplines had developed must be due to the ideological influence of the dictatorship and its censorship. Both authors argued further that socialist ideology had affected only the form of the scholarship produced, and that the content remained scientifically valid. Alfred Uçi was more critical of the effects of the ideological and political imposition of a narrow historical materialism on ethnography, and pointed out the theoretical poverty, even sterility, of most ethnographic and folkloric works.[1] In recent years the number of critical works has increased.[2]

---

[1] Although I present all three analyses as equal, Uçi's analysis was especially important because he is an influential policymaker in Albanian cultural sciences. Albanian cultural sciences (*shkencat kulturore shqiptare*) was the term used during socialism to refer to both ethnography and folklore; Doja (this volume) explains why the term is best translated as 'people's culture studies' and why he refers to the Institute of Folk Culture as the Institute of

I will start this paper from my own experience as a young researcher who was recruited in 2001 to the Institute of Folk Culture. Since neither ethnography nor ethnology were traditionally available as university disciplines in Albania, researchers were generally recruited from history (for the Department of Ethnography and later of Ethnology), literature (for the Department of Folklore), and musicology (for the Department of Ethnomusicology). During my recruitment, I was told I should learn what ethnology is, and then select a field of study from those that were available at the institute. The Department of Ethnology was divided into two sections, one for material culture and one for social and spiritual culture. Spiro Shkurti, my mentor and Head of the Department, told me that this was the old Soviet distinction, adding: 'It serves to facilitate research. In reality, in everyday life, things are not divided so sharply. Life is composed of all the cultural elements together, and it is not good to demarcate our studies sharply, though we often do so'. When I joined the institute, I asked many questions about the difference between ethnography and ethnology. 'We are ethnographers', Shkurti replied and explained the department's new name:

> Mark Tirta fought to change the name of the department from ethnography to ethnology. But there is too much description in our studies, and not much analysis. To practise ethnology should mean to make analytical comparisons of findings from all over the country, and further afield. The data must be compared to as many written sources as possible. Only then does the outcome qualify as ethnology. Only I and two or three other researchers have done this.

My questions did not arise out of curiosity, but out of fear. I knew practically nothing about ethnology, yet I was being called an ethnologist. I went around for days and days asking my colleagues to explain this discipline, its research methods, what I should read, and how I should write. My mentor gave detailed advice. Paraphrasing him, I learned that

> Ethnography is a sub-discipline of history. History is based on three pillars: archaeology, documents, and ethnography. Only through archaeology can history reconstruct dead cultures and peoples for whom we have no written sources. Only through ethnography can history grasp those aspects of everyday life of contemporary peoples or cultures that are not recorded in any texts. And even when written

---

People's Culture. While Uçi retained this term, Xhagolli replaced it with ethno-folkloristics (*etno-folkloristika*).

[2] See Hysa 2010, 2011, Bardhoshi and Doja, this volume; Bardhoshi 2009 and this volume, Halili 2009, Lelaj 2011. There are other papers which at the moment are being written in this respect from other Albanian anthropologists. For critical views on the development of Albanian ethnography by non-Albanian anthropologists, see Schwandner-Sievers 2009 and Voell 2011.

> sources do exist, ethnography is still useful for making more precise comparisons. It is therefore the best way to guarantee high quality scientific work.

There is, of course, much to be debated concerning the way in which ethnography, in this formulation, is still subordinated to a kind of historicism which has not freed itself completely from historical materialism. But for me this approach was productive because it pointed toward interdisciplinarity and a plurality of methods. Shkurti also advised me against over-exaggeration: 'During Communism, ethnographers tended to search for the Illyrian roots of our culture. Please don't do this. You should never make that mistake. We deal a lot with memory, and memory never goes back beyond 200 years. Every assertion of Illyrian roots is an invention'.

Colleagues approved of what the Head of Department said, but only in his presence. They never reflected this position in their writings. For my colleagues, Illyrians were and remain our ancestors, and any claim that this is a modern myth of nationalism is considered blasphemy. Furthermore, my colleagues discouraged me from reading even the small quantity of ethnological literature in German and Italian which was to be found in the institute's library. This kind of ethnology, they claimed, only addressed 'primitive' peoples, and was therefore not useful for the study of Albanians, a people *with history*. Such an opinion was even shared, at least publicly, by Mark Tirta who had argued for ethnography being renamed ethnology. Tirta cited Malinowski and Lévi-Strauss, but he also thought their theories were not applicable to Albanians who had history. It was also unclear whether my colleagues thought that their research was historical: Tirta sometimes claimed sometimes that ethnology was a discipline in itself, and not a historical one, but in his books he generally stuck to the contrary position: 'Being a historical discipline, ethnological study should correspond to the most important periods of the history of our people' (Tirta 2004: 4).

Given such confusion, the teachings of my mentor were the only reliable guide I had as I began my career. There was no literature, either for theory or for methodology. The only theory and method of research during socialism was historical materialism of the Marxist-Leninist variety, which was automatically disqualified after 1990. But I found that the Marxist-Leninist approach had been fused with a national approach to such an extent that most ethnographers still wrote in a nationalist way without even being aware that this was a tradition with Herderian roots. They conformed superficially to the unilinear evolutionism of Marxism-Leninism without entering into any serious theoretical discussions.

It was a shock to discover the gap that existed not only between Albanian ethnology and Anglophone socio-cultural anthropology, but with the

ethnologies of south-east European countries as well. If the Albanian discipline stands in a marginal position in respect to other anthropologies and ethnologies, the reasons lie first and foremost in its isolation and failure to engage with contemporary debates on contemporary theories and methods. My experience was common to those of my generation. We discovered that *ethnology (ethnography) was not only a discipline that dealt with oral tradition, it was itself an orally transmitted tradition.* Moreover, *etnologjia* also has a marginal status in relation to other disciplines within Albania. Its conceptualisation as a pillar of history, which was imposed ideologically during socialism and internalised by ethnographers, influenced the reproduction of marginality. This chapter is intended as a contribution to opening a much-needed space for anthropology within the humanities in Albania.

The Beginnings

In 1947, a delegation of Yugoslav ethnologists led by Milovan Gavazzi made an official visit to Bedri Spahiu, the Albanian Minister of Education and Culture. They also visited Aleks Buda who was a historian by training and Head of the Institute of Sciences (*Instituti i Shkencave*). This was the period of 'love and brotherhood' between Albania and Yugoslavia, when the thesis of Albania as the seventh Yugoslav republic was close to implementation. The aim of the delegation was to recruit an Albanian ethnographer to work for the Yugoslav state. Gavazzi had targeted Rrok Zojzi, who was the only known ethnographer in Albania at this time.[3] The minister approved the proposal immediately, but Buda realised that it was a pity that ethnography had been excluded as a branch of the 'albanological sciences' (the others being history and linguistics). Why should they give Zojzi away to the Yugoslavs, when he could found Albanian ethnography in Albania (Tirta 2010)? In this way *etnografia*, together with archaeology, was institutionalised within the Department of History, at the Institute of Sciences. One year later, in 1948, Albania broke-off relations with Yugoslavia following the Informbiro (Cominform Resolution) in which Yugoslavia was accused of departing from Marxist-Leninist teachings (Tirta 2010).

This origin story shows how the fate of ethnography in Albania has been tightly connected to the political situation, inside and outside Albania. From the beginning, ethnography was expected to contribute to a national-

[3] Rrok Zojzi never formally studied ethnology, but he had served as a translator for groups of German and Austrian ethnology students, and had learned the techniques of research from accompanying them during fieldwork. Gaining interest in ethnology, Zojzi read many German ethnological publications and became well acquainted with the Vienna School of ethnology. Eventually, he began to conduct his own ethnological research and collect material artefacts, and he published a few articles during the 1930s (Tirta 2010).

communist ideology as a *Hilfswissenschaft* (auxiliary science) to history. The Section of Ethnography (*Sektori i Etnografisë*) established in 1947 at the Institute of Sciences initially consisted only of Rrok Zojzi himself. He was joined later by two other researchers. All had studied history. The first articles, written mostly by Zojzi, were published in the *Bulletin of the Institute of Sciences*. The section's own journal, *Etnografia shqiptare* (*Albanian Ethnography*), appeared from 1962. Zojzi's introduction defined ethnography for the first time:

> Ethnography is the science that studies the specific cultural characteristics of peoples, their national and ethnic specificities, as well as the historical processes of their developments (Zojzi 1962a: 3).

He continued:

> Ethnography is an inductive science: through a retrospective view it passes from the present to the past, from contemporarity to the distant past, and it reconstructs the historical process of the development of peoples… . We start from the existing conditions, from the highest scale of the development of the people, and through a voyage back into the past, we trace previous scales and forms (Zojzi 1962b: 17).

Zojzi proceeded to elaborate the subject matter and goals of ethnogaphy as well as its theoretical bases. He summarised writings about 'the national tradition of Albanian people', emphasising the National Revival (1846 - 1912) and the period between the creation of the Albanian state in 1912 and the Second World War. These periods were important, in his view, because the collection of folk traditions was intensified and the materials were gathered in a more systematic form. But these 'studies of folk life' (*studimi i jetës së popullit*) were considered by Zojzi as 'descriptive and with a fragmented character' (*punë përshruese me karakter te fragmetuar*). Moreover, their philosophical orientation was idealistic; he concluded that 'work on the national traditions of the people could not be left to private initiatives with dilletant bases' (Zojzi 1962b: 17). The purpose of the ethnographic group was to establish research based on historical materialism, which was considered to be 'the only true scientific theory and method' (17).

Zojzi did not adopt any particular school of thought in this foundational statement. There was no mention of Johan Gottfried Herder or of Lewis Henry Morgan. The scope of ethnography was given in the abovementioned definition, and not opened to further debate. This was a typical pattern for scientific development in Albania. Similarly, there was no discussion as to why the discipline should be called *etnografia* rather than *etnologjia*. Zojzi stated that ethnography was to deal with 'traditions of Albanian people', but it was by no means clear what 'tradition' meant, nor who ex-

actly constituted 'the people', though we were told that 'the broad masses of the population, especially *the peasants,* are those who persistently protected these traditions, and developed them further' (Zojzi 1962a: 6; italics are mine). In practice, the ruling classes, especially the feudal – bourgeois class, which was perceived as cosmopolitan and having betrayed national interests by collaborating with various occupying powers, were excluded (Hysa 2011; see also Bardhoshi 2009). The many cultural elements pertaining to earlier ruling classes were not considered part of traditional culture and were not analysed (Uçi 1997: 178).

Following Zojzi's outline, ethnographers only considered history through the Marxist materialist-dialectical approach. That is, history was equated with the unilineal evolutionist theory which Engels formulated on the basis of the works of Lewis Henry Morgan (Tirta 2004: 87). This was combined with the narrative of the Albanian nation, a legacy of Albanian romanticist intellectuals of the second half of the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century.[4] In this combination, only the influence of historical materialism on methodological and theoretical development was officially recognised.

Historical materialism was considered a science in itself: the study of the general laws of the development of human society (see e.g. Fjalori Filozofik 1973: 288). Historical materialism is considered to be '*the general sociology of Marxism, the theoretical and methodological bases for the specific social sciences, as well as for the concrete sociological studies*' (Fjalori Filozofik 1973: 288; my emphasis). Thus researchers in the field of Marxist-Leninist historical materialism were responsible for providing the social and human sciences with a theoretical and methodological framework, and at a deeper level for the philosophical legitimation of Party rule in all spheres of life. They were also the political philosophers for the Party which meant they were directly dependent on the Party and its directives in developing their science. Furthermore, researchers were considered part of the intelligentsia, a social category that belonged to the proletariat powerholders. Historical materialists were the educators of the masses with their teachings on class consciousness, class struggle, and revolutionary practice, and they, according to Marx's Fifth Thesis on Feuerbach[5], were to undergo continuous re-education. The Party and its leader, Enver Hoxha, were obligated to

[4] I have written in detail how the narrative of the Albanian people (*popullit shqiptar*) was created during the nineteenth century, emphasising the influence of German, Austrian, and Austro-Hungarian travellers, diplomats, and researchers. This narrative determined in many ways how the humanities developed in Albania (see Hysa 2010: 108-11).

[5] Marx, Karl: *Theses on Feuerbach*, http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/index.htm (accessed in August 2012).

reinforce this educational process from time to time, through publication after publication, work after work, congress after congress. An integral part of the administration of every research working centre, whether university or research institute, was the 'Base Organisation of the Party' (*Organizata Baze e Partise*), with its chief, secretary, and ordinary members. The Base Organisation transmitted Party instructions and instructed researchers how to organise their work accordingly, and it also controlled and reviewed the writings and behaviour of the scientific 'workers'.[6]

Rrok Zojzi's Charter for Ethnography at the Margins of History

It is worth looking more closely at Zojzi's 1962 essay which created a marginal position of ethnography in the service of Marxist-Leninist historiography that lasted until around 1980. Because ethnography was organised only at the departmental level and did not have its own institute, ethnographers were even more circumscribed by scientific policymakers in developing their own theories and methods. The role of ethnography was paradoxical: it had to be the science of the nation's trajectory through history, and at the same time to contribute to the building of socialism and a socialist popular culture. This highly particular contribution had to be grounded in universal Marxist-Leninist principles.

Zojzi dated the history of Albanian ethnography from the works of outstanding Albanian humanists and Catholic priests in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. During the second half of the nineteenth century, the gathering of ethnographic data intensified. 'In each and every one of their publications', wrote Zojzi about the intellectuals of that period, 'and in their notebooks and journals, we can find ethnographical materials gathered with great care and love for the people and its culture' (1962a: 5-6). In the early twentieth century this work expanded to include articles on the *kanun* (the corpus of traditional laws of Northern Albania) and the northern Albanian clans. However, Zojzi concluded that these collections were primarily descriptive, and that data collection or analysis based on scientific criteria was rudimentary or lacking altogether.

According to Zojzi, *etnografia* was itself a product of the hardening of the inner contradictions of capitalism. The discipline 'was to become a strong weapon (of capitalism) in the predacious purposes of the great imperialist states toward the small and backward people' (1962: 4). According to this argument, the Albanian people had become the object of foreign researches, and the precise place of study that researchers chose was always determined by the geopolitical interests of foreign states. Despite having

[6] Researchers are still recognised officially as 'scientific workers'.

served foreign state and capitalist interests, Zojzi acknowledged that some foreign-conducted research had contributed positively to the development of Albanian ethnography by gathering and publishing valuable ethnographical materials, and that some researchers, like Edith Durham and Franz Nopcsa, had even became true friends to Albania (1962: 5).

Zojzi claimed that following Albania's independence in 1912-13, plans to institutionalise the field of Albanian studies were not implemented by any of the various governments that held power through the Liberation (Clirimi) in 1945.[7] Efforts to continue the study of traditional culture were confined to the private sphere and not, according to Zojzi, supported by the state. The results of ethnography work before 1945 were published in journals such as *Hylli i Dritës* (*The Star of Light*) (1913-1944), *Leka* (1929-1944), *Mësuesi* (*The Teacher*) (1929), and *Shkolla Kombëtare* (*The National School*) (1937-43). Zojzi proclaimed that during this period

> the oath, honour, loyalty, manhood and other traditional virtues of our people were considered by the higher classes as backward; artistic traditions like folk music and dances, folk art, etc. were considered old-fashioned… . But the masses, especially the villagers, protected these traditions and made efforts for their development (1962: 6).

As this statement makes clear, the ethnography that Zojzi was outlining was meant to consider the lower classes and peasants as the true bearers of national culture, and of the nation itself. It should be noted that in his general depiction of the situation of Albanian ethnography before the Second World War, Zojzi paid particular attention to the 1933 publication of the *Kanun* as it had been collected and codified by Shtjefën Gjeçovi.

Writing in 1962, Zojzi had to lavish praise on Albania's Party of Labour for establishing the correct ideological bases for the study of traditional culture. And it is clear that he had to establish proletarian internationalism as the leading ideology after the end of interwar cosmopolitanism. In his article, he commended the ethnographic sector for initiating fieldwork expeditions to gather information and ethnographic artefacts. He wrote proudly that new archives of 'our national culture' were being established and new centres for its development were being opened all over the country, drawing ordinary citizens into the collection of ethnographic information and objects (Zojzi 1962: 7; cf. Chrystofforou, this volume).

At this point in Zojzi's article, the political dimension becomes even more prominent:

---

[7] According to Albanian socialist historiography, Albania was liberated in 1945 not only from the Nazi-Fascist occupation but also from the exploitative capitalist regime of King Zog.

> A very important step in the field of ethnographic studies was the knowledge acquired … of Marxist-Leninist methodology, and of the materialist understanding of the social phenomena of the people (1962: 8).

The introduction continues with the presentation of key articles published in different scientific journals in Albania and abroad. Zojzi asserts that:

> The traditions of our national culture were not considered by the ethnographers as dead material, as a closed chapter of the history of our people, with only antiquarian and museum value, but as a living activity, full of life, that continue to grow and develop parallel with the economic and social growth and development of the people. This was the orientation that the Party of Labour of Albania gave to our scientists, in the elucidation of the Marxist-Leninist principles. This is the reason why our scientists in the field of traditions are making efforts to develop them further, in order for the new culture of our people to be national in form and socialist in content (1962: 9).

What Zojzi wrote in 1962 determined the development of ethnography for many years to come. Ethnography was understood to be the science of traditions and ethnicity. As such, it was considered to have been born with its own people's traditions and culture. Ethnography also held that traditions and culture had protected the people during difficult historical periods, helping the nation to resist foreign assimilation and the depredations of the cosmopolitan and exploiting classes who generally embraced foreign exploitative cultures. In turn, Zojzi emphasised the long struggle by ethnographers to safeguard the nation and national culture, that was finally secured by the Communist Party, socialist state, and institutionalised sciences. From the National Revival of the nineteenth century until the Second World War, gathering ethnographic data had been considered a patriotic duty by Albanian nationalist ideologues. This period, however, had been marked by conflict between the emergent proletariat and the exploitative feudal-capitalist regime of King Zog, during which intellectuals tried to continue their work in the field of ethnography in order to protect their dear national culture from the evil of cosmopolitanism. The Liberation brought the people to power, and assured that their culture and the Albanian nation were finally safe. After 1945, there was no longer any contradiction between material social practice and superstructural ideology, or between proletariat and governmental structures. If the culture of the ruling class had tried to oppress the culture of the exploited, now the last was the first. The final period of history was to be communism, and revolutionary practice had to prepare every segment of society for the achievement of this culminating stage of history and social organisation. Ethnographers were called upon to play their

part in guiding the transformation of their own society and culture into the classless, egalitarian communist society and culture. Thus ethnography had to be 'national in form and socialist in content' (Zojzi 1962a: 9; see also Doja this volume).

Rrok Zojzi was a complex personality whose work cannot be analysed easily. He preached historical materialism as theory and method, but he also dedicated his life to ethnography and energetically taught other ethnographers how to do fieldwork. As a teacher, he made his students aware of the ethics of ethnography. Many of his articles are still valuable, since they contain not only interesting data but also challenging theoretical concepts which escaped censorship. His field notebooks, deposited in the archive of the Department of Ethnology, are treasures for the data they record and for the original interpretations he jotted down at the time.

Ideological Directives during the 1970s

On 6 February 1967, Enver Hoxha presented his famous 'Programmatic Discourse against Religion and Backward Habits'. Immediately thereafter, the right to believe in God, to frequent places of worship, or to declare any religious identity, was abolished. All teachers were subject to continuous re-education programs in accordance with the dictator's pronouncements. Every institution had to report the successful implementation of the Party's program. In the case of ethnography, articles touching on theoretical directives appeared in 1973 and 1976. Abaz Dojaka and Andromaqi Gjergji (1973) offered a new history of the discipline and admonishments concerning the tasks ahead. After discussing authors of the pre-Liberation era, Dojaka and Gjergji gave a detailed account of fields of study within the discipline, emphasising the application of historical materialism and the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Enver Hoxha, and Albania's Party of Labour. According to Dojaka and Gjergji, every topic in Albanian ethnography was analysed using historical materialism as a scientific method, from material culture (traditional agriculture, handicrafts, clothes, buildings, and figurative arts) to topics in spiritual and social culture (family, migration, mythology, ceremonial feasts, and customary laws). Because the old material culture was rapidly disappearing, researchers were charged with describing this in detail. In carrying out this task they were able to escape the new ideology, at least at a certain level. By contrast, there was no escape in the fields of social and spiritual culture. The new revolutionary socialist way of life could not coexist with a traditional way of life that for centuries had exploited the people. Dojaka and Gjergji argued that Hoxha's Programmatic Discourse and the Party's Fifth Congress in 1967 had assigned new duties to Albanian ethnography. The task of the 1970s was to uncover the roots of all

retrograde traditions and habits and their idealist-reactionary philosophical bases. Ethnographers had to choose their topics according to the great challenges set by the Party in the deepening of the ideological and cultural revolution of the country (Dojaka and Gjergji 1973: 14).

Ethnographers were not to abandon their research into past ways of life and culture of the Albanian people:

> Together with other branches of history, ethnography will contribute to shed light into some of the most important questions of our historiography, like that of ethnogenesis, the contribution of our people to the material and spiritual culture of neighbouring peoples and vice-versa, etc. These problems will be solved based on reasoned ideological positions, on the basic principles of historical materialism (Dojaka and Gjergji 1973: 14).

Yet the emphasis on rooting out retrograde traditions implied a significant shift toward the analytic social sciences. Dojaka and Gjergji explained that prior to 1973 ethnographers had contented themselves with collecting and describing a material culture that belonged to the past. Even when this traditional way of life had been analysed with the methods of historical materialism, the level of analysis was not as high as required in the future of the field.

In the same issue of *Etnografia shqiptare*, the linguist Androkli Kostallari (head of the group which standardised the Albanian literary language) expressed his impatience with ethnographers. His message could be summed up as 'Enough of description and collecting the material culture, we have to build socialism, and you, ethnographers, are not doing a good enough job'. His actual argument was much longer:

> Based on the orders of the second plenum of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, held in June 1967, for a deeper study of the habits of everyday life and of the *kanun*s that prohibit the establishment of the new socialist relationships promoted by the Party, to the researchers of history and literature, and especially to the ethnographers – was assigned the duty to reach a deeper knowledge of these fragments, so that they can be substituted completely. The material culture should be collected as historical patrimony and be stored in museums. However, the study of the social life of the people has an urgent character. It is a war that does not wait. It has to be fought right now, every single hour. It will permit us to penetrate deeper in diagnosing the ideological and social pathologies that have survived from the historical past of our society, and will enable a faster recuperation thanks to the strength of our Marxist-Leninist

> ideology, as well as to better recognise the paths of the development of our society (Kostallari 1973: 25).

The development of Albanian ethnography reached its peak in 1976 with a National Conference of Ethnographic Studies, organised in the frame of celebrations for the 35th anniversary of the foundation of the Party of Labour of Albania. Among approximately 65 participants, only 8 were professional ethnographers. Six were the so-called collaborators of the department; four were folklorists. The rest were historians, archaeologists, linguists, art historians, lawyers, demographers, and researchers of Marxism-Leninism. The conference was supposed to mark achievements in the field of 'cultural sciences' under the leadership of the Party of Labour of Albania, both in the field of material culture – a documentary work that should go on - and in the integration of healthy traditions into the new socialist culture. The conference was opened by the Minister of Education and Culture, who reminded 'researchers of culture' in general, and ethnographers in particular, that they should obey the teachings of the Party and its leader because this was their revolutionary mission (Cami 1976: 7-8). Four keynote speakers presented theoretical lines, but none of these speakers was an ethnographer. The ethnographers had evidently demonstrated their incompetence in the interpretation and implementation of Marxism in their works.[8]

The historians and Marxist philosophers who delivered the keynotes poured scorn on contemporary theories and trends abroad. Thus the historian Aleks Buda repeated and elaborated some of the points made by Zojzi in 1962, before proceeding to attack capitalist and revisionist theories in the field of culture. He listed some of the very recent achievements of Albanian ethnography up to 1976, and outlined recommendations for the future (Buda 1976b).

Stefanaq Pollo, also a historian, called ethnographers' attention to the national question. He emphasised that Albanian folk culture was the dialectical product of the Albanian people as an ethnic and national community (Pollo 1976: 37). This raised a basic dilemma: if Albanian culture had really retained its clear ethnic character from antiquity, then Albanians must have been an isolated people who did not receive external cultural influences; according to the unilineal theory of Morgan and Engels, such isolation would mean that Albanians were still locked in barbarity. Pollo declared that the data of archaeology and linguistics were insufficient to illuminate the early stages of history of the culture of Albanian people and resolve this

[8] At this time ethnographic research was still organised under the Institute of History and only a handful of scholars were allowed access to foreign literature. These trusted comrades prepared new theoretical and ideological directives for their colleagues; see Bardhoshi, this volume.

conflict, and that the contributions of ethnographers and historians were therefore indispensable (38). When an archaeologist found an artefact, the historian had to seek an explanation through documents, but if they were lacking, then the ethnographer could compare the actual artefact with others. If the similarities exceeded the differences, the artefact in question could be considered autochthonous and as evidence for Illyrian-Albanian continuity. Pollo further outlined two categories of difference. One set of differences between the elements of contemporary folk culture resulted from endogenous change and development and had no bearing on ethnicity. The other set of differences was due to the influences of foreign cultures, but these elements had never been fully internalised into Albanian culture and were therefore easily visible.

According to Pollo, Albanian ethnicity had three basic components: the territory, the language, and the folk culture. He enumerated the following facts: 1) there had not been any large migration of Illyrians from their lands; 2) the people who migrated into the Balkans between the sixth and ninth centuries (CE) had no contact with Albanians; 3) the Albanian language was genetically related to Illyrian; 4) Albanian folk culture included elements that were easily traceable through archaeology as Illyrian. On this basis Pollo proved, at least to his own satisfaction, that Albanians were direct descendants of Illyrians, and therefore both autochthonous and unique (1976: 39-43). Pollo conceded that this conclusion was similar to that of Franz Nopsca. But although Nopsca had applied the right method in his studies of North Albania, his theory was defective because it was not based on dialectical materialism. Nopsca's reactionary metaphysical idealism had depicted Albanian autochthony as romantic and isolated. Nonetheless, Nopsca was commended as a good example to be followed.

At the end of the first and last conference of Albanian ethnography, Aleks Buda concluded that Albanian ethnographers should:

1. continue to discover, collect, document, and study the folk culture of some regions that had not yet been studied;
2. extend the concept of tradition to include new socialist traditions. Therefore the ethnographers should include some sociology in their approach;
3. deepen their knowledge of the bad and backward habits and traditions as well as of the good ones, and recommend consolidation of the latter into socialist culture;
4. illuminate the evolution of Albanian people (as described above);
5. take part actively in the compilation of pedagogical manuals, which would help craftsmen to preserve the Albanian character of their handicrafts (Buda 1976a: 10-12).

In 1979, the Department of Ethnography merged with the Institute of Folklore to form the Institute of Folk Culture. This decision came as consequence of the perception shared by Androkli Kostallari, Alfred Uçi, and Zija Xholi that both ethnography and folklore were part of the cultural sciences, and that ethnography should start to be a contemporary sociology of Marxism. Not all ethnographers agreed with this decision. Some considered that as part of the historical sciences, ethnography dealt with real traditions and events in distinction to folklorists, who (as they saw it) only dealt with myths and phantasies.[9] By 1979, Albania had severed relations with China and declared itself 'the only communist island in the world'. Theoretical and ideological orientations did not change much during the 1980s, though emphasis on the dogmas of Enver Hoxha became even more pronounced.

The Response of Albanian Ethnographers

Reading through the 15 volumes of *Etnografia shqiptare*, the proceedings of the abovementioned conference, and various articles in *Kultura popullore*, it is evident that the ethnographers working on material culture remained predominantly descriptive in their studies of folk costumes, traditional handicrafts, agriculture, buildings, and technologies. Most of their material was collected through fieldwork expeditions. And, they largely followed the lines described above, tracing both historical materialist progression and Illyrian continuity.

For example, Andromaqi Gjergji tried to be politically correct and analysed folk costumes in the light of Party propaganda, emphasising how the manufacture of garments revealed key economic features of Albanian society in the past and highlighting the changes of the revolutionary era. However, she concluded that the true importance of folk costumes lay in their ethnic function which testified to Illyrian continuity. Her book on Albanian folk costumes (Gjergji 1988) contained detailed descriptions and classifications of all types of folk costumes and of the technologies used to produce them. Her work has even been used by designers and by specialists in textiles. But her major contribution for the nation was to 'discover' which elements could be traced back to Illyrian times and differed from the costumes of other Balkan peoples. Gjergji later wrote about traditional agriculture, drawing on archaeological and historical sources, including data from the period of King Zog, to conclude that Albanian agriculture went through all the stages of evolution which Engels had identified. Socialist agriculture was the concluding stage of this evolution, and from a social point of view the contemporary rural population was to be considered as part of the ruling

[9] Personal communication with Spiro Shkurti and Afërdita Onuzi.

class (Gjergji 2004). In short, the work of this scholar rested less on field data than on the dogmas of Marxist-Leninist historical materialism, from which she derived the stages of evolution of the Albanian people.

Pirro Thomo was a specialist in urban architecture and also on the *kulla*, the typical dwelling in those regions of northern Albania famous for blood feuding. When writing about urban architecture his style was technical and offered little social or economic analysis. However, his work on *kulla* penetrated the social organisation of villages in North Albania, as perceived through the lens of the dwelling place (Thomo 1991). It is interesting that Thomo cited communist discourses in a perfunctory way. He was a communist by conviction, and was even an elected Member of Parliament. But in his scholarly work based on his fieldwork data, he was a researcher rather than a politician.

Afërdita Onuzi specialised in handicrafts, especially pottery and weaving. Her descriptions of technology were sometimes so detailed that she left out the social context. Like those of Thomo, her citations of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Enver were purely formal (Onuzi 1988). Much the same was true of Ali Muka, who published many articles before 1990 based on his countless field trips exploring the relationships between environment, dwelling-styles, economy, and social organisation in villages. He too referenced the stages of unilinear evolutionism without detailed analysis (Muka 2005).

A few ethnographers attempted more elaborate analyses of their data that extended beyond the recommended paradigms. Spiro Shkurti had a vision of ethnography which approximated to what we now call historical anthropology. As I mentioned in my introduction, he was convinced that ethnography belonged to history; but unlike Buda, Pollo, and others who applied Engels' rigid periodisation to Albanian history, Shkurti favoured an interdisciplinary approach to society and economy. Based on the Ottoman *defterleri* (tax registers) and other historical documents of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, he developed an original analysis of agricultural organisation between the thirteenth and seventeenth centuries (Shkurti 2004). He supplemented historical sources with field data for richer descriptions of traditional practices (Shkurti 2003). Shkurti criticised Franz Nopsca's findings as 'based on the erroneous and romantic theory of cultural circles' (Shkurti 1983: 104). He preferred functionalist explanation to evolutionist speculation.

None of these ethnographers, however, offered a deep theoretical analysis through historical materialism, and this caused problems with the appointment of the Marxist philosopher Alfred Uçi as the new director in 1980. Following a heated debate in the beginnings of the 1980s, Uçi threw his colleagues' articles into the garbage. The researchers replied that if the

director wanted ethnography to be developed in his way, he would have to fire them and recruit new employees. But with Zojzi retired, who would teach these new employees?[10] Uçi relented, but the creative space for ethnographers of material culture in *kultura popullore* was narrowed further during the 1970s and 1980s.

Scholars working on spiritual and social culture had even less opportunity than those studying material culture to escape the pressures of ideologically-oriented analysis. The orders of the Party and its leader were made very clear in 1967, and in 1976 the new constitution declared that Albania was an atheist state. It was completely impossible for ethnographers – or anyone else - to analyse the rituals of family life without condemning the role of religion, whether pagan or monotheist.

Mark Tirta, Abaz Dojaka, and Yllka Selimi were the most prominent ethnographers in the study of domestic rituals, calendrical feasts, beliefs and mythology, and migration. General perceptions of religion were framed by Tirta and Dojaka. According to Tirta, religion had an idealist character and was a negative and restrictive phenomenon (Marxist-Leninist approach to religion), though historically unavoidable (historical determinism) as an element of superstructure in the exploitation of the masses. He also considered that religion was bad for national unity, and argued that Albanian myths, rites and rituals, beliefs and traditions had been influenced by religion, but that the religious influence was never entirely internalised into Albanian culture. Certain religious influences had survived due to their affinity with the ideology of patriarchy (whose institutions, though Albanian, were nonetheless exploitative for the masses). These were the notorious bad habits that had to be eliminated. Other rituals, habits, and traditions which did not originate in the exploitative ideology of superstructure were considered typically Albanian since time immemorial: these were the good traditions (Tirta 1976: 301-10). A similar conceptualisation of religion, rituals, and traditions along national-communist lines can be found in the work of Abaz Dojaka and Andromaqi Gjergji (1973). Despite the dismissive analyses, the quantity of recorded material on religiously-inflected rituals held in the department's archives is huge.

The Party also decided the main ethno-psychological features of the Albanian people, and ethnographers had no choice but to return, over and over, to the themes of *besa* (the oath), *mikpritja* (hospitality), and *trimwria* (bravery). Some ethnographers still do so, even after 1990. Others, especially Shkurti, have tried to turn to other themes.

[10] Personal communication with Mark Tirta and Afërdita Onuzi.

In a sense, their preoccupation with description offered ethnographers a refuge from the strong political and ideological pressures and impositions, but after 1990 ethnographers found themselves in an increasingly difficult position. Most of the theories coming from abroad were so different from what they had been doing. Joel Halpern visited Albania around this time and his visit entered local folklore. Halpern gave some lectures on developments in world anthropology and ethnology in the last four decades. He urged combining fieldwork data with theory, going beyond the mere description of techniques, and placing all material into its social and cultural context. 'But we had grown up that way, and it was not easy for us to change', Yllka Selimi said to me. 'We therefore decided to send our young researchers abroad for postgraduate qualifications. If they had come back, than we would all be moving gradually toward the goal advised by Halpern' (personal communication). But because of the very difficult economic and political situation, particularly in research institutions, four of these young scholars chose not to return to Albania or did not rejoin the Institute. After 1990, many ethnographers published the manuscripts on which they had been working for years, usually taking the trouble to delete citations of the Party and Enver Hoxha. However, even after 2000, books continued to appear in which readers were informed of how miserable the life of Albanians had been before the enlightening rule of the Party of Labour of Albania.

The Grand Narrative of the Albanian People

When dealing with cultural elements considered to be antique, ethnographers called archaeologists for help, as I have already explained. Theoretically, both relied on Engels' evolutionism. Historians took these explanations to construct a grand narrative of Albanian nation.[11] The first draft of this official version of Albanian history was published in 1959, and very little was changed in later decades (even after the end of the dictatorship). The findings of archaeologists, ethnographers, and historians were presented as ultimate truths. Even though no ethnographer was involved in the writing of these four volumes, their works were used by the authors of chapters dealing with autochthony, Illyrian-Albanian continuity, and other cultural themes. This compilation was the epitome of historical materialism as perceived and interpreted in Albania. I will summarise it schematically:

[11] *Historia e Popullit Shqiptar*, Tirana 1959, 1964, 1985, 2002.

Marx (Albanian History)	Engels/Morgan (Albanian Ethnography and Archaeology)
Primitive communism, no private property, no surplus, no classes, no class struggle. Equality.	**Hunters and gatherers.** Archaeology provided some data on the presence of such communities since the Middle Paleolithic in Albanian territory. **Fishermen** There were many examples of Neolithic settings and of the material evolution of those settings, especially with the emergence of pottery. Most of the Neolithic settings were to be found near rivers or lakes, or bogs, which implies that the main means of subsistence was fishing. New discoveries and improvements in the means of production led to a gradual intensification, changing the mode of production. The domestication of wild animals was decisive in establishing the first division of labour. Some rituals related to fishing documented by ethnographers were considered to have originated in this era. **Swidden Cultivation** In the transition from the Neolithic to the Bronze Age, swidden cultivation appeared as the main form of subsistence, and matriarchy as the dominant form of social organisation. Again, many twentieth century domestic rituals were explained as survivals of this era, thus giving the impression of an uninterrupted continuity between the population

	of the Late Paleolithic period and the modern Albanian population.
Slavery	This corresponded to the coming of the Indo-European population. The emergence of intensive agriculture brought about an asymmetrical redistribution of goods and commodities that led to the further transformation of economic and social structures. This was the second division of labour, which meant a new socially stratified society. Social organisation was based on patriarchal ideology. According to material finds, this was more or less the time of the consolidation of the Illyrian groups with their specific cultural patterns, differing from those of neighbouring groups, and with their specific language.
The peak period of slavery: deep antagonism between classes. Although Illyrians built some kingdoms, including the Dardanian Kingdom in the present-day territory of Kosovo, they were considered to have become subject during this period to foreign or foreign-cultured (cosmopolitan) slave owners. The Romanisation process affected only the slave-owning aristocracy, and not the middle- or poor- free classes. This impact of a foreign culture caused antagonism to grow, and only the middle and lower classes preserved the true culture from the foreign high culture of the elites. They were the real	The Hellenic and later the Roman civilisations. There are ethnographic arguments, beginning with clothes and some other elements of material culture of the twentieth century, that were interpreted as directly descended from Illyrians. There were also archaic elements of Illyrian origin in the customary law, legendary epics, and pagan mythology. Ethnography provided arguments that the Illyrians had resisted Romanisation, and that Albanians were the only nation in the Balkans to have preserved their cultural heritage. This was a proof of the Illyrian descent of the Albanian people.

ethnos, unassimilated, and they opted self-consciously to fight to protect their culture. From this point on, the culture that the folk protected from assimilation and alienation was called the ethno-culture (*etnokultura*) and it constituted the primary object of study for ethnographers	Illyrian elements of mythology and *Kanun* among the Albanians of Kosovo were proofs of their autochthony.
Feudalism. Continuous antagonism between classes, Arberesh aristocracy tended to get Byzantinised and it was again the free poor folk which preserved its ethno-culture, the treasure they had inherited from their Illyrian ancestors, and the name Albanian was spread because of the political domination of the Illyrian tribe of Albans in the Early Middle Ages. The situation became complicated with the arrival of the Slavs. Even through their kingdoms, Slavs did not succeed in assimilating Albanians. The new interest of the elite opposed to Byzantinum made them conscious of their ethnic origin, and this moment of cooperation between folk and the elite was the moment of the foundation of the first independent Albanian medieval kingdom in the mid-thirteenth century. **The Great Anti-Ottoman War led by Skanderbeg (1443 - 1468)** While the elite once again was Ottomanised, the memory of the national hero Skanderbeg, as it had been preserved by the folk was	Mythological narratives provided arguments that the territory up to near Raguza (present-day Dubrovnik) was inhabited by the Arberesh. Meanwhile, Albanian folklorists try to argue that Miloś Obilić was Albanian, as he is the hero of many Albanian folk songs in Kosovo. Actually he is the hero of many songs of Albanians from Kosovo, but recognised as Millosh Kopiliqi. But Albanian folklorists, like many of their Serbian colleagues, instead of analysing the myth, tried to make its presence in their people's respective epics as irrefutable historical evidence. Archaeological data provide evidence that Albanians in general were not a pastoral nomadic people, but practised intensive agriculture and had permanent settlements. Albanian folklorists have collected folklore dedicated to Skanderbeg, in order to prove that his contribution to the nation was never forgotten.

accepted by the emerging class of bourgeoisie. The National Revival began, and it reached its peak in 1912, with the declaration of independence. But the Imperialist Powers (the Great Powers of the time: Russia, Great Britain, Germany, Austro-Hungary, France, and Italy), protecting the interests of Serbia, Greece, and Bulgaria, left more than half of ethnically Albanian territory outside the political borders of the new and weak Albanian state.	
Capitalism Under King Zog's rule, elites tended to became Westernised. Once again the people preserved the ethno-culture.	Zog's regime was not interested in ethnographical science.
Socialism, aspiring toward communism. The dictatorship of the proletariat, power to the people.	The people's aspirations were fulfilled with the new regime, so the folk culture, after a process of purging itself of foreign elements, as well as some other archaic and anti-democratic ones, should be incorporated into the new socialist culture, the result of which will be 'socialist popular culture'.

Conclusions

In this paper, I tried to analyse the dependence of Albanian ethnography on political ideology and its institutional dependence on history. I have outlined the theoretical precursors of ethnography before its institutionalisation, and analysed the main theoretical articles, which were always subject to the Party's control. I have tried to depict the way that political control was imposed on researchers, through the orders of the Party of Labour of Albania and Enver Hoxha, and through the Base Organisation of the Party. Much remains to be done in analysing all the documentation, articles, and memo-

ries of the ethnographers themselves. Only in this way can we obtain a better understanding of what we inherited from the past, and how this legacy affects the actual development of the discipline in Albania today.

References

Bardhoshi, N. 2009. Teoria etnografike e Rrok Zojzit mbi të drejtën kanunore. Një vështrim kritik. *Kultura popullore* 1/2: 69–94.

———. 2013. The Ethnography of Law in a Dictatorial Situation. In A. Bošković and C. Hann (eds.), *The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945-1991*, pp. 175-189. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Buda, A. 1976a. Fjala e mbylljes. *Konferenca Kombëtare e studimeve etnografike*, pp. 10–12.

———. 1976b. Etnografia shqiptare dhe disa probleme te saj. *Konferenca Kombëtare e studimeve etnografike*, pp. 15–35.

Cami, T. 1976. Fjala e hapjes. *Konferenca Kombëtare e studimeve etnografike*, pp. 7–8.

Doja, A. 2013. Folkloric Archaism and Cultural Manipulation in Albania under Socalism. In A. Bošković and C. Hann (eds.), *The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945-1991*, pp. 153-174. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Dojaka, Abaz dhe A. G. 1973. Rezultatet e punes. *Etnografia shqiptare* 4: 13-24.

Fjalori Filozofik. 1973. Tiranë: Shkolla e lartë e Partisë.

Gjergji, A. 1988. *Veshjet popullore shqiptare në shekuj: origjina, tipologjia, zhvillimi*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të RPSSH.

———. 2004. *Leksione etnologjike*. Tiranë: Afërdita

Halili, R. 2009. *Oralnośc i piśmienność. Epika ludowa wśród Albańczyków i Serbów*. PhD thesis. University of Warsaw.

Historia e Popullit Shqiptar. 1959, 1964, 1985, 2002. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të RPSSH, Akademia e Shkencave të Shqipërisë.

Hysa, A. 2010. Ethnography in the Communist Albania: Nationalist Discourse and Relation with History. *Historical Seminar* 8: 103–125.

———. 2011. Mbi studimin e qytetit në etnografinë shqiptare të periudhës socialiste. *Kultura Popullore* 1/2: 163-187.

Kostallari, A. 1973 Mbi shtresëzimin e të drejtës kanunore. *Etnografia shqiptare* 4: 25-28.

Lelaj, O. 2011 Një analizë kritike e studimeve etnografike shqiptare mbi shoqërinë e 'real socializmit' ne Shqipëri. *Kultura Popullore* 1/2: 199-224.

Marx, K. *Theses on Feuerbach*. http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/index.htm.

Muka, A. 2005. *Ndërtimet fshatare dhe shtëpia e madhe*. Tiranë: Geer.

Pollo, S. 1976. Kultura popullore shprehje e vecorive etnike dhe e formimit te kombit shqiptar. *Konferenca Kombëtare e studimeve etnografike,* pp. 37–49.

Onuzi, A. 1988. *Poçeria tradicionale në Shqipëri*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të RPSSH.

Schwandner-Sievers, S. 2009. "Jungfrauen" und "Elefanten im Porzellanladen": Zur internationalen Herausforderung der albanischen Ethnologie im Postsozializmus. In O. J. Schmitt, and E. A. Frantz (eds.), *Albanische Geschichte: Stand und Perspektiven der Forschung*, pp. 187–214. Wien: Oldenbourg Verlag.

Shkurti, S. 1983. Sprovë për klasifikimin e parmendave shqiptare. *Etnografia Shqiptare* 13: 101–131.

———. 2003. *Bujqësia në Arbërinë e shekujve 13 – 17*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të Shqipërisë

———. 2004. *Tradita bujqësore ndër shqiptarë*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të Shqipërisë

Tirta, M. 1976. Probleme të besimeve në kulturën popullore. *Konferenca Kombëtare e studimeve etnografike*, pp. 301–310.

____. 2003. *Etnologjia e Përgjithshme*, Tiranë: Geer

———. 2004. *Etnologjia e Shqiptarëve*. Tiranë: Geer.

———. 2010. *Etnologu Rrok Zojzi- studius i shquar i etnokultures shqiptare*. Conference paper, Tirana, 29.12.2010.

Thomo, P. 1991. *Urbanistika dhe arkitektura e Korces*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të Shqipërisë.

Voell, S. 2011. The Kanun in Ethnographic Self-description. Research into Albanian Traditional Law During Socialism. In U. Brunnbauer, C. Kraft, and M. Schulze Wessel (eds.), *Sociology and Ethnography in East-Central and South-East Europe: Scientific Self-Description in State Socialist Countries*, pp. 277–294. München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag.

UçI, A. 1997. Për një rivlerësim kritik të përvojës së zhvillimit të kulturës popullore. *Kultura popullore* 1/2: 173–186.

Xhagolli, A. 1997. Arritje dhe probleme të folkloristikës dhe të etnologjisë shqiptare. *Kultura popullore* 1/2: 3–15.

Zojzi, R. 1962a. Etnografia shqiptare në pesëmbëdhjetë vjetorin e themelimit. *Etnografia shqiptare* 1: 3–11.

———. 1962b. Ndamja krahinore e popullit shq.iptar. *Etnografia shqiptare* 1: 16–62.

Chapter 7

Folkloric Archaism and Cultural Manipulation in Albania under Socialism

Albert Doja

At the beginning of the twentieth century, scholarship on Albania promoted the idea that Albania and the Albanians were still at the stage of being 'unknown', the last 'undiscovered' region in the Balkans, so close and yet so far on the south-eastern 'margins of Europe' (cf. Herzfeld 1987). Orientalising and Balkanising images singled out certain seemingly 'archaic' phenomena which were labelled and reified as 'Albanian'. They put emphasis on Albania's so-called tribes and their primitive laws, archaic blood revenge, and the primitiveness and purity of the indigenous people.

This concern among native scholars for the identification of the ancient elements of Albanian culture, pursued both consciously and unconsciously, culminated in the stylised text of customary law (Gjeçovi 1993 [1933]) published by the Albanian Franciscans of Shkodra who had a clear social and political agenda. The Franciscans saw themselves as working toward an enlightened revitalisation of the Albanian nation. Their overarching goal and barely disguised objective was to provide Albanians with a national identity, and to strengthen and unify the nation. Their goal was not to record customary law, but to improve it.

The image of the Albanians at the beginning of the twentieth century was frozen until the end of the century, when the country opened again to foreign travellers. At the beginning and at the end of the twentieth century, the mountainous territories of northern Albania were exploited in very similar ways. Many Western scholars and journalists continue to flock to the highlands in search of what they imagine to be the distilled essence of the mountain spirit, a barbarous and splendid anachronism embodied in a primitive and fearless mountain people living according to an ancient code of honour enforced by 'tribal' law on the margins of modern Europe.

This kind of literature, as a pure construction and an act of ethnocentrism, created a certain stereotype, not only of 'a land of the living past' (Durham 1994 [1909]: 1), but also a mixture of exoticism and 'Balkanism'

(Todorova 1997), partaking in the logic of many 'nesting orientalisms' (Bakic-Hayden 1995; see also Said 1978). The continued strength of such exoticism in Western scholarship during the twentieth century is striking: in the 1950s, Claude Lévi-Strauss had already bitterly deplored similar stances in *Tristes Tropiques* (1955). To borrow his terms, the literature on Albania represents another instance of the mistake made even within the profession of anthropology to believe that men are not always men, and that some are more deserving of interest and attention only because in the midst of Europe they astonish us by the apparent strangeness of their customs.

Anthropology emerged into modernity out of its exotic manifestation in colonial ethnology. The native ethnographies of central and eastern Europe also took shape in the historically-determined political, economic, social, and cultural conditions that accompanied the movements of national liberation to throw-off Ottoman, Russian, Prussian, and Habsburg overlords and establish independent nation-states. These conditions created a burning feeling of national resentment and a climate extremely favourable to the production or adoption of all-encompassing ideological solutions, which led the local intellectual elites to consider Romantic nationalism a viable strategy for overcoming the historical problems that faced their group (Greenfeld 1992). As a nationalist ideology, Romanticism started with German national resentment giving birth to pan-Germanism. Paradoxically, the threat stemming from German reactions induced a similar resentment giving birth to pan-Slavism. Other national elites reacted not only to pan-Germanism, but also to pan-Slavism; this was the case for developing forms of neo-Hellenism and Albanianism. Thus, a chain reaction of mutually imposed national frustrations and reactive exaltations were the driving force of the Romanticism that shaped 'imagined communities' and various forms of nationalism in the Balkans from the nineteenth century to the present.

The history of ethnography in Albania cannot be separated from the broader political and social context that generated widespread interest in the collection, description, preservation, and often exaltation of the 'nation'. Early ethnography was part of a broader category of native studies, often referred to as 'Albanology'. As is generally the case with native studies that also double as advocacy studies, especially throughout central and east European countries, Albanology has been institutionalised in Albania during periods when there was a felt need to confirm the nation's existence or to assert the legitimacy of its independence or claims to territory (cf. Naumović 1998). Albanology, and ethnography specifically, has been a nation-building discipline par excellence because it has provided cultural and historic evidence of Albanian existence, distinction, and legitimacy in confirmation with 'scientific' ideals.

Folkloric People's Culture Studies: Glorifying National Culture

Native Albanian scholars have long provided a unique view of Albanian tradition and folk culture in historical perspective, including material culture, social organisation, mythology and beliefs, and even some useful observations on social changes during socialism. Their researches are scattered in disparate publications or lost in the archives, as is the case with works on customary laws by Rrok Zojzi (see Bardhoshi, Kodra-Hysa, this volume) or on oral literature by Qemal Haxhihasani. Some works of the time have been republished in recent collections (e.g. Gjergji 2001, 2002, 2006; Ulqini 2003; Tirta 2003, 2004, 2007). It is difficult, however, for contemporary scholars to integrate these works with current anthropological questions and concerns. Although many of the earlier researchers explored Albanian issues in a relatively balanced way, their publications have been reproduced with little commentary, analysis, or revision. It is difficult to distinguish which of the older works is of continuing relevance because many of them were excessively empiricist and lack analytic depth, or even basic academic referencing standards.

In Albania, there was no equivalent to social anthropology before or during the socialist period; and this is still the case. The field has been dominated by 'national ethnography' as practiced by 'native ethnographers' (cf. Hofer 1968) and is known as studies of folk culture or better *people's* culture, to comply with both socialist era terminology and word-formation in English (as in 'people's democracy'). The standard term for ethnography in Albanian is the study of *kultura popullore*,[1] which is often rendered in English as 'studies of *popular* culture', and is taken to mean the totality of ideas, perspectives, attitudes, images, and other phenomena that are deemed to be preferred within the mainstream of Albanian culture. This translation is mistaken however, and 'people-science' is undoubtedly more accurate. The concerns of the field have corresponded with folklore studies if we take folklore at its primary meaning as 'knowledge of the people' or the study of 'the whole of the people's traditions, customs and arts'. The institutional history of these labels is tortuous and becomes even more difficult when well-defined tracks for professional training are absent. In Albania as

[1] The term is closer in meaning to the French *populaire*, which according to *Le Grand Robert Dictionary of French* means something like 'relative to the people, which belongs to and is part of the people, emanates from and is spread among the people, speaks to the people and remains within their reach, which is created and used by the people and not by the bourgeois and high class', than it is to the English *popular*, which according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* refers to what is 'liked, admired, or enjoyed by many people, held by the majority of the general public, carried on by the people as a whole, intended for or suited to the taste, understanding, or means of the general public'.

throughout eastern Europe, the study of *kultura popullore* has included investigations of material culture, folk art objects, oral traditions, myths, beliefs, customs, and the like. The shifting boundaries between folklore (focusing on oral traditions), ethnography (dealing primarily with customs and artefacts) and even physical anthropology (dealing with racial traits), should be seen as secondary divisions within a common project of national history.

Like national ethnography in other Balkan countries, including modern Greece (Herzfeld 1982), these studies were focused on the culture to which the researcher belonged. They celebrated a national model that is supposed to be deeply rooted in the past, uncovering an older and unsullied state of people's culture and people's spirit (*Volksgeist*), which inevitably gave these studies a nationalist orientation. In all cases, their methodology is based in folkloric data collection in the manner of German *Volkskunde*, which can be traced back to Herder's perspective on culture and other German Romantic reactions to the universalism underpinning French Enlightenment. As such, the field of people's culture studies in Albania can be viewed as a re-working of the German *kulturhistorische* school as part of a revitalisation movement; culture studies itself has served as 'a deliberate, organised, conscious effort to construct a more satisfying culture' (Wallace 1956: 265). In Albania, the role of national ethnography has been more precisely linked to movements of national awakening or 'rebirth' (*rilindja kombëtare*).

Much of people's culture studies in Albania, as elsewhere, is afflicted by what Roland Barthes called the 'virus of essence' (1993 [1957]). Such studies are conducted nation-wide and the village has always been the primary location of research, despite the tremendous impact of modernisation and the rural exodus that depopulated the countryside in the second half of the twentieth century. Social and economic change made it only more urgent to study the peasant milieu, now seen as the depository of a 'dying' way of folk life, customs, and communities. Even today, researchers focus on the urgent collection of traditions 'in danger of disappearing without leaving any trace' (Zojzi 1962: 7; similar statements are repeated in recent collections, e.g. Gjergji 2001: 26; Tirta 2003), paralleling the 'salvage ethnography' of colonial anthropology, in which 'old age', 'cultural isolation', and 'geographic remoteness' are deemed to reveal the embodiment of *shpirti popullor i kombit*, the 'national soul of the people'.

Following the tradition of many influential works of the interwar period (e.g. Çabej 1939), philological approaches to the study of the Albanian people carried higher prestige than other approaches, and were accompanied by greater professional opportunities. Institutionally, however, after a phase

within the short-lived National Institute of Sciences in 1940-44, people's culture studies were born in the aftermath of the Second World War and had a complex history under socialism. Following the reorganisation of the National Institute of Sciences in 1947 (see Kodra-Hysa, this volume), people's culture studies were recognised in 1955 under the auspices of the Institute of History and Linguistics. In 1960 people's culture studies became a body in their own right with the establishment of the Institute of Folklore. In 1979, this institute was transformed into the Institute of People's Culture Studies within the National Academy of Sciences that had been established in 1972. In 2008, the institute changed its name to the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Art Studies, and moved out of the Academy to be housed within a newly formed National Centre for Albanological Studies.

During the early decades of socialism the Herderian tradition of people's culture studies had another quite different tradition grafted on it. Under the label of 'ethnography', emulating Soviet *etnografiia* and following the logic of the latter's development and separation from *folkloristika*, as in other east European countries (cf. Valtchinova 2004), people's culture studies adopted a deliberately historical approach and privileged the search for origins, and for the most 'primitive state' of an object, practice, or ritual. Culture was conceived of as *etnokultura*, and emphasised a deliberately ethnicised concept of the folk, which merged into that of people and nation (*kultura popullore-kombëtare*). Ethnography was associated with an array of arts and techniques performed in order to transmit the stock of memory, knowledge, and practices through the generations. All were to be read as crystallisations of the past, with the material artefact coming to be seen as a direct testimony to primordial origins, thus functioning in a similar way to historical records.

Such studies tended to privilege and celebrate the material framework of 'people's life' over the verbal or spiritual dimensions of tradition. This corresponded to the axiom of the determinant character of the material world and of the labour value in Marxist social theory. In this way, the material culture of traditional rituals and customs was separated from 'spiritual culture', which was in turn separated from the study of verbal and musical arts, as distinct sub-fields of people's culture studies. These demarcations have obscured the structural and functional bases of cultural practices. A programmatic paper presented to the National Conference of Ethnographic Studies in 1976 (Uçi 1977), which can be considered to have laid down the main principles of the transformation of the Institute of Folklore into the reformed Institute of People's Culture, and perhaps the appointment of the author as its first official Director in 1979, was especially intended to show the effects of time and the changes occurring in social conditions and ways

of life under socialism. As stated by the soon-to-be Comrade Director of the Institute of People's Culture, 'a typical and very interesting renovation of folklore', considered to be 'a critical appropriation of people's cultural heritage motivated by socialist ideology', was the modification of its functions (Uçi 1977: 79-80). Although the people did not entirely lose a spiritual life, the religious, magical, and ceremonial functions of folklore were assumed to have 'atrophied', and to have been replaced by a sense of the decorative. Folklore was 'increasingly activated in the spiritual life of society with its artistic-aesthetic functions' (Uçi 1977: 79-80). Official studies of people's culture thus came to overestimate the purely material or artistic character and instrumental or aesthetic functions of symbolic forms and cultural practices, and to neglect the anthropological study of their semantic and functional values. This method erected an artificial division between research on artistic and oral traditions and that on social and cultural systems as a whole. Folk songs and other verbal forms of oral traditions or handicrafts and other objects of material culture had to be evaluated in artistic terms, while rites and many other practices could only be considered as vestiges and survivals of some folkloric institution. Recent reproductions of research conducted during the socialist era maintain these interpretive practices without revision (e.g. Gjergji 2006).

The dichotomies spiritual/material and ceremonial/artistic emerged in different forms, but the attention to 'survivals' was consistent with the nineteenth-century evolutionism of Tylor and Frazer as well as the folkloric paradigm of *Reliktforschung* in Europe generally (Bausinger 1993). The Albanian case was extreme in the extent to which symbolic forms and cultural practices were considered as isolated islands preserved from modernisation and contact with learned culture. Peasant culture was taken to reflect a primitive, initial state of things, which led to a burgeoning of detailed studies of various items of traditional culture, taken outside historical time. For example, the purported practice of couvade in which a man ritually simulated labour pains during a woman's birth, and the existence of 'sworn virgins' who take on male social roles and identities, were both characterised as vestiges (*mbeturina*) of a hypothetical matriarchy (Gjergji 1964; but see Doja 2005 for a critical reassessment).

Employing a historicising terminology, scholars of Albanian people's culture did recognise syncretic processes between various cultural and religious systems. While they were concerned to show the temporal depth of the phenomena they studied, they still avoided historical chronology. Quantitative calculation was replaced by a qualitative terminology: the labels 'pagan' or 'archaic' were (and remain) co-extensive with 'popular' or 'authentic'. In turn, the 'people' in *kultura popullore* slipped easily from conno-

tations of 'traditional' and 'archaic' into a political equation of the deliberately ethnicised concept of folk (*etnokultura*), which merged into that of people and nation (*kultura popullore-kombëtare*), increasingly associated with an additional socio-class understanding of the 'people' in contemporary socialist society leading to the creation of a 'socialist nation'. The task was always to assign cultural forms and practices a qualitative place in the process of historical becoming according to a vision which, evolutionary in its essence, at least sought to simulate the procedures of a method of classification. Skilfully arranged in the drawers of time where dates are irrelevant, they had no secret to reveal, and 'survivals' no longer had any function worth further investigation.

In this sense, one may wonder how to understand the alleged 'strong commitment to fieldwork' (Hann 2007: 56, n. 35) that is argued to have been conducted to a level of 'exceptional quality' (Bošković 2007: 16) in many former communist countries of central and eastern Europe, including Albania. Fieldwork is, in any case, not conducted according to the standards imagined by most professional socio-cultural anthropologists. At the beginning of the twentieth century, when Franz Boas and Bronislaw Malinowski insisted on the modern importance of fieldwork and displaced the Frazerian interest in survivals, they firmly believed that they had inaugurated a new epoch for the development of their discipline that would enable objective comparisons between human communities and the scientific study of culture and society. Indeed, the achievements of their revolutionary theory and method were basically a move away from historicism and folklorism towards social science, and helped established modern anthropology in the succeeding decades. By contrast, in their efforts to seize the authentic traditions of people's culture such as they were supposed to have functioned in a society of official ideology, Albanian scholars (like their fellows in other east European countries) were devoted to producing snippets of localised and historicised descriptions of primordial materials suited for folkloric archives. The uncritical juxtaposition of reported customs, artefacts, dresses, habitations, tools, utensils, songs, dances, rites and ceremonials, as exemplified by people's culture scholars, is hardly an exaggeration of what was once unforgettably denounced by Edmund Leach as the 'butterfly collecting' of older forms of anthropology which dealt with cultural materials as 'bounded and distinguishable as species types and classifiable as such in a kind of Linnaean taxonomy' (Leach 1961: 4). People's culture scholars in Albania as in other east European countries can freely be such "descriptive collectors of local butterflies", because they have been unable and unwilling to go beyond their own experiences and tolerate explanations that transcend their local setting. To date, my own book on Albanian age-grading practices (Doja

2000), is still dismissed in Albania simply because it raises larger comparative issues. As it is been reported to me, for my Albanian colleagues it is unacceptable to imply that 'the culture of our own great Albanian people looks African'. This might be hearsay, but it is indicative of how anthropology is taken to be in Albania.

The main objective of my work was neither to show the authentic and culturally specific 'Albanian' character of the data that I analysed, nor to show a similarity with data collected elsewhere in other cultures. Rather, my intent was to expose Albanian cultural data to a thorough analysis from the perspective of a comparative approach based on the best achievements of contemporary social anthropology. Driven by a comparative analytical concern, I wanted to shed an anthropological light on the specific features of Albanian culture that were still unexplored by Albanian studies. The theoretical objective of my work was to show that even the analysis of data from a particular culture, in my case Albanian, can reveal cultural diversity across human communities. In turn, through the comparative analysis of ostensibly similar cases across the world Albanian culture cannot be unique or exceptional in its achievements; nor can it be summarily described as either Western or Eastern; European or Other; or in hierarchical relations to African, Melanesian, or Amerindian cultures. Albanian culture is just as important as other cultures, without exception, to provide anthropological explanations on human history and society.

If anthropological analyses are comparative and cosmopolitan in nature, the subject matter of anthropology is only apparently the study of different customs in other cultures. Anthropology's main objective is to explain cultural diversity by means of the unified and common ways that humankind uses to produce culture, ideas, norms, institutions, and social behaviour. Only on that basis could anthropology legitimately make sense of specific cultural singularities in any given society, including the anthropologist's own society.

Clearly, the broad contrast between the comparative enquiries carried out by anthropologists in western Europe and the types of study carried out within disciplines devoted to the study of culture in eastern Europe have long been recognised and articulated (Hofer 1968; Halpern and Hammel 1969). Both traditions are profoundly political, but the political background to the growth of anthropology in an empire-building project differs radically from the political background to the development of culture studies in nation-building projects. Empire-building encouraged comparative and theoretical knowledge, while nation-building required descriptive and factual information.

Despite the great contrast in the methodological and theoretical scopes of anthropology studies and the study of people's culture, it is commonly maintained in Albania that the two traditions are essentially the same field. As elsewhere in eastern Europe, the differences are explained as reflecting temporal or regional variations within a single discipline. Since the beginning of the 2000s, many Albanian scholars naively expected that a mere change of terminology at the institutional level would suffice to overcome, or at least blur, the differences between the two disciplines. As in almost all other east European countries, 'anthropology' has become fashionable (Skalnik 2002). People with diverse education and training, including public intellectuals and media figures, have recast themselves as 'anthropologists' or 'culturologists' and pontificate about general theories of human nature, culture, and society. At the level of public debate, these 'anthropologists' have joined other scholars, writers, literary theorists, and critics in launching and conducting debates on Albanian 'psychology' and the 'national soul', mixing within their arguments statements about the glorious Albanian past, cultural heritage, folk culture, ethnic territory, and the importance of 'blood' or other racial traits. Within these debates only the invocation of 'anthropology' is new: questions of language, philology, folklore, customs, and traditions have long provided the core arguments for the great debate on modernity in Albania. As elsewhere in south-eastern and central Europe, broad public discourse on people's culture and folk ways of life has contributed to the essentialisation of national character and underwritten popular forms of nationalism (cf. Karnoouh 1990; Verdery 1991).

The rapid appearance of 'anthropologists' in the postsocialist period is eloquent testimony to the use of a disciplinary label as a device of distinction in an uncertain field of academic redistribution of power (cf. Bourdieu 1979). Like Moliere's *Monsieur Jourdain,* who suddenly realised that he was speaking in prose, many realised one beautiful day around 2008, when the Institute of People's Culture Studies also changed its name, that they were really anthropologists. Many of those who have re-identified themselves as 'anthropologists' without undertaking additional professional training believe that the merits of their work and collections will be positively re-valued in universal terms as representing the kind of 'ethnography' practised by anthropologists. Some self-proclaimed anthropologists take a more nationalistic approach, and claim that 'anthropology' has existed in Albania since the 'Dark Ages' of the Pelasgian-Illyrian period. Anthropology is thus reconfigured, not as an academic discipline, but as a mystical national ideology. This 'national anthropology' (*antropologjia kombëtare*) has protected 'our' people's culture from foreign assimilation and 'brought it safely through Illyrian-Albanian history to the global overture of democracy

and market capitalism today' (Kabo 2006). Statements like this one, that ascribe a protective role to the academic work of national anthropology is a direct continuation of the claim made during socialism that national studies existed to protect the people's culture from the class distortions of high culture and its alien exploitative and disruptive intentions.

Clearly, the problems of distinguishing variant approaches within anthropology and of distinguishing anthropology from other forms of cultural study is complex. Changes in a discipline's name do not necessarily reflect or engender predictable changes in methodological and theoretical orientations. Nor do decorative details, like our very claims in this volume that cultural studies in the Balkans can be characterised as an 'anthropology on the margins', resolve the differences between scholarly traditions that are produced by the deep interpenetration of politics and science. It is relatively easy to depict the different methodologies and approaches that distinguish academic traditions in different societies. However, it is much more problematic and important to reveal the different political, social, ideological, and cultural implications of various traditions. Culture studies that are oriented towards the search for authentic and ancient customs and values in the researcher's own society are particularly likely to be entangled with nationalism and totalitarianism. Although this entanglement can be inadvertent and unintentional, such folklorically-oriented research traditions often become, deliberately and intentionally, the prey and fuel of political ideologies stemming from nationalistic claims or totalitarian regimes.

The reception of Romanticism turned people's culture studies into a weapon of politics and national pride. The task of these studies is to enforce identity construction in three ways. People's culture studies provide proof of national cultural unity despite the existence of heterogeneous local communities. They insist on the uniqueness, superiority, prestige, and autochthony of the nation vis-a-vis rival neighbouring cultures. And, they locate, with varying degrees of success, the nation's essential continuity from antiquity to the present. In Albania as in other countries on the south-eastern 'margins of Europe' (Herzfeld 1987), these principles are at work in people's culture studies and throughout the historical sciences. Albanian people's culture studies are perceived primarily as a 'national' science that is supposed to uncover the *Volksgeist* and contribute to understanding Albanian superiority. The main studies of 'national' and people's culture in Albania are clearly caught-up in celebrations of the nation, and can be accused of being a 'nationalist discipline' as happened to *Volkskunde* in Germany and in folklore studies elsewhere (Emmerich 1968; Gerndt 1987; Dow and Lixfeld 1994; Lixfeld 1994).

If the principle of nationalism 'asserts that political unity and national unity must be congruent' (Gellner 1997 [1983]: 11), more than anything else the eventual social units of the socialist polity were to be compact and reasonably homogeneous, especially in eastern Europe and in the Balkans including Albania. Though practitioners have preferred to claim only the 'salvage' aspects of their research, their contribution to cultural engineering has been brutal and dramatic. In Albania, many people had to be forcibly assimilated to the cultural norms described as 'Albanian', if not expelled or killed, as elsewhere in the Balkans.

From the initial period of nation-building in Albania, through socialism, and into the postsocialist period, the most important ideological implication of people's culture studies is that they are intricately linked to national politics. People's culture studies function to explore and construct a particular vision of the self against the other, and facilitate their own subversion as scholarship into a political instrument of propaganda. At the beginning of the socialist period, communist leaders were initially hostile to this seemingly petit-bourgeois discipline, with its curious obsession for the preindustrial peasantry who were the supposed repository of the unsullied essence of the nation. Before long, however, communist powerholders concluded that such research was either harmless or useful in legitimating their own program.

Ideological Implications: The Construction of a People's Culture 'National in Form and Socialist in Content'

So far I have emphasised long-term continuities in Albanian people's culture studies, which pre-dated and out-lived socialism. In this section I want to look more closely at the limited changes and innovations which occurred in the socialist decades. As indicated, researchers continued to deal with 'the distinct cultural features of the people and their ethnic and national specificities' (Zojzi 1962: 3). People's culture studies extrapolated the past from the present, and re-constructed all the historical processes of cultural development from this retrospective prospective. During the socialist period, however, researchers were also charged with adopting a broader perspective on the study of socialist transformations and new ways of life, following the Stalinist concept of building a new people's culture to be 'national in form and socialist in content' (Zojzi 1962: 9).

At the first National Conference of Ethnographic Studies, the Comrade President of the National Academy of Sciences described how people's culture studies had to balance both nationalist and communist ideologies. Researchers, he said, had to 'engage in the major processes of revolutionary cultural transformations' and 'contribute to the socialist emancipation of

Albanian society' by 'capturing those essential aspects (of class struggle) that assign the place and role of people's culture in the creation of the new socialist culture' (Buda 1977: 33-34). In other words, researchers should not merely collect traditions of people's culture, but they should seek to expand the collection of 'survivals'. These 'survivals' of the old ways were to be both studied and transformed in order to be used to construct the full hegemony of a new morality.

The application of this ideological program was multifaceted. Those aspects of Albanian life which would seem exotic to an outsider, not only blood feud and customary laws, but also birth practices, cradle betrothals, marriage customs, inter-generational behaviour, and above all women's subordination, were the very traits targeted (with some justification) by the communist authorities as 'backward' and 'reactionary' customs (*zakone prapanike dhe reaksionare*) that needed to be eradicated. Tradition posed a serious obstacle to the creation of a desired socialist future, and it was not clear whether the force of tradition could be resisted along with other 'foreign reactionary and nihilistic influences' that threatened the establishment of socialism. Yet communist authorities were ambivalent in their critique of custom and tradition. They also considered that the traditions of the ancestors had to be cherished as symbols of identity for 'socialist patriotism and national pride', and allowed their study in the form of people's culture (*kultura popullore*).

As part of a socialist scholarly strategy of identity construction, customary law was recognised as a crucial element in Albanian history, even though it was obsolete and primitive according to communist ideology (see Bardhoshi, this volume). Of course, 'enlightened' members of rural society were considered to have long abandoned such an archaic way and adapted communist principles as their guide. The enactment of tradition as an integral part of village life was prohibited. In 1967, the Comrade Director of the Institute of History and Linguistics (where people's culture studies were based at the time) declared that customary laws were synonymous with 'ideological illness and cultural backwardness coming from the past, from which society could only recover with the strength of Marxist-Leninist ideology' (Kostallari 1972: 25). Following this declaration, people's culture studies was directed to systematically assist in bringing Marxist-Leninist ideology into practice.

By the late 1960s, the intensification of class struggle against reactionary and antiquated customs, religious prejudices, and old ways of living granted new tasks to Albanian people's culture studies. Researchers were tasked with 'directly contributing in the solution of the major duties set forth by the Communist Party toward the further development and intensification

of the ideological and cultural revolution in the country' (Dojaka and Gjergji 1972: 12). 'Urged to discover the historical roots and fight the reactionary philosophical foundations of corrupt customs that were holding back the development of society', people's culture scholars consciously 'focused their efforts in replacing them with new customs' (Dojaka and Gjergji 1972: 12).[2]

Albanian scholars contributed to an ideological, demagogic, and propagandistic process which I have described elsewhere as a process of state instrumentalisation or 'folklorisation of cultural traditions' (Doja 1998). There was a conscious, institutionalised selection, reconstitution, and promotion of certain cultural forms and practices, created in the official laboratories of people's culture studies in line with communist ideology. These selected traditions were disseminated in society as traditional and authentic people's cultural products and practices, to be incorporated in the contemporary socialist lifestyle and in the teaching of progressive socialist ethics.

Simultaneously, a 'censorship' was imposed upon genuine cultural traditions, as on all other aspects of social life (Doja 1998: 112). Only those practices and values considered interesting in terms of insularity and archival value were retained. These were subjected to multiple processes of selective updating and editing of their semantic and functional structures, in order to adapt to radically new requirements, mainly of an aesthetic nature. The national science was expected to contribute to the building of socialism and to play an active role in the aesthetic and moral education of the masses by the design and construction of a new people's culture. The new culture was to be 'national in form and socialist in content', according the Stalinist concept and very much influenced by the Chinese Cultural Revolution of the late 1960s, especially in so far as it was best expressed in the concept of the socialist 'New Man' (cf. Nikolla 2011).

Albanian scholars were urged to identify and recover those elements of Albanian customs, laws, culture, and arts that were believed to be very authentic, truly Albanian, and congruent with the new cultural norms and values. Social practices and cultural values that were not compatible with communist ideology, such as those related to private property, patriarchal attitudes, or religious beliefs and practices were to be considered 'inauthentic', 'alien', or 'disruptive' to Albanian socialist reality. These practices were to be removed from the realm of people's culture. Set apart as *zakone prapanike* (backward customs) that actually conflicted with communist morality by mirroring class interest or the world-view of a people living in darkness, these customs were further deemed to have entered circulation through

[2] Interestingly, the same statement is reproduced almost verbatim in recent collection (Gjergji 2001: 15), while nearly identical statements continue to be reproduced in other compilations (e.g. Tirta 2003).

foreign importation; to have originated from socio-economic conditions such as private property; to have been inherited from customary laws or the organisation of pre-socialist states; or to pertain to the bourgeois morals of exploiting and reactionary classes.

People's culture scholars were forced to reconfigure customary practices that were ideologically at odds with socialism, and official impressions of Albanian culture were heavily mediated by the 'domesticated' paraphernalia and often romanticised depictions of village life that were safely housed in the national museum and propagated in official publications and cultural activism. As stated by the future Comrade Director of the Institute of People's Culture, during the performance of folklorised activities, the performers were 'asserting their new personality as members of the socialist community, promoting the new aesthetic ideals and the new worldview and psychology, [and] embodying the transformations in the ways of life and the new higher artistic preferences' (Uçi 1977: 87-88).

Folklore festivals, more than anything else, were straightforward celebrations of national pride. Festivals promoted the production and performance of theatrical cultural practices, which were to be applied throughout the nation to the detriment of local variation. Even when regional differences were showcased, such as in the annual folklore festival in the southern town of Gjirokastra, music, dance, and costume were wholesomely detached from any 'backward' practices that were prevalent in the areas which had produced them. The aim was to show the national character of communities according to a vision in which people's culture was central to all of life's activities, and in which men and women joined their strong, resonant voices together to develop a vibrant people's art. People's culture studies were brought to task in the organisation of festivals to provide pseudo-scientific rationalisations of this vision. Scholars outlined the criteria for reproducing traditional costumes; helped conserve and direct the evolution of dances; organised festivals; evaluated the social and cultural status of performers and actors; and produced descriptions of the performed traditions that were all aimed to track the so-called development of 'contemporary folkloric people's culture' (e.g. in: Uçi 1980). The task of people's culture studies and activism was to validate the officially enforced ideals and worldviews that were supposed to represent the positive changes in people's lifestyles that were accompanying the economic and political changes in the country (see Doja 1998 for further details). Or, in the language of the time, practitioners of people's culture studies were to 'ethnographically validate' the impact of socialist economic developments and 'the great transformations from tradi-

tions to modernisations in the ways of life in rural areas' (e.g. Gjergji 2002).[3] In this way, people's culture studies were thus expected to contribute to an extremely important process of aesthetic and rational cultural 'cleansing' in the struggle against reactionary and evil vestiges of the past.

Ideological and political servility among scholars were enforced in many cases, transforming them into totalised subjects with virtually no scientific courage. Many of them were not as much concerned with the reception of their work in academic circles or in the larger public as they were concerned about the opinion of certain party leaders. In socialist countries, including Albania, the manipulation of the past and the present was the responsibility not only of politicians and official writers like historians, philosophers, and economists, but also of social and cultural scientists (cf. Tarifa 1996). Some practitioners of these studies would even adopt a very unethical behaviour, adjusting their findings to the official dogma of communist ideology and propaganda. Albanian farmers had, for instance, been dispossessed and were either 'proletarianised' by their entry into agricultural cooperatives, or 'urbanised' by their migration into the cities, or 'systematised' by other means of centralised measures. Nevertheless, the image of a 'virgin and non-capitalistic' people's culture was propagated by the state ideology and cultivated and administered by the practitioners of people's culture studies.

On the pretext of efficiency or, more simply, by absence of any genuine cultural and social project, such an industry of folklorism, as a pseudo-cultural project of reconstructions and modifications, generally reduced identity claims to a set of frozen values. Ultimately, the traditionalist approach deployed in Albanian studies reduced any attempts to explain people's culture into simple claims to identify its real or imagined roots, while the idealised conception of people's culture removed culture from history and from social life. Folk costumes, songs, and dances were promoted and folklore cultivated to give people a sense of their creative and authentic past, to construct a highly specific cultural identity, and to inculcate xenophobic and isolationist sentiments. Efforts within people's culture studies shifted to foster a sense of ethnic compactness and superiority against the identity of neighbouring Slavic and Greek cultures.

The new vision of people's democracy as a society without internal struggles required a new ideological model which could create an image of unity and homogeneity. This model was provided by national-socialism or the Stalinist concept that people's culture should be 'national in form and socialist in content'. In Albania, scholarly narratives on customary law and

[3] This recently published reference uncritically reproduces work of the time without revision.

other traditions of people's culture were manipulated to justify the formulation of state policies in the 'ideological struggle against backward customs' and the adoption of certain political solutions leading in many cases to cultural, social, and economic disasters. Scholarly narratives justified both the disastrous collectivisation of land and livestock in the late 1970s and the generalised isolationist and autarkic paranoia in many realms of social life. More than other social scientific disciplines, scholarly research that justified such policies inadvertently supported the terrorist repression that Albanian and other communist societies witnessed.

Arguably, even though indirectly, people's culture studies must have mattered in an extreme, sometimes devastating way for many people, giving legitimacy and laying 'theoretical foundations' to policies of class repression, expulsion, and resettlement of 'backward' and therefore 'alien' people. As stated by the Comrade Director of the Institute of History and Linguistics (where people's culture studies were based at the time), data from the systematic investigation of old traditions and backward customs were 'used by party committees and organisations to improve the value and impact of ideological and organisational work of the party', because 'they provide a more solid basis to improve analyses and syntheses in the ideological party work with the people' and 'they definitely help party workers to better know the people and more easily convey the party line to them' (Kostallari 1972: 24). In this way, people's culture studies seem to have provided a theoretical foundation for the communist policy of hegemonic control over the whole population. In a more concrete way, these attitudes indicated elite distrust, and even their contempt, for all forms of cultural creativity produced at the level of basic social units which escaped their direct control.

In summary, the practitioners of people's culture studies were only too pleased to participate in advancing notions of authenticity and superiority of the socialist people's culture, which turned them often into prestigious bearers of 'authority'. As such, people's culture studies during socialism in Albania and elsewhere, like their counterparts in German *Volkskunde*, must be unhesitatingly indicted as nationalist and communist apologists for official policies. Unequivocally, Albanian studies of people's culture in the socialist period, based on their conservative national and political objectives, were highly disposed if not even predestined to be used and misused under communist rule as a national science that could systemically stabilise state control. That is why the story must be told of a profession which had proclivities that predisposed its practitioners to make compromises with the new power holders. Full acknowledgment of this fact can become another instance of coming to terms with the communist past.

Epilogue

Anthropology also emerged into modernity out of its exotic manifestation in colonial ethnology (*Völkerkunde*), but it was tempered by the crisis of self-doubt that attacked it during the post-colonial era. Following decolonisation, the great majority of anthropologists discarded the notion of 'primitivism' constructed by their predecessors (Kuper 1988), along with the accompanying intellectual framework which had conceived the search for the essence of humanity as a search for what existed 'originally', 'before', under 'primitive', 'savage', or 'non-modern' conditions. In this way, they endeavoured to take anthropology towards new fields, leaving behind an association with colonial spaces that had so deeply marked the development of the discipline. The universalising of anthropology has been achieved by taking on board the implications of a more contemporary and informed philosophical epistemology that de-centred its original object.

If we want to definitely overcome 'the definitional straitjacket that we inherited from this history which wedged anthropology between nationalism and primitivism' (Pina-Cabral 2006: 665), a comparable transformation of the nation-building strand requires a more serious engagement with the Romantic debate on nationalism and its communist variations in eastern Europe, including Albania. Indeed, it is important to clearly show how the eighteenth-century Romantic legacy became corrupted in a variety of cultural and political ways by twentieth-century professionals. Only then can native micro-studies of people's culture be integrated into wider regional histories and cosmopolitan theory. Unfortunately, Albania is not ready for this challenge. Since the political change in the 1990s with the collapse of socialism and the fall of the totalitarian regime, people's culture studies have given no attention to the socio-cultural consequences of the rapid transformations that have resulted from democratisation and westernisation, despite the obvious importance of such contemporary processes.

Such issues have been approached by a new generation of scholars willing to draw on the theory and methodology of contemporary social sciences.[4] An increasing number of their works, which must be examined elsewhere, has started to make an impact on Albanian and international academic opinions. Actually, studying 'culture' as things, artefacts, arts, and techniques, is no longer in favour. People's culture studies – obsessed with the traditions, roots, and immutable structures of the national body and psyche – has started to leave room for a decisive turn to the present, with its

[4] I have worked in close collaboration with many promising young anthropologists. Suffice it to mention Smoki Musaraj, Olsi Lelaj, and Sofia Kalo, who have been my assistants during recent years when I have taught anthropology in Albania.

multifaceted and multi-coloured realities and ongoing processes. Almost absent during state socialism, anthropological research on social change is poised to become one of the most exciting new trends. It is possible that this new research may also seek to shape a more general idea of a society in transition, starting from basic anthropological concepts like kinship and social structure, or clientele and patronage, to rural migrations and urban settings, the dynamics between the working and white-collar classes, new solidarities and public opinions, civic activism, and political parties.

The problem is therefore not that the discipline of anthropology is unknown in Albania, but that people's culture studies continues to reproduce itself in the socialist-era model. Influential scholars continue to re-publish their main works from the socialist period without revision (e.g. Gjergji 2001, 2002, 2006; Tirta 2003, 2004, 2007). Many others, as elsewhere in central and eastern Europe (Skalnik 2002), continue to speak from an uncritical national perspective. These scholars never miss an opportunity to proclaim the autochthony, antiquity, or uniqueness of Albanian customs and oral traditions, which are claimed to be Homeric in their style and actual descent. Fictional idealisations like Ismail Kadare's novel *The H-File*, might be forgiven for such excesses, but it is not possible to forgive 'scientific' works that mingle Odysseus, the Sirens, and Achilles' horses into an analysis of mourning lamentations, folk polyphony, and native ethnomusicology (Tole 2005, 2011). Other authors continue to selectively suppress and upgrade their material, clearly identifying themselves with Shtjefën Gjeçovi's tradition (1993 [1933]) and other 'enlightened patriots' whose 'sense of mission' drives them to promote a positive national image and to support an explicit agenda for strengthening the nation, the family, and occasionally the Church. This claim to be promoting a higher good is made, for example, by the authors of a spate of books that has been published on the supposed unwritten laws in adjacent northern and southern areas (Ilia 1993; Meçi 1995, 2002; Elezi 2002; Martini 2007). More seriously, current state policy has encouraged a rapid increase in the number of students seeking doctoral degrees, and these students are pushed to retain the old methods of their supervisors (cf. Stewart 2007: 41 in his comment to Hann 2007).

In the final analysis, the real weakness in folkloric studies of people's culture is not simply that it is oriented towards the past, but that it tends to isolate its subjects in 'cultural quarantine'; it denies universal cultural tendencies, the common traits shared with other cultures and societies, and in particular those of Albania's immediate neighbours. In this respect, not only has this stance run counter to the dynamic of intercultural exchange, but also counter to a dynamic approach to culture which, in remaining open to all

influences and all re-elaborations whatever their origin, would confront past and present, tradition and modernity.

References

Bakic-Hayden, M. 1995. Nesting Orientalisms: The case of Former Yugoslavia. *Slavic Review* 54 (4): 917–931. (doi: 10.2307/2501399).

Barthes, R. 1993 [1957]. Le mythe aujourd'i. *Oeuvres complètes* 1: 681–719.

Bausinger, H. 1993. *Volkskunde ou l'ethnologie allemande: de la recherche sur l'antiquité à l'analyse culturelle*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme.

Bošković, A. 2007. Between ethnology and anthropology: Some former Yugoslav Perspectives. In C. M. Hann et al., *Anthropology's multiple temporalities and its future in East-Central Europe*, pp. 15-18. Working Paper 90. Halle/Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthrpology.

Bourdieu, P. 1979. *La distinction: critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Minuit.

Buda, A. 1977. Etnografia shqiptare dhe disa probleme të saj. Paper presented to the *Konferenca Kombëtare e Studimeve Etnografike* (28-30 qershor 1976 in Tirana). Proceedings by Akademia e Shkencave, pp. 15–35.

Çabej, E. 1939. Die albanische Volksdichtung. *Leipziger Vierteljahresschrift für Südosteuropa* 3 (3): 194–213.

Doja, A. 1998. Évolution et folklorisation des traditions culturelles. *East European Quarterly* 32 (1): 95–126.

———. 2000. *Naître et grandir chez les Albanais: la construction culturelle de la personne*. Paris/ Montreal: L'Harmattan.

———. 2005. Rethinking the Couvade. *Anthropological Quarterly* 78 (4): 919–951. (doi:10.1353/anq.2005.0053).

Dojaka, A., and A. Gjergji. 1972. Rezultatet e punës në fushën e etnografisë gjatë 25 vjetëve. *Etnografia Shqiptare* 4: 3–13. [Reprint in Gjergji 2001: 5–22].

Dow, J. R., and H. Lixfeld (eds.). 1994. *The Nazification of an academic discipline: Folklore in the Third Reich*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Durham, E. 1994 [1909]. *High Albania*. London: Virago.

Elezi, I. 2002. *E drejta zakonore e Labërisë*. 2nd ed. Tirana: Toena.

Emmerich, W. 1968. *Germanistische Volkstumsideologie: Genese und Kritik der Volksforschung im Dritten Reich*. Bd. 20. Tübingen: Tübinger Vereinigung für Volkskunde.

Gellner, E. 1997 [1983]. *Nationalism*. New York: New York University Press.

Gerndt, H. (ed.). 1987. *Volkskunde und Nationalsozialismus*. Münchner Beiträge zur Volkskunde. Bd. 7. München: Münchner Vereinigung für Volkskunde.

Gjeçovi, S. 1993 [1933]. *Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit*. Shkodra: Shtypshkronja Franceskane.

Gjergji, A. 1964. Vestigia del matriarcato in alcune antiche usanze della vita familiare. *Rassegna di Studi Albanesi* 1: 27–31.

———. 2001. *Ligjërata për etnologjinë shqiptare*. Tirana: Extra.

———. 2002. *Mënyra e jetesës në shekujt XII-XX*. Tirana: Kotti.

———. 2006. *Arti i zbatuar popullor*. Tirana: Ilar.

Greenfeld, L. 1992. *Nationalism: five roads to modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Halpern, J. M., and E. A. Hammel. 1969. Observations on the Intellectual History of Ethnology and Other Social Sciences in Yugoslavia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1): 17-26. (doi: 10.1017/S0010417500005120) (http://www.jstor.org/stable/178285).

Hann, C. M. et al. 2007. Anthropology's multiple temporalities and its future in East-Central Europe. *Working Paper* 90. Halle/Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthrpology.

Herzfeld, M. 1982. *Ours once more: folklore, ideology and the making of Modern Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1987. *Anthropology through the looking-glass: critical ethnography in the margins of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofer, T. 1968. Anthropologists and Native Ethnographers in Central European Villages: Comparative Notes on the Professional Personality of Two Disciplines. *Current Anthropology* 9 (4): 311-315. (http://www.jstor.org/stable/2740596).

Ilia, F. 1993. *Kanuni i Skanderbegut*. Shkodra: Botim i Arqipeshkvisë.

Kabo, P. 2006. *Autoritarizëm në tranzicion: antropologjia shqiptare përmes globalizmave*. Tirana: Plejad.

Karnoouh, C. 1990. *L'invention du peuple: chroniques de Roumanie*. Paris: Arcantère (Mémoires et Identités).

Kostallari, A. 1972. Mbi shtrirjen e shtresëzimin e së drejtës kanunore në Shqipëri dhe mbi disa çështje që lidhen me studimin e saj e me organizimin e luftës kundër mbeturinave të së vjetrës. *Etnografia Shqiptare* 4: 18–25.

Kuper, A. 1988. *The invention of primitive society: transformations of an illusion*. London/New York: Routledge.

Leach, E. 1961. *Rethinking anthropology*. London: Athlone Press.

Lévi-Strauss, C. 1955. *Tristes Tropiques*. Paris: Plon.

Lixfeld, H. 1994. *Folklore and fascism: the Reich Institute for German Volkskunde*. (ed. and transl. by James R. Dow). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Martini, X. 2007. *Kanuni i Dibrës*. Tirana: Emal.

Meçi, X. 1995. *Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit: varianti i Pukës*. Tirana: Cabej.

——. 2002. *Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit në variantin e Mirditës*. Tirana: Geer.

Naumovic, S. 1998. Romanticists or Double Insiders? An Essay on the Origins of Ideologised Discourses in Balkan Ethnology. *Ethnologia Balkanica: Journal for Southeast European Anthropology* 2: 101–120.

Nikolla, A. P. 2011. *L'uomo nuovo albanese: Tra morale comunista e crisi della transizione*. Roma: Bonanno.

Pina-Cabral, J. 2006. Anthropology challenged: Notes for a debate. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12 (3): 663–673. (doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9655.2006.00358.x).

Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.

Skalnik, P. (ed.). 2002. *A Post-Communist Millennium: the struggles for sociocultural anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*. Prague: Set Out.

Stewart, M. 2007. Reply to Chris Hann. In C. M. Hann et al., *Anthropology's multiple temporalities and its future in East-Central Europe*, pp. 39-41. Working Paper 90. Halle/Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthrpology.

Tarifa, F. 1996. Neither 'bourgeois' nor 'communist' science: Sociology in communist and post-communist Albania. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 29 (1): 103–113. (doi:10.1016/s0967-067x(96)80015-8).

Tirta, M. 2003. *Etnologjia e shqiptarëve*. Tirana: Geer.

——. 2004. *Mitologjia ndër Shqiptarë*. Tirana: Akademia e Shkencave.

——. 2007. *Panteoni e simbolika: doke e kode në etnokulturën shqiptare.* Tirana: Ilar.

Todorova, M. 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Tole, V. S. 2005. *Odiseja dhe Sirenat, grishje drejt viseve iso-polifonike të Epirit: një temë homerike me variacione*. Tirana: Uegen.

——. 2011. *Pse qajnë kuajt e Akilit? 'E qara me botë' dhe prejardhja e iso-polifonisë popullore shqiptare: sprovë etnomuzikologjike*. Tirana: Mediaprint.

Uçi, A. 1977. Vendi i artit popullor në kulturën artistike socialiste. Paper presented to the *Konferenca Kombëtare e Studimeve Etnografike*, (28-30 qershor 1976 in Tirana). Proceedings by Akademia e Shkencave, pp. 75–92.

Uçi, A. (ed.). 1980. *Probleme të zhvillimit të folklorit bashkëkohor (Simpozium): Festivali folklorik kombëtar 1978 dhe problemet aktuale të shkencave etnografike-folklorike*. Tirana: Akademia e Shkencave.

Ulqini, K. 2003. *Struktura e shoqërisë tradicionale shqiptare*. Shkodra: Idromeno.

Valtchinova, G. 2004. Folkloristic, Ethnography, or Anthropology: Bulgarian Ethnology at the Crossroads. *Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Europe* 4 (2): 2-18. (doi:10.1525/jsae.2004.4.2.2).

Verdery, K. 1991. *National ideology under socialism: identity and cultural politics in Ceausescu's Romania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wallace, A. F. C. 1956. Revitalization movements. *American Anthropologist* 58 (2): 264–281.

Zojzi, R. 1962. Etnografia shqiptare dhe veprimtaria shkencore e zhvilluar në këtë fushë. *Etnografia Shqiptare* 1: 3–11.

Chapter 8
The Ethnography of Law in a Dictatorial Situation

Nebi Bardhoshi

This chapter shows how 'doing legal ethnography' in Albania during communism was more than an academic activity. It was above all a state-oriented 'business' to create a new social memory which would legitimate the political system (Connerton 1989: 3). In the communist era, with few exceptions, all research in this field was carried out by native ethnographers (cf. Hofer 1968). The main exception was the work of the Russian ethnographer Julia Ivanova (Ivanova 1960: 114-33), but even she followed the methodology and theoretical frameworks used by local scholars to interpret *kanun* law.

Several terms have been used by Albanian ethnographers to denote the study of unwritten law. I use the term *kanun* inclusively, and translate it as 'customary law'. This choice is pragmatic in the local politics of naming, and not rooted in the debates within legal anthropology about how to classify customary law (e.g. Rouland 1994: 315-16). Several terms are used by Albanian scholars to reference unwritten legal forms, including *e drejtë zakonore* (customary or traditional law), *e drejtë dokesore* (legal mores), and (more rarely) *e drejtë popullore* (folk law). Among these variants, there has been controversy surrounding the most commonly used term, *e drejtë zakonore*, because *zakon* (an otherwise common Albanian word) has Slavic roots. Under the influence of linguist Eqrem Cabej and ongoing concerns for language purification (which reached a high point in the 1970s and 1980s), some scholars have preferred to use *e drejtë dokesore*; such a choice also helps to deny the claims of Yugoslav scholars that the customary law found in Northern Albania originated from Tsar Dušan's Code of 1349 CE (see Pupovci 1972: XVIII-CX). I use *kanun* as a shortened version of *e drejtë kanunore* inclusively to refer not only to the particular corpuses of customary law that have been identified by Albanian ethnographers, but also to all forms of unwritten law. As discussed below, ethnographers who pursued cohesive bodies of *kanun* often only succeeded in collecting individual examples of unwritten law and mores.

To grasp a wider picture of what happened in the production of ethnographic knowledge about *kanun* and traditional culture during communism in Albania, ethnographic texts should be read with a consideration for how they were produced in a dictatorial situation (Lelaj 2011: 199-224; 2013). Neither a purely theoretical approach to analysing Albanian ethnography in terms of nationalism and communism, nor a critique of the differences between international anthropology and national ethnology (e.g. Schwandner-Sievers 2012), would help us to grasp the real cause of the homogenised language that appears across the Albanian ethnography of *kanun*. The dictatorial situation which based its legitimacy on the dual ideologies of communism and nationalism produced a schizophrenic attitude in the study of *kanun* law in which the *kanun* of the past is revered, but its presence in socialist times is reviled. This chapter therefore explores the political and ideological circumstances that constrained the study of *kanun*. It draws primarily on unpublished ethnographic data in the Albanian Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Art Studies.[1]

Legal Ethnography between Ethnography and Anthropology

When I started working at the Institute of Folk Culture (IFC) in 2002, two general ideas prevailed among my older colleagues. First, ethnography (*etnografia*) was considered an inferior form of cultural and social analysis in comparison to socio-cultural anthropology (*antropologji social-kulturore*). The translation of a chapter of Claude Lévi-Strauss's *Structural Anthropology*, the first publication about 'anthropology' to appear in Albanian, helped to create this perception of a gulf between the two strands of anthropology in the early 1990s (Lévi-Strauss 1992). Second, despite the greater appeal of anthropology over ethnography, Albanian researchers were generally convinced that their analysis and understanding of Albanian culture was much deeper and more thorough than that of any foreign researchers. While foreign researchers might be theoretically more sophisticated, the native ethnographers thought they could compensate by virtue of their local knowledge. These opinions were strongly expressed in debates during the early 1990s, when some researchers at the IFC favoured changing the discipline's name to 'ethnology' (*etnologjia*).

Other innovations in the naming and division of sub-fields within ethnography were also discussed in the 1990s. Mark Tirta, for example, coined the term 'legal ethnology' (e*tnologji juridike*). During the communist period,

[1] From 1979-2008 this institute was known as the Institute of People's Culture Studies (see Doja, Kodra-Hysa this volume), but for the sake of simplicity I shall refer to it as the Institute of Folk Culture.

the field of studies dealing with 'ethno-legal phenomena' was known as ethno-legal science (*shkencë etno-juridike*) (Nova 1989: 13). Tirta's innovation was not widely adapted. Since 2000, the terms 'legal anthropology' and the 'anthropology of law' have occasionally appeared, but they too have not been widely adapted. In part, this is because 'anthropology' has continued to be associated by most Albanians with physical anthropology. But, the reluctance to adapt new terms to describe the study of ethno- legal phenomena also relates to the preference of local scholars to continue their research in 'ethnography' rather than related fields. I therefore use the term 'legal ethnography' to denote the corpus of ethnographic works under consideration.

Ethnographers who oppose changing the name of the discipline are not only reluctant to accept the hierarchy of knowledge outlined by Lévi-Strauss. They also feel that a tradition had been created under the term ethnography and that it should continue as such.[2] Ethnography continues to be understood and practised as the self-consciously and deliberately 'Albanian' field of study that formed during the communist period. The field's national aspirations combined uniquely with communist ideology and a dictatorial situation to shape the subject of study as well as habits of description and analysis.

For example, when exploring the archives of the ethnographic section of the former IFC, I was surprised to come across a number of works translated mostly from Soviet ethnography (*etnografiia*), exploring the history of ethnography and anthropology, the position of Soviet ethnography toward Western bourgeois cosmopolitan studies, and theoretical developments in Yugoslav ethnology. None of this literature was cited in works published by Albanian researchers. The politics of translation at the IFC allowed young researchers access to other traditions and even to works dealing with general concepts such as tribal organisation, culture, politics, and law. Also available in translation were the works of foreign researchers dealing with Albania's tribal organisation and customary law. Apart from Western scholars, most of these studies were the work of Yugoslav ethnologists (Nedejleviq 1956; Vukosaloviq 1957; Dobrankoviq 1972; Bajraktaroviq 1974, 1976, 1981; Vuesloviq 1976). It was considered necessary to have these translations from Yugoslav ethnologists so that Albanian ethnographers could respond to the theoretical perspectives raised by their colleagues in Yugoslavia.

[2] The terms 'ethnography' and 'ethnology' seem to have gained legitimacy in Albania due to the prefix *ethnos*, which in Albanian is used synonymously with ethnic group, people, and even nation (see Tirta 2003). The term 'anthropology' has never had such recognition. It was rejected in former Yugoslavia because it was seen as a Western colonial discipline (Bošković 2005), but no such debate has taken place in postsocialist Albania.

Throughout the communist period, ethnographic publications were also expected to cite only authors whose work could be identified as contributing to the modernisation of the Albanian communist nation. Despite a general exclusion of foreign scholarship, a few researchers such as Franz Nopcsa and Edith Durham were considered to have made positive contributions, as was Shtjefën Gjeçovi who codified the *Kanun of Lekë Dukagjini*. Other works, notably those on *kanun* compiled by the Franciscan priests in Shkodra, were discarded because of the authors' political affiliations. The Franciscan priests had opposed communism and collaborated with the Fascist Italian and Nazi German armies.

Similarly, my academic supervisor told me that even in the communist period, IFC researchers had access to classic works in social and cultural anthropology. Morgan's *Ancient Society* (1877), Tylor's *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization* (1865), and Frazer's *The Golden Bough* (1890) – all classical accounts of lineal evolutionism – were explicitly cited. Albanian ethnographers adapted the concept of 'development stages' from Engels and Morgan, that of 'cultural survivals' from Tylor, and that of 'culture areas' from the anthro-geographic and cultural diffusionist schools. The works of other classic cultural and social anthropologists, such as those by Malinowski, Boas, and Mauss, were available, but researchers were obliged to take a critical stance towards this 'bourgeois' literature.

In general, a strict (if unwritten) citation policy was applied, according to which the researcher had first to cite everything that Enver Hoxha had written, second the relevant works of the classical authors of Marxism-Leninism, and lastly, any specialised works that had been ratified by the 'official line'.[3] Although many works were proscribed on the basis of these criteria, they were nonetheless available to Albanian researchers in the archive, where they were classified for 'internal use only'. Researchers could make extensive use of them, but not mention either the work or the author. Actual instances of engagement between Albanian ethnographers and foreign works are thus rendered invisible in actual publications.

The Official Birth of Ethnography: The Past in the Socialist Present

The appointment of Rrok Zojzi, followed shortly afterwards by Andromaqi Gjergji, in 1947 as scientific researchers at the National Institute of Sciences

[3] For example, the *Bibliography of Albanian Ethnography* begins with a 53-page listing of Enver Hoxha's publications on culture and society; this represents nearly one-sixth of the entire volume (Gjergji 1980).

marked the birth of national ethnography as a discipline and profession in Albania (see Tirta 2003; Bardhoshi 2009).[4] The first phase of ethnographic studies under the communist regime was devoted to gathering evidence of the folk culture (*kultura popullore*).[5] Under socialism, the ethnographers' duty was to depict Albanian traditional society and ways of life in a society committed to breakneck change. Thus the gathering of ethnographic data was valued for its own sake, and had higher priority than analysis and publication of the findings in scientific periodicals. As with other topics that Zojzi identified as being important for ethnographers to study, *kanun* was considered to be in danger of disappearing without a trace under the conditions of rapid change being experienced by Albania (Zojzi 1956a: 144). Correspondingly, the expeditions led by the charismatic Zojzi targeted remote highland villages in the belief that the essence of Albanian culture, including customary law, was best preserved there, because those areas were relatively free from any foreign cultural contamination due to the difficult topography. As Zojzi's vision for ethnography was based on the principle of 'isolation', ethnographers only rarely approached urban settings (cf. Bošković 2005: 10).

In 1952, an ethnographic expedition was undertaken by researchers from the Section of Ethnography in the Institute of History to the areas of Albania where Georg von Hahn had documented *The Canun of Scanderbeg* in the nineteenth century (Hahn 1867: 21). The expedition confirmed the *kanun*'s existence and documented it meticulously (Zojzi and Gjergji 1952). The importance of this particular expedition for the newly created Section of Ethnography was twofold. On the one hand it expanded the geography of customary law in the country. On the other hand, it confirmed that national hero Skanderbeg, who was officially glorified in the state's historiography, was also present in social memory.[6] The ethnographers saw themselves as belonging to a new profession through which the state could verify Albania's

[4] According to Mark Tirta, Zojzi's appointment followed an official dinner held to honour a Yugoslav scientific delegation. Zojzi's name was proposed by the Yugoslav delegation for a position as scientific collaborator at the Zagreb Institute of Science. The Albanian Minster of Education responded that he could serve only as an external collaborator to the Zagreb Institute because he had just been appointed as a full-time researcher at the Institute of Sciences in Tirana (cf. Kodra-Hysa, this volume).

[5] Kodra-Hysa (this volume) presents an analysis of Zojzi's program for the development of ethnography. It is worth noting that very similar visions are still expressed (e.g. Gjergji 2001, Tirta 2003). Spiro Shkurti agreed that ethnography was an 'historical science', but he was unusual in urging his fellow ethnographers to broaden their perspective by paying attention toward the study of socialist transformation and new ways of life (Shkurti 1985).

[6] The historical figure on whom the national hero is based was a prince of Arberia; he died in 1468.

uniqueness and unity. Several other ethnographic expeditions were organised to map customary law, especially the *Kanun of Labëria* in South Albania and the *Kanun of Mus Ballgjinit* in central Albania. Often the researcher would compare his or her findings in these regions with what was known already about kin organisation and customary law in the north in order to mark out the transformations caused by foreign cultural contamination. Most of the data gathered from these expeditions are stored in the archives in Tirana and have not been published.

The first work to be published on the basis of this ethnographic research by native ethnographers was that of Zojzi (1956a), who emphasised that customary law was a 'national' rather than a regional or local phenomenon. The same thesis had been put forward by Shtjefën Gjeçovi before communism (see Tedeskini 1984), though his studies had been based mainly in northern Albania and Kosovo. Zojzi cited Soviet ethnographer Mark O. Kosven in claiming that *kanun* must be read as the collective product of the nation. According to this theoretical stance the authors of the law were unknown and meant to be so because 'primitive history' recorded no individual contributions or achievements: 'The customary law of our people springs from very ancient times and it develops through centuries alongside economic and social changes of the people. The customary law did not originate either with Papa Zhuli, or Geges, or Scanderbeg, Lek Dukagjni, or Idriz Suli and Mus Ballgjini' (Zojzi 1956a: 146-47).[7] Similar perspectives to that advanced by Zojzi continue to prevail even in the postsocialist period:

> Albanian customary law is an unwritten folk law, transmitted from generation to generation through oral tradition, that has served to regulate juridical relations through centuries in our country. It is not created by any individual, nor by any legislative institutions (e.g. parliament). Like songs, dances, legendary epics, myths, material culture, etc., it has been created by the people through centuries, the people have given to it all its popular philosophy, its mentality and its wisdom. The Albanian customary law is a great legal monument and it is a very important part of cultural heritage of the Albanian people (Luarasi, et. al. 2003 [1988]: 229).

[7] These are all individuals and groups popularly considered to have been the originators of specific *kanun*. For example, Papa Zhuli is considered to be the ancestor of the village of Zhulat in Labëria (south Albania). He continues to appear in ethnographically collected data as the person who gave *kanun* to Liberia and rendered justice based on tradition. Idriz Suli changed some of Papa Zhuli's *kanun*, specifically rules regarding property, inheritance, and divorce (Zojzi 1956a: 144-51). Leke Dukagjini III (1438-81) was a prince who is also believed to have authored *kanun*; while Geges is a collective name for the people from the southern reaches of Northern Albania (Zojzi 1962b). See Bardhoshi (2011) for more details about present beliefs concerning the origin of *kanun* in Albania and Kosovo.

Although the study of *kanun* was prioritised, ethnographers developed relatively few synthetic accounts or detailed analyses in their reports or early publications. Zojzi himself made a major contribution to legal ethnography by documenting the little known *Kanun of Labëria*. However, few of his colleagues or students recorded comparably coherent bodies of local law.

Archive materials, filed as 'unedited material' or 'ethnographic reports', reveal that most of the ethnographic data on legal material were collected by individuals or teams of ethnographers in the course of long semi-structured or structured interviews. The resulting reports usually included the age of the person interviewed (the elderly predominated) and their profession (e.g. Zojzi 1950, 1956b, 1956c, 1962c; Gjergji 1995). Informants, especially in the lowlands, rarely spoke of *kanun* norms, and ethnographers followed suit by recording legal practices as traditional ways of behaving or settling disputes without systemising them. *Kanun* principles were sometimes elicited through what in legal anthropology is known as the 'trouble case method' (Donovan 2007: 88-99), but there was still little methodological or theoretical attention given to identifying deeper patterns from the collected materials. Ethnographers generally lacked training in law or legal studies, and there was no theoretical debate concerning the nature of law vis-a-vis other normative systems.

The principles of publication did not encourage critical reflection on the nature of customary law. Researchers had to deny the continued existence of *kanun* law during communism. Usually this meant that a case study illustrating how the norm worked was placed before the end of the Second World War. This localisation in the recent past enabled researchers (without explicitly articulating the notion of legal pluralism) to interpret it in the light of pre-communist state failure.

Nevertheless, the Section of Ethnography undertook the enormous process of codification was undertaken in the framework of a single project entitled *E drejta zakonore Shqiptare* (Albania's customary law). As Mark Tirta explained (personal correspondence), publications on *kanun* were considered to pose the risk of fostering social memory and keeping alive the practice of *kanun*. The proposed compendium, however, was justified as promoting ethnic cohesion and providing a deeper knowledge of Albanian legal culture in the wider view of Balkan history:

> The study of traditional legal norms sheds light not only on the patriarchal institutions it supports but also on the originality of ethnic consciousness, the strong feelings of sovereignty and national pride that characterised the free peasants and highlanders. Within the broader context of our peninsula, the customary law, like the language and history of the Albanian people, clarifies many aspects of

> the history of the Balkans. Furthermore [such studies] open wide horizons on the development and fusion of different juridical systems in this peninsula (Nova 1989: 13).

The publication of the volume was also legitimated by a speech given by Enver Hoxha on Shtjefen Gjeçovi: 'We are stuck at the level of Gjeçovi's work on *kanun*. As far as I know, Gjeçovi's publication does not meet proper scientific standards. On the other side, if I am not wrong, until now no one has succeeded in publishing something better than Gjeçovi... . The study of *kanun* would help us to understand deeper the history of law in Albania' (Hoxha as reported by Nova 1989: 12-13). The compendium was completed after the fall of communism (the first and last volume appeared in 1989), but it retained the imprint of communist ideology concerning *kanun:* any traces of customary law found in the present were necessarily interpreted as 'cultural survivals' and 'leftovers from an archaic past'. There was no consideration that practices of *kanun* may also have been expressions of resistance to the system.

The Study of *Kanun* in a Dictatorial Situation

The theoretical framework which made *kanun* an object of reverence and revulsion defined the general ethnographic project in communist Albania. In the first several decades of communism, the dual project of recovering 'Albanian' national customs and eradicating their actual practice was developed in programmatic statements by leading ethnographers, following official pronouncements by Enver Hoxha. In 1977, Aleks Buda, then Chair of the Albanian Academy of Sciences, exhorted ethnographers to adapt the perspective of Vico and Herder in seeking to understand 'the soul of the nation' (*shpirti i kombit*) and the nation's inner core or *medulla* (*palca e ombit*) (Buda 1977a: 21). According to Buda, neither culture nor the spirit of a nation was a static phenomenon; both were parts of culture that continued to exist by changing over time. Buda incorporated the necessity of a Marxist perspective to analyse such changes, and he made a soft critique on the Romantic imaginings of writers from the 'Albanian Renaissance' that the peasantry embodied the spirit of the nation (Buda 1977a: 23). In his vision of ethnography, Buda followed the official line by considering all pre-communist research and publications to be pre-scientific (Zojzi 1962a; Dojaka and Gjergji 1969: 107-19). The new scientific ethnography would be based on a Marxist perspective and ethnographers had a social goal: 'By investigating the "core tissue" (*indet bazë*) of Albanian traditional culture, ethnographers were to contribute to the creation of the socialist "New Man"

and emancipation from "backward superstitions"' (Buda 1977b: 11; see also 1977a: 21-35).[8]

In the practical application of Buda's vision, ethnographers were expected to contribute to the eradication of feudal customs and to transform those that were most distinctly Albanian into modern forms. A quotation from Ismet Elezi conveys the tone of these efforts:

> Our socialist order and our Party's Marxist-Leninist ideology is totally against backward and conservative customs. The Party and Comrade Enver Hoxha, particularly Enver Hoxha in his speech of 6 February, raised the people of Albania and all public opinion in our country to fight against the old concepts such as patriarchal and tribal and feudal concepts. [Ethnographers] are to fight against the concepts and remnants of kanun norms, which are the obstacle for the full emancipation of women and for the progress of our socialist society (Elezi 1977: 214).

Buda's paper was the first one to be given by a Chair of the Academy of Sciences that directly addressed ethnography. His reference to Herder and Vico were the first and last to be made within the ethnography of *kanun*. Otherwise, Buda's vision for ethnography only added a new urgency to the already well-established orientations of post-war Albanian ethnography.

For example, in the preceding decade, ethnographic readers had been produced to provide guidance for specialists and amateurs in how to properly study traditional culture. One such compilation of six chapters was published under the title *Materiale Ndimëse Për Studimin e Disa Problemeve Shoqërore nga Pikëpamja Etnografike* (*Some Required Readings on Some Social Issues from Ethnographic Point of View*) (No author 1969). The first chapter contains a selection of short works by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, among which the most directly connected to ethnography are the sections on marriage and property from Engels' *Origin of Family, Private Property and State* (pp. 10-33) and three pages from Lenin's 'About the Attitude of the Working Party toward Religion' (pp. 39-42). The book's second and third chapters contain ethnographic questionnaires and theoretical instruction concerning the collection of information on village social organisation, migration, traditional economic aspects of agriculture, livestock, the social position of women before and during communism, and traditional feasts, celebrations, and rituals. Chapters 4 and 5 contain partial and whole reprints from articles previously published by Androkli Kostal-

[8] In 1964, Albania's leadership waged a campaign 'The War against Backward Customs' (*lufta kunder zakoneve prapanike*). The campaign began two years before the Chinese Cultural Revolution, but was influenced by Chinese developments.

lari, Rrok Zojzi, Andromaqi Gjergji, Georg von Hahn, and – surprisingly - Margaret Hasluck.[9]

Between Love and Hate

As outlined above, Albanian ethnographers during socialism were charged with classifying those elements of culture that were believed to be specific, pure, unique, and original to Albania. They were simultaneously expected to differentiate between appropriate and backward elements as defined by communist ideology. The consequence was that attitudes to customary law, specifically the *Kanun of Lekë Dukagjini*, were schizophrenic, oscillating between love and hate in the terms of Julia Kristeva (Kristeva 1994; see also Jezernik 2010: 25).

The *kanun* was both a 'monument of Albania's national spiritual culture', and a synonym for backwardness, inequality, and exploitation. Officially, Enver Hoxha classified customary law as a feudal-bourgeois phenomenon (1978: 509-34), and invoked the continued presence of *kanun* law in Albania to legitimate his policies of repression, including the class war, 'the war against backward customs', and 'the Dictatorship of the Proletariat'. The dictator also 'suggested' the appropriate books to read in order to interpret customary law, particularly *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and State* (Engels 1942 [1884]). Pointing to the *Kanun of Lekë Dukagjini*, Hoxha wrote: 'If we carefully study the work of Father Shtjefën Gjeçovi, the *Kanun of Lekë Dukagjini*, and particularly the chapters on private property, inheritance, family, position of women and marriage, we would see in our reality the great truth that revealed the genius of Engels. We would see how *private property* enslaves women, and how she is transformed into a property that can be sold and bought' (Hoxha 1978: 74-82, italics mine). Often, researchers would conclude that Albanian cultural and social backwardness originated from economic factors, due ultimately to private property as sanctioned in customary law and tolerated by the pre-socialist state. Thus, the ethnographers wrote critical assessments of customary law, and the regime drew upon these accounts to legitimate its policy of collectivisation (see Zojzi 1969, 1972; Dojaka 1968).

[9] The work of Scottish linguist, archaeologist, and ethnographer Margaret Hasluck was generally ignored during the communist period because she was close friends with the scholar, folklorist, and politician Lef Nosi who was considered a traitor by the communist regime because of his collaboration with Fascist and Nazi forces.

Conclusion

The theoretical approach to the study of customary law in Albanian legal ethnography under socialism reflected a strong version of Marxist-Leninist ideology, which approached customary law as a product of historical processes where legal norms were ultimately determined by economic factors and mirrored class interests. Yet, Albanian ethnographers appealed simultaneously to Herderian, evolutionist, and diffusionist theories to prove the originality and antiquity of customary law (Bardhoshi 2009). Ethnography in socialist Albania was condemned to swing between the poles of patriotic invocation of the *Volksgeist* on the one hand and Marxist-Leninist assertions of feudal-bourgeois, foreign oppression, and exploitative mentalities on the other (cf. Hann et al. 2007: 8-9, Naumović 1998). The uneasy juxtapositions of nationalist and communist ideologies led numerous researchers to declare that *kanun* was dead, or quickly disappearing in the new socialist society, even as ethnographic data on social memory told a very different story (Bardhoshi 2011, 2013).

In a wider ethnographic perspective, native studies of *kanun* should be read as one of many projects in the name of modernity, aiming to create new social memories and consequently new cultural identities (Connerton 1989: 2009). Within the Albanian context, as I have argued elsewhere (Bardhoshi 2013), modernity was articulated as a state project. The notion of a 'new socialist man' living in a 'new society' could only be sustained by a definite image of the past. In a context where *étatised* knowledge springs from the God-like state (Bourdieu 2000: 245), and where the notion of culture takes the place of religion (Finkierlkraut 1999), ethnography was called upon not simply to study the social memory of a people, but also to create a new memory that was compatible with the state's modernist project. This is exceptionally transparent in the case of law because law is one of the major instruments through which the modern state articulates transformations in society. Indeed, law is the very basis of power and authority in the political system. One of the key ways in which modern law provides legitimacy for the existing order is through its negation of the past (Fitzpatrick 1992).

References

Bajraktaroviq, M. 1974. *Mbi fiset e Ballkanit*. Përkthyer nga J Lazri, 16 faqe. Tiranë: Instituti i Historisë, Sektori i Etmografisë.

——. 1976. *Familjet shqiptae me dy besimie në Rrafshin e Dukagjinit*. Përkthyer nga S. Ahmeti, 18 faqe. Tiranë: Instituti i Historisë, Sektori i Enografisë.

——. 1981. *Bazat e Etnologjisë së përgjithshme*. Përkthyer nga J. Lazri, 129 faqe. Tiranë: Instituti i Historisë, Sektori i Enografisë.

Bardhoshi, N. 2009. *Teoria Etnografike e Rrok Zojzit për të drejtën kanunore: një vështrim kritik*, pp. 44-67. Tiranë: Kultura Popullore.

——. 2011. *Gurtë e Kufinit: Kanuni, prona, strukturimi social*. Tiranë: UET-Press.

——. 2013. Albanian Communism and Legal Pluralism: The Question of Kanun Continuity. *Etnologia Balkanica* 16: 62-74.

Bošković, A. 2005. Distinguishing self' and other': Anthropology and identity in former Yugoslavia. *Anthropology Today* 21 (2): 8-13.

Bourdieu, P. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Buda, A. 1977a. *Etnografia Shqiptare dhe disa probleme te saj, in 'Konfereca Kombetare e Studimeve Etnografike*, pp. 15-35. Tiranë, Akademia e Shkencave të R.P. S. Sh. Instituti i Historisë, Sektori i Etnografisë.

——. 1977b. *Fjala e Mbylljes e Kryetarit të Akademisë së Shkencave Aleks Buda*, pp. 9-12. Tiranë, Akademia e Shkencave të R.P. S. Sh. Instituti i Historisë, Sektori i Etnografisë.

Connerton, P. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 2009. *How Modernity Forgets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dobrankoviq, B. 1972. *Etnologjia e Popujve të Ballkanit*. Përkthyer nga F. Fishta, 114 faqe. Tiranë: Instituti i Historisë, Sektori i Etnografisë.

Dojaka, A. 1968. *Egzogamia tek Shqiptaret*. Konferenca e I-rë Albanologjike, pp. 123-132.

Dojaka, A. Gjergji. A. 1969. Rezultatet e punës në fushën e etnografisë gjatë 25 vjetëve. Tiranë, *Studime Historike* 4: 107-119.

Donovan, J. 2007. *Legal Anthropology: An Introduction*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Elezi, I. 1977. *Mbi disa tipare të së drejtës zakonore*, pp. 209-214. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të R.P. S. Sh. Instituti i Historisë, Sektori i Etnografisë.

Engels. F. 1942 [1884]. *Origin of Family, Private Property and State*. London, New York. Alick West.

Finkierlkraut, A. 1999 [1987]. *Disfata e mendimit*. Tiranë: Shtëpia e Librit.

Fitzpatrick, P. 1992. *The Mythology of Modern Law*. London: Routledge.

Frazer, J. 1890. *The Golden Bough*. London: Macmillan.
Gjergji, A. 1980. *Bibliography of Albanian Ethnography*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave të R.P.S. Sh, Instituti i Kulturës Popullore.
——. 1995. Në Ekspeditë me Rrok Zojzin. *Kultura Popullore* 1-2 (20): 19-21.
——. 2001. *Ligjerata per etnologjine Shqiptare*. Tirane: 'Extra'.
Hahn, J. G. von. 1867. *Reise durch die Gebiete des Drin und Wardar*. Wien: K.-K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei.
Hofer, T. 1968. Anthropologists and Native Ethnographers in Central European Villages: comparative notes on the professional personality of the two disciplines. *Current Anthropology* 9 (4): 311-315.
Hann, C. et al. 2007. Anthropology's Multiple Temporalities and its Future in Central and Eastern Europe: A Debate. *Working Paper* 90. Halle/S.: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.
Hoxha, E. 1978. Mbi disa aspekte të problemit të gruas shqiptare - Fjala e mbajtur në Plenumin e 2-të të KQ të PPSH. In *Çështje të Revolucionit dhe të Ndërtimit Socialist, Përmbledhje Veprash*, pp. 509-34. Tiranë: Universiteti i Tiranës, „8 Nëntori".
Ivanova, J. 1960. Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit Sprovë e karakteristikave historike. *Seria Shkencat Shoqërore* 2: 114-133.
Jezernik, B. 2010. *Europa e Eger*. Tirane: Plejad.
Kristeva, J. 1994. *Strangers to Ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Lelaj, O. 2011. *Një analizë kritike e studimeve etnografike shqiptare mbi shoqërinë e "real socializimit" në Shqipëri*. Tiranë: Kultura Popullore.
——. 2013. P*roletarizimi,Shteti dhe Shoqëria: Reflektimi mbi natyrën e modernitetit në Shqipëri*. Tiranë: Kultura Popullore.
Lévi-Strauss, C. 1992. *Vendi i antropologjise midis shkencave shoqërore*. Tiranë: Kultura Popullore. (Trans.by Andromaqi Gjergji).
Luarasi, Z., and N. Elezi. 2003 [1988]. E drejta zakonore në Shqipëri. In *Historia e Shtetit dhe së Drejtës në Shqipëri*, pp. 229-286. Tiranë: Luarasi.
Morgan, L. 1877. *Ancient Society: Researches in Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilisation*. London: MacMillan & Company.
Nedejković, B. 1956 K*anuni i Lekë Dukagjinit*. Tirane: Archive of Institute of History, Sector of Ethnography. (Transl. by V. Meksi).
Naumović, S. 1998. Romanticists or Double Insider? An Eassy on the Origins of Ideologised Discourses in Balkan Ethnology. *Ethnologica Balkanica* 2: 101-120.

Nova, K. 1989. *Hyrje te e Drejta Zakonore Shqiptare*. Tiranw: Akademia e Shkenave tw RPS, Instittuti i Kulturës Popullore.

No author. 1969. *Materiale Ndimëse Për Studimin e Disa Problemeve Shoqërore nga Pikëpamja Etnografike*. Drejtoria e Botimeve U.SH. T.

Pupovci, S. 1972. Parathënie. In *Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit* (origjina, zhvillimi dhe karakteristikat), pp. XVII-CX. Prishtinë: Rilindja.

Rouland, N. 1994. *Legal Anthropology*. London: Athlone Press.

Schwandner-Sievers, S. 2012. "Virgjëreshat" dhe elefantët në dyqanin e qelqurinave": Rreth sfidave ndërkombëtare të etnologjisë shqiptare në epokën post-socialiste. In W. Schmitt (ed.), *Historia e Shqiptarëve: Gjendja dhe prespektiva e studimit*, Përpjekja, pp. 219-254. Tiranë.

Shkurti, S. 1985. Etnografia. In *Fjalorin Enciklopedik Shqiptar*, pp 245-246. Tirane: Albanian Academy of Science.

Tedeskini, E. 1984. *Dorëshkrime arkivore të pabotuara të At. Shtefen Gjeçovit në lidhje me veprën e tij Kanuni i Lekë Dukagjinit*. Tiranë: Arkivi i Institutit të Etnologjisë, Instituti i Antropologjisë Kulturore dhe Studimit të Artit.

Tirta, M. 2003. *Etnologjia e Shqiptarëve*. Tirane: Geer.

Tylor, B. E. 1865. *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization*. London: J. Murray.

Vuesloviq, A. 1976. *Mbi veçoritë fisnore shqiptare të Kosovës dhe transmetimi i emrave të fiseve në popullsinë tjetër*. Përkthyer nga Gj. Lekoçaj, 8 faqe. Tiranë: Insitituti i Historisë, Sektori i Etnografisë.

Vukosaloviq, J. 1957. *Organizatat e fiseve dinakrike*. Përkthyer nga Gj. Lekoçaj, 124 faqe. Tiranë: Instituti i Historisë Sektori i Etnografisë.

Zojzi, R., and A. Gjergij. 1952. *Raport etnografik mbi Kanunin e Skenderbeut*. Tiranë: Arkivi i Etnologjisë pranë Institutit të Antropologjisë Kulturore dhe Studimit të Artit.

Zojzi, R. 1950. *Raporte etnografike të vitit 1950, mbi krahinën e Kolonjës dhe Myzeqesë*. Vol. III, Nr. Dok. 12/4: 11-12. Tiranë: Arkivi I Etnologjisë, Instituti I Antropologjisë kulturore dhe Studimit të Arteve.

———. 1956a. Mbi te drejten kanunore te popullit shqiptar. *Buletini per Shkencat Shoqnore* 1: 144-148.

———. 1956b. *Shala*. Nr i dok, 42/5, 96 pages. Tiranë: Arkivi i Etnologjisë, Instituti i Antropologjisë Kulturore dhe Studimit të Artit.

———. 1956c. Tërbaçi. *IAKSA* Vol II, Nr. Dok. 41/4: 80. Tiranë: Arkivi i Etnologjisë.

———. 1962a. Etnografia Shqiptare dhe veprimtaria shkencore e zhvilluar ne kete fushe. *Etnografia Shqiptare* 1: 3-11.

——. 1962b. Ndamja Krahinore e popullit shqiptar. *Etnografia Shqiptare* 1: 16-62.
——. 1962c. *Etnografia shqiptare dhe veprimtaria shkencore e zhvilluar në këtë fushë*. Nr 1, f. 3, (f. 3-11). Tiranë: Etnografia Shqiptare.
——. 1969. Mbeturina të familjes patriarkale që i bëhen pengesë emancipimit të plotë të gruas shqiptare. *Studimi historike* 1: 33-39.
——. 1972. Aspekte të kalimit nga familja patriarkale në familjen e re socialiste. *Etnografia Shqiptare* 4: 28-36.

Chapter 9
Disciplinary Continuities and Breaches: Contested Issues in Slovenian Ethnology in the Socialist Era*

Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik

Ethnological discourse in Slovenia under socialism (1945–91) cannot be defined without ambiguities or in a consistent manner. This is especially so when we consider the impact of politics and ideology on scholarship and the disciplinary habitus of ethnology immediately following the Second World War.

From existing studies on the characteristics of ethnology in socialist countries[1], it is apparent that politics shaped the prospects of academic disciplines in multiple ways – officially and unofficially, overtly and covertly. The socialist political regime more or less restricted academic and other contacts between East and West: in individual countries these contacts depended on the varied cycles of political liberalisation (e.g. Poland and Hungary after 1956, Czechoslovakia and East Germany considerably later), as well as the linguistic barrier that resulted from the compulsory study of Russian among younger scholars. The instruments of political authority over research institutions and universities also varied between countries, over time, and even between institutes. Academic disciplines generally had to reorganise themselves to fit the new ideological circumstances of socialism (Hann, Sárkány and Skalník 2005: 9). Generally speaking, there were few left-oriented scholars before the establishment of the socialist political system; this was all the more so within ethnographic/ethnological scholar-

* This text is informed by a comparative study on Marxism and ethnology under the framework of a bilateral project conducted by the Ethnological Institutes of Bratislava and Ljubljana and sponsored by the national research agencies of Slovenia and Slovakia during 2008-10. In addition, it is part of the study of the comparative history of national ethnologies within the research program entitled 'Cultural Spaces and Practices: Ethnological and Folklore Studies (P6-0088)', sponsored by the Slovenian Research Agency, 2009-14. The following essay is an expanded and revised version of the synthetic review that can be found in Slavec Gradišnik 2010b.

[1] See the two extensive volumes *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies I and II* (Hann, Sárkány and Skalník 2005; Michăilescu, Iliev and Naumović 2008).

ship which itself was on the margins of progressive intellectual currents in European culture. After the Second World War, political claims regarding academic practices in socialist countries differed considerably, just as the Soviet spirit permeated various domains of life with an uneven intensity.

It is important to point out that the socialist period (1945-91) in Yugoslavia and Slovenia cannot be described as uniform or homogeneous. This era is characterised by internal economic, social, and cultural dynamics and changes that led to the softer model of communism often referred to as 'socialism with a human face' when compared with other Eastern Bloc countries. This distinctive character of Yugoslav socialism was also a consequence of the break with the stricter Stalinist version that resulted from the Yugoslav Cominform dispute in 1948 and the consequent distancing of Yugoslavia from the Soviet Union (cf. Godina 2002; Halpern 2005; Portis-Winner 2005). In addition, different pre-war disciplinary traditions in the former republics of federal and socialist Yugoslavia led to divergent developments in the futures of Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Macedonian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin ethnology (Bogataj and Terseglav 1983; Čapo Žmegač 2004; Prica 2004; Bošković 2010; Slavec Gradišnik 2010a).

The new socialist system, guided by communist ideology, fostered the participation of all social actors in carrying out its ambitious political, economic, and social projects. The ideology of the socialist regime required a radical reorientation of academic practice in the spirit of scientific Marxism. In Slovenia, the effects of political ideology on scholarship were neither immediate nor uniform; thus, it did not affect all disciplines or involve them to the same extent and with the same intensity. Nevertheless, all areas of study were expected to follow the state's established economic, political, and social goals whether the academic discipline had been previously consolidated and had a firm disciplinary tradition within the university or the Academy of Sciences and Arts or was a newly established discipline (among which sociology was a privileged social science).

The corpus of ethnological and folklore studies created during socialism shows that a Marxist current in ethnology was not instituted in Slovenia immediately in the late 1940s, even though it was privileged from the standpoint of science policy. As a result, two prominent research orientations or trends can be observed during the socialist period. The first was dominant at least until the end of the 1950s and was built on the pre-war disciplinary tradition described below (cf. Slavec Gradišnik 2000; Fikfak 2010, 2011). The second trend came into prominence only after the late 1950s as a critique of the folk culture (or *Volkskunde*) paradigm. The latter is usually envisaged as coupled with Marxist thought. The radical debate known in German academia as 'a farewell to folk life' (*Abschied vom Volksleben*)

(Geiger, Jeggle and Korff 1970; cf. Bausinger 1961), or a critique of the ethnographic paradigm, was pioneered in Slovenia by then university assistant Slavko Kremenšek. His critique of traditional folk culture research, as well as its core concepts and methodology, was explicitly grounded in the spirit of historical materialism. Kremenšek's personal account sheds additional light on the relationship between ideology and scholarship not only at the personal level but also in an institutional and broader social context. Individual perspectives are important for 'emphasis[ing] the element of subjectivity in exploring a disciplinary history which has come to an end but which is still very much live in memories and is at multiple levels "essentially contested"' (Hann, Sárkány and Skalnik 2005: 1).[2]

In the face of such diverse sources of influence upon the development of ethnology in Slovenia and elsewhere, it is pertinent to ask to what extent one can speak of 'socialist ethnology' or the 'ethnology of socialism'. How deeply did the postulated Marxist orientation in scholarship characterise the development of ethnology and folklore studies? Is it better characterised as a random, programmatic, or self-reflexive scholarly agenda?

A Brief Outline of Disciplinary Tradition

By outlining in broad strokes the development of twentieth century ethnology in Slovenia, it is possible to identify many parallels with other European national ethnologies: a rich proto-ethnographic tradition; disciplinary roots in the Enlightenment and the Romantic era; gradual institutionalisation from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards; a mostly separate tradition of studying domestic and foreign cultures (*Volkskunde* vs. *Völkerkunde*); and shared concepts (folk culture, tradition, and community). One could also identify a similar positivistic apparatus (classifications, typologies, cultural historical comparisons, and philological methodology) that suited the descriptive character of the discipline and its aversion to theory; ideological and political situatedness with various concepts of ethnic and national culture; the production of a national cultural grammar and stereotypes; a farewell to folk culture research in the 1960s and 1970s; and the 'anthropologisation' of national ethnologies since the early 1990s. In spite of

[2] In addition, this presentation cannot avoid my own life experience under socialism. I was born, socialised and professionally enculturated during this period. I studied ethnology in the late 1970s; somewhat earlier, there were very lively discussions in Slovenia regarding the character of the discipline and its status among humanities and social sciences and in society at large. 'Fundamentals of Marxism' was a subject in both the upper secondary school and university curricula (and was at that time a compulsory course for all students in the Faculty of Arts). In the last decade under socialism, I was already employed at the university, where I followed developments in the discipline on a daily basis.

these comparative or transnational characteristics, every 'national' disciplinary tradition also exhibits unique traits that are the result of the particular circumstances in which the production of knowledge takes place. These kinds of differences – that also concern the societal use of this knowledge – remain specific to the national context and its individual research institutions.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Karel Štrekelj (1859–1912) and Matija Murko (1861–1952), the founding fathers of Slovenian ethnology, were engaged in the academic establishment of ethnological and folkloristic research. Murko launched a program for Slovenian ethnography in 1896, inspired by the ethnographic exhibition held in Prague in 1895, and Karel Štrekelj started to publish a scientific collection of Slovenian folk songs (*Slovenske narodne pesmi*, 4 vols., 1895–1923). Both had less difficulty, at least from today's perspective, to define the disciplinary horizon of the discipline then called folklore, ethnography, or *narodopis*.[3] The discipline's subject matter was defined negatively. Everything that was not proper, high, or educated culture fell under the category of folk culture and could be studied by the new field.

As philologists, Štrekelj and Murko were promoters of a positivist methodology which bestowed on ethnography its scientific status. Indirectly, the positivist approach was reinforced in subsequent decades because ethnographic material and issues were dealt with by experts who were educated as art historians, historians, geographers, or philologists. In the early years, ethnography developed as a discipline without a distinctive infrastructure or an adequate university program for training new ethnographers.

Researching the particular segment of cultural traits labelled as 'folk', these researchers delineated the field of 'folk life' specific to ethnography before the Second World War. In the framework of what was considered folk, most scholars focused on individual elements of culture (e.g. the motifs of various folk songs and the farm house form were thoroughly researched topics). Such a practice was grounded in the romanticist hypothesis that the

[3] Murko and Štrekelj introduced the term *narodopis* (national writing) as a Slovenian equivalent to 'folklore'; later scholars adjusted it to *narodopisje* to be an analogue of 'ethnology', but in practice the field remained more similar to ethnography. By the first decades of the twentieth century, *etnografija* (ethnography) and *etnologija* (ethnology) had also been introduced alongside *narodopis* and *narodopisje*. The initial distinction between *etnografija* and *etnologija* corresponded more or less with the distinction between the German disciplinary denominations *Volkskunde* and *Völkerkunde* (cf. Slavec Gradišnik 2000, 2008b). By the middle of the twentieth century, *narodopisje* came to be generally understood and practised in a way that is best understood as 'ethnography' (*etnografija*). I follow the general uses of terms in specific historical periods, except when referencing the work of particular authors, in which case I follow their own use.

essential spirit of a nation or its folk life is reflected in its artefacts, ecological adaptations, and subsistence strategies through technology and material culture (*snovna, materialna kultura*); community life through elements of social culture (*družbena, socialna kultura*); and creativity through spiritual culture (*duhovna kultura*).[4] This concern for identifying the essential spirit favoured practices of cultural essentialism and reification.

The social referent of the folk culture concept was mainly agrarian, meaning that the peasant population was treated as a homogeneous, undifferentiated entity. Only a handful of authors acknowledged dissimilar cultural manifestations in terms of social stratification (i.e. that cultural practices differed between small, middle, and large landholders (peasants); craftsmen and semi-craftsmen; and countryside merchant traders). Rather, the principal criterion of cultural differentiation was regional – by cultural areas. Given the widespread use of the cultural-historical approach as well as a strong interest in cultural seriation and the geographic distribution of cultural traits, the knowledge produced within this model was typological or classificatory. Still, a positive side effect of this methodology was that it maintained a comparative analysis (in historical and geographical terms) as the singular ethnological approach that goes beyond the borders of a single ethnic or national culture.

Few researchers drew attention to the links between folk and high cultures. They mainly emphasised differences, oppositions as well as cultural contacts through cultural diffusion, adoption, and fusion of elements between cultural strata, for example, in the form of *gesunkenes Kulturgut*. In spite of the varied significance of these processes, the prevailing perspective concerning folk culture was devolutionary: the threats of deculturation that 'genuine', 'original', 'old', 'our' culture faced from 'civilised', 'modern' culture or civilisation were considered to come primarily from abroad. This point of view was far from being unbiased or neutral: on the ideological level it advocated 'traditional' values, norms, and forms of community life, and on the practical level it promoted the primacy of rescuing and collecting activities characteristic of salvage ethnography. On some occasions, scholars drew upon relevant references or patterns from the disciplines of central European *Volkskunde* (folklore, ethnography) and *Völkerkunde* (general ethnology and research on primitive cultures) in which epistemological and

[4] A commonly recognised category throughout eastern Europe, 'spiritual culture' often causes confusion in English translation. It refers, not only to religious ideas and practices, but to the nonmaterial and intangible aspects of culture, such as the aesthetic creativity materialised in folk songs and narrative; folk music and dance; mythology; symbolic systems; and various forms of traditional knowledge.

methodological interests were very similar.[5] This period may be characterised as favouring a relatively well-rounded tradition in ethnography (*narodopisje*)[6] over ethnological interest in non-European, so-called primitive cultures.

It is necessary to also acknowledge the national and ethnic bias of this type of research: the main reproach to the academic tradition of *narodopisje* (and also to a public interest in folk culture) is not so much its prevailing concern for peasant culture but the ways in which scholars observed and described peasant life (cf. Rihtman-Auguštin 1987).[7] Specifically, by casting peasants as the ideological foundation of the nation (cf. Löfgren 1989; Stocklund 1999), such scholarship reduced the scope of value in studying the peasantry to fit within the framework of ethnic characteristics and cultural traits. Such ethnography was also practiced within the so-called small nations without political autonomy or their own state institutions. Selected cultural phenomena with accentuated aesthetic value obtained a special symbolic power in the process of the nationalisation of folk culture (cf. Johler, Nikitsch and Tschofen 1999), a process well known in Europe in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In scholarship, this process was instituted in the 'ethnographic paradigm' (Köstlin 1994), and in this context the subject of ethnography was time and again a handy tool for political-ideological use and abuse. The first comprehensive work on Slovenian ethnography, *Narodopisje Slovencev* (*Ethnography of Slovenians*), edited by Rajko Ložar in 1944, for example, aimed to prove ethnography's social relevance by demonstrating Slovenian cultural autonomy in the face of Germanisation from the north and Italianisation from the west; by promoting archaic cultural forms as the most Slovenian; and by providing an invigorating model for life in a world overrun by mechanical civilisation.

---

[5] The patterns of research of so-called non-European primitive cultures and European folk and peasant cultures were intertwined and shifted from one to the other, as researchers of European peasant culture long considered peasant culture to be the more primitive cultural stratum of an otherwise civilised world. For example, Ivan Grafenauer complimented the usefulness of the cultural-historical method as it was implemented by Wilhelm Schmidt (1937), which Grafenauer employed in his research on religious and poetic traditions (Stanonik 2011). Nevertheless, there was little interest in undertaking ethnological research per se. Only theology professor Lambert Ehrlich (1878–1942), who was interested in so-called primitive cultures because of his research on the origins of religion, wrote a longer article on ethnology (Ehrlich 1929). Like Grafenhauer, Ehrlich followed the ethnology practiced in Vienna's cultural-historical school by Wilhelm Schmidt.

[6] See note 3 above.

[7] For this reason it is not surprising that, *narodopisje* was also sometimes defined as peasantology using the German term *Bauernkunde*.

Slovenian Ethnography in the First Years after the Second World War

Many characteristics of post-war ethnology[8] can be explained by the specificities of the academic landscape in its new socio-political context. Until the late 1950s, the discipline was referred to as *narodopisje* or *etnografija*; the latter term was used to include folklore as a special field.[9] As in other continental disciplinary traditions, precursors to ethnological research existed from the late eighteenth century onwards as the study of the folk and folk culture in ethnic or national frameworks. Ethnographic accounts, local studies and *Heimatkunde*, efforts in philology, museum work, and various forms of popularising the 'folk' built an initial corpus of ethnographic material. Notwithstanding its involvement in a nation-building process from the nineteenth century onwards, ethnology was a marginal field in relation to other disciplines and within society in general, just as the object of its studies was in a certain sense trivial. There were no researchers with degrees in ethnology until after 1940 when the subject was introduced at the University of Ljubljana (itself founded in 1919). There also was no strong disciplinary community or set of institutions until the early twentieth century. At the time of their foundations, the national Ethnographic Museum (1923) employed only two experts; the Folklore Institute (1934) was a one-man institution; and the university department had a sole professor for eight years until an assistant instructor was hired in 1948.

Following the idea that 'a paradigm governs, in the first instance, not a subject matter but a group of practitioners' (Kuhn 1998 [1969]: 160), it is not surprising that the ethnography of that time did not exhibit an elaborate paradigm (in the sense of a 'school' or research trend). As a result, scholars of different pedigrees recognised immediately after the war that research was fragmented and that ethnography had no firm theoretical foundations:

> We cannot be satisfied at all with the development of Slovenian ethnography and folklore in the past. In many respects, we can argue that this discipline has come to a halt given that we can point to an entire range of realms and issues in Slovenian folk life that we never tackled, let alone processed. Moreover, we still have not collected all of the material that applies to Slovenian folk life. There are many forms of folk culture and objects from various ethnographic areas

[8] I use the term ethnology to reference the overall field of studies, though continue to indicate the local terms that were commonly used at various times and by individual authors.

[9] The Slovenian term *folklora* often signified the subject of the discipline and the discipline itself; to aid distinction, the term *folkloristika* (folklore studies) was later established to designate the discipline.

> about which we have very little or almost no data. There are still many areas across the Slovenian territory that have not been studied at all with regard to ethnographic folklore. *Narodopisje Slovencev* best depicts the various gaps in the material that we have gathered so far (Orel 1948a: 6, referring to Ložar 1944).[10]

In the first years after the war, ethnographers who had already committed themselves to research before the war were still active. Their scholarly outlook was far from the propagated versions of Marxism and historical materialism, which as a rule were established as a principle for scholarly research after the war.[11] Therefore it is possible, at least in part, to uphold the critical stance that in the years of post-war development 'ethnological thought ... unavoidably found itself going nowhere' (Kremenšek 1978: 46). However, this only holds to some degree because available sources imply that in the first post-war years ethnography was also imbued with an optimistic spirit. Such optimism could be explained with the promises that socialist politics employed to stimulate social mobilisation for the construction of a 'new' homeland to replace what had been destroyed during the war. Another possible reason was summed up by Katherine Verdery, who defined the positive significance of socialism in the following manner: 'Inequality, hunger, poverty, and exploitation—to these perennial features of the human condition socialism offered a response. It promised laboring people dignity and freedom, women equal pay for equal work, and national minorities equal rights in the state. By making these promises, it drew attention to major problems that capitalist liberal democracies had not adequately resolved' (Verdery 1996: 4).

Under the leadership of its enthusiastic director Boris Orel with his ambitious plans (Orel 1948b)[12], the Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana

---

[10] All Slovenian sources have been translated by the author.

[11] For example, Ivan Grafenauer, Niko Kuret, France Marolt, Boris Orel, Milko Matičetov, Franjo Baš, Vilko Novak, to mention only the most prominent researchers who were affiliated to the major ethnological institutions in the first postwar period. The majority of them belonged to the circle of Catholic intellectuals, and their otherwise different social and intellectual outlooks were, with few exceptions, unified under a so-called neo-Romantic disciplinary perspective.

[12] The former director of the Ethnographic Museum, Rajko Ložar (1904–85), left Slovenia in May 1945, just before the liberation, emigrating first to Austria and then to the United States at the beginning of the 1950s. The reasons for this were certainly not exclusively personal. Ložar was active in Catholic intellectual circles before the war and he did not compromise himself during the war (although the violation of the ban on publishing and other cultural activities imposed by the Liberation Front was contestable because he published the journal *Etnolog* as he edited the first volume of *Narodopisje Slovencev* in 1944). However, he feared for his existence under the new regime. Boris Orel (1903–62) attended the state trade academy after graduating from upper secondary school, and he was employed as a bank official

became the centre of lively activity. This period was also characterised by a series of lectures in the university's Seminar of Ethnology and Ethnography, led by Niko Zupanič, and with a plan to establish an ethnographic institute at the Academy of Sciences and Arts (Kuret 1972).[13]

This zeal is manifested in the introduction to the first volume of the journal *Slovenski etnograf* (*Slovenian Ethnographer*)[14], entitled 'V novo razdobje' (Into a New Epoch), which indicates how socio-historical changes were reflected in the practice of ethnography:

> When publishing the first volume of *Slovenski etnograf*, our new journal of ethnography and folklore, we are especially gladdened by the awareness that we live in a homeland where the national and democratic aspirations of the peoples of Yugoslavia have become a living fact. Soon it will be three years since the beginning of peaceful development and the socialist construction of our new people's state, the greatest achievement of our national liberation struggle, and we have already decisively stepped forward into the second year of our five-year plan that is consolidating the strength of our country externally and internally, building up our economy, improving our homeland's welfare, and contributing to its cultural advancement. The new, hitherto unheard of strengths of our working people have been unleashed and have been channelled into the struggle to carry out the five-year plan, in the struggle for a better future for Yugoslavia (Orel 1948a: 5).

This quotation is sufficiently transparent to demonstrate the obligatory socio-political rhetoric, which also framed the objectives of scholarship. In this, all cultural workers had to be aware of the changes and that their task was to ensure that, 'our science … leave the dusty offices and … become a help-

---

from 1924–44. He was active as a puppeteer and journalist; furthermore, he also studied art history, becoming familiar with the ethnographers active at that time. His first ethnographic publications addressed phenomena related to mythology. For *Narodopisje Slovencev*, the first overview of Slovenian ethnography (Ložar 1944), he prepared an extensive contribution on folk customs. He received a bachelor's degree in ethnology in 1958 and a doctorate in 1960.

[13] The Committee for Slovenian Ethnography was established in 1947, and it became the Institute for Slovenian Ethnology in 1951. It was led by the philologist Ivan Grafenauer (1880–1964) and operated exclusively on the basis of the enthusiasm of its honorary researchers until the early 1950s.

[14] *Slovenski etnograf* was the main (and only) ethnographic publication at the time replacing the museum's earlier journal *Etnolog* (*Ethnologist*), of which 17 volumes had been published from 1926–44. One possible reason for the name change could have been the emulation of the Soviet journal *Sovjetskaja etnografija* (*Soviet Ethnography*), although a more probable explanation was that *Etnolog* had been compromised because it was published during the war and violated the ban on cultural activities imposed by the Liberation Front (cf. Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 82).

mate and innovator in building our homeland and improving the social and political education of our people' (Orel 1948a: 5).[15] Orel maintained that the progress of science had been strengthened through Stalinist five-year plans in the Soviet Union. There, he wrote, 'science in particular has contributed greatly to successfully carrying out [the plans] ... this therefore involves ... truly progressive science, which in the words of Comrade Stalin does not shut itself off from the people, but serves the people and willingly and conscientiously delivers all of its findings to them' (Orel 1948a: 5).

Following the propagated politics of science, Boris Orel, for example, distinguished two models of doing scholarship or two types of sciences. One type was directly involved 'in the production and preparation for better material foundations for our lives'. The other type had fewer observable material effects, but was no less important if it was connected in any way whatsoever with the tasks of the five-year plan. The second type of science might concern itself, 'among other things, especially with the issues of restructuring our new society and the political and cultural re-education of our people' (Orel 1948a: 5). He placed ethnography in the company of the humanities and historical studies, and assigned it the following tasks:

> If we imagine that Slovenian ethnography and folklore represent a discipline that collects and studies various material from Slovenian folk life, that Slovenian ethnography and folklore are the science of the cultural creations of our people and their laws of development, then we must fulfil the various tasks being assigned to us today in such a manner that, the science that studies the life of the people will truly serve them in the best way possible and will benefit the new society during the period of socialist construction (Orel 1948a: 6).

According to this passage, ethnographers affirmed and reinforced a relatively traditional definition of ethnography that had been assigned new goals. It seems that in the first years after the war, ideologically coloured rhetoric reflected the adoption of binding discourse that was also intended to grant credibility to ethnography, through which researchers legitimated the necessity and value of their activity. Thus, for example, in a study of the folk foods of Prekmurje, it was written that ethnography is 'constantly forgotten when resolving issues related to the material and mental aspects of people's lives ... It will therefore be necessary to include the ethnographer in providing solutions to the issue of nutrition as well as to all other aspects of folk life if we do not wish to solve the needs of the people in a cookie-cutter fashion, regardless of his experience or the character and needs of individual regions' (Novak 1947: 5). Similarly, the research groups of the Maribor

[15] This is a quotation from the Slovenian politician Edvard Kardelj as cited by Orel (1948a: 5).

Historical Society planned research on 'topical issues of Slovenian economic history', with an emphasis on the need 'to resolve various ethnographic topics in connection with the development of agriculture in our countryside today' (Baš F. 1949: 114). Thoughts on the 'applied' character of ethnography are found in numerous publications from the first post-war years. Their purpose was to establish and popularise ethnography as a truly useful and practical discipline, as an agent between life and politics.[16]

However, this rhetoric was not based on a systematic study of the issues of political science, scientific ideology, the Marxist understanding of history, or a reflection on appropriate research methodology. Instead it was informed by the propaganda about the goals of the new society that were disseminated on a daily basis, as well as by concrete social practices concerning scientific research, primarily as it concerned its applied aspects and systematic ways of conducting research.[17] A convincing proof of this statement may be found in the absence of a search for Marxist research patterns. No scholars were able to recognise a pioneer Marxist analysis in the local study conducted by Vinko Möderdorfer (1938) in the 1930s (Matičetov 1959: 222; cf. Fikfak 2008; Slavec Gradišnik 2008a). Möderdorfer's discourse on folk culture had nothing in common with the picturesque, aesthetic, ethno-national paradigm that was typical of the ethnographic paradigm in most of continental pre-war Europe (cf. Slavec Gradišnik 2008a).

In practice, the main role of progressively oriented ethnography was to systematically collect information on all cultural phenomena from all Slovenian regions. Collection took precedence over interpretation: 'To neglect the collection of material, which creates the basis of all further scientific work ... means to obstruct the development of science' (Orel 1948a: 6). In the plans for the Ethnographic Museum and the Committee for Slovenian Ethnography, fieldwork was a privileged method: 'one of the

---

[16] For example, researchers from the Ethnographic Museum always provided lectures for the locals in the field during their fieldwork (Simikič 1983, 2003).

[17] It was also true that more extensive discussions concerning Marxist-oriented science appeared only somewhat later (from the 1950s onwards) despite the fact that Marxist journalism was already vigorous before the war. In 1952, *Dijalektički i istorijski materializam* (*Dialectical and Historical Materialism*) was published by Boris Ziherl (1910–76), the leading Marxist theorist in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (and Slovenia); an annotator of the works of Plekhanov, Marx, and Engels; author of essays on history, literature, and philosophy; and a leading postwar sociologist. Marx's *Das Kapital* appeared in Slovenian in 1933, Marx and Engels' letters on the history of materialism in 1948, on art and literature in 1950, their selected papers in two volumes in 1950–51, an introduction to dialectical materialism by Plekhanov in 1933, *Fundamental Problems of Marxism* in 1934 and 1954, *The Materialist Conception of History* in 1946, and *Essays on the History of Materialism* in 1950. Niko Toš (1960) summarised existing discussions on science and ideology at the end of the 1950s.

primary tasks is to get out into the field, into our countryside, and to systematically collect all material that relates to past and current forms of folk life. However, we are of course aware that we will not be able to make up today for certain missed opportunities in [past] ethnographic-folklore research' (Orel 1948a: 7).[18]

For staffing, financial, and organisational reasons, researchers were also forced to acquire material using other methods. For example, in the 1950s questionnaires were important; they were published in magazines and primarily sent to schools and rectories. Researchers aspired to substitute unsystematic pre-war research with efficient organisation, thoroughness, and comprehensiveness in order to ensure the thorough investigation of all material that by definition belonged to folk culture. An important goal was to provide 'a true picture of folk life in our rural areas in the years following the war of national liberation and before the transformation of our villages as part of building our homeland' (Orel 1948a: 7).

The most highlighted areas of research were various forms of material culture. For Orel, these took precedence for two reasons. First, he noted that these forms had been overlooked by previous researchers due to the predominantly folkloristic research orientation. Second, following a Marxist perspective, he asserted that the material conditions of life outline the shape of a society and its ideas (Orel 1948a: 7). This statement was in line with the conception of the subject field of ethnography and folklore studies, which was divided into material, social, and spiritual culture.

There was therefore no doubt about the empirical character of the discipline.[19] A 'true scientific method' was required in order to achieve 'objective scientific conclusions'; this method was to be a historical method that is dialectic in nature and that reveals the 'laws of the material being of society and [explains] its intellectual life by understanding its material development' (Orel 1948a: 8).[20]

Ethnographers could not overlook the course of social change: it was obvious that the differences between living conditions in urban and rural

[18] Orel organised 18 field teams during the years he led the Ethnographic Museum. This was the preferred research method he employed to respond to the demand that science must not remain in dusty offices. The field teams included museum employees and experts in other relevant fields (see Simikič 1983, 2003).

[19] 'Complete material from the field already creates half of the success in processing it' (Orel 1948a: 8).

[20] He explained this with a quotation from Plekhanov: 'From the dialectical point of view, the entire world is a nomothetic process and we must study its constant movement, change, transformation, and development – in other words, historically' (Orel 1948a: 8).

environments would be diminished.[21] Orel wrote that his colleagues did not resist urbanisation: 'such development of our villages ... is in the interest of the welfare of the working people and the advancement of our countryside, and Slovenian ethnographers and folklore specialists as true members of our new people's community cannot and do not wish to impede this. However, at the same time they must understand that such a vision of development requires that they complete specific tasks' (Orel 1948a: 6-7).

For ethnographers and folklore specialists, this indirectly meant that they should investigate the rural folk culture that was changing or dying out. Regardless of the highlighted applied goals, the plans reflected exceptional care for collecting the disappearing evidence of folk culture, and therefore they cannot be understood as being outside the model of the 'salvage projects' characteristic of the history of our discipline.[22] The discipline also preserved an explicitly ethnic (or national) impetus because the studies focused on Slovenian ethnic territory by documenting past and contemporary regional diversity of folk-cultural objectifications and developing their historical typologies.

Criticism of Positivist Ethnography in the Marxist Spirit

There are a number of reasons why the research pattern that privileged the traditional field of cultural-historical research was not challenged until the end of the 1950s. Neither Slovenia nor Yugoslavia were completely isolated from international circles; not all scholarly contacts were prevented, although actual opportunities for research trips abroad were limited.[23] Contact with experts abroad was maintained primarily through correspondence and

---

[21] Orel adopted the vision of the then leading Slovenian politician and Yugoslav ideologue Edvard Kardelj: 'building socialism means in the end the final elimination of the opposition between town and countryside, and that our villages will entirely change their character when community centres and community stores are built in them, when electricity will be supplied to all villages, when there will be pools of agricultural machinery and tractors in villages, workshops, and local factories' (as cited in Orel 1948a: 6).

[22] The outcome was to be a new *Narodopisje Slovencev* (*Ethnography of Slovenians*). The enormous amount of material collected by field teams and stored in the archives of the Ethnographic Museum and the Institute of Slovenian Ethnography sat unused for many years (with the exception of publications of some of this material in a few thematic issues of *Slovenski etnograf*). It was later used mostly in publications of primarily thematic monograph studies.

[23] The archive of the ZRC SAZU (Scientific Research Centre at the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts) Institute of Slovenian Ethnology in Ljubljana clearly demonstrates the kind of difficulties that arose involving funding for even the normal operation of the institute (from the meagre opportunities to employ experts, provide working material, purchase basic literature, and fund local travel, let alone travel abroad; the lengthy procedures for receiving travel permission were normally decided in Belgrade).

literature exchange. The researchers' frame of reference was also not restrained solely by external constraints. Their horizon remained bound by traditional preferences for scholarship from (and about) the Germanic, Slavic, and some Romance linguistic and cultural areas[24]; furthermore, contacts with researchers from the other Yugoslav republics became more intense.[25] As a result, comparative aspects of research were mostly framed in terms of 'families' of peoples and cultures (Slavic, Germanic, Romance).

During the first few years after the war, explicit responses to Soviet ethnography and folklore studies included a review of the 1947 issue of *Sovjetskaja etnografija* (Matičetov 1948) that praised the well-thought-out organisation of the journal into sections, the thoroughness and pithiness of the articles, the thematic openness, research on domestic and foreign cultures, broad scientific perspectives and methods, and pluralism in sources and literature. One article on Soviet folklore studies from *Sovjetskaja etnografija* was also translated into Slovenian (Gippius and Čičerov 1949). Both texts stimulated a comparative inspiration for the reviewer and translator, although the announced follow-ups for future publications and the increase in implementation of research experience of 'comrade Soviet ethnologists' did not take place. However, it should be noted that Soviet ethnographers did draw attention to a number of problems or dilemmas with which Slovenian ethnographers were also grappling (a meagre number of researchers, no new PhD holders, the importance of systematic field studies, the use of diverse data sources, cooperation between disciplines, constructive criticism, keeping up with international happenings in the field, studying the history of the discipline, and terminology).

Therefore, in comparison with certain other socialist countries, the referential horizon of Slovenian ethnology was not subjugated to the effect of the communist 'cognitive organization of the world' (Verdery 1996: 4), although this shaped everyday life in many ways. Criticism of the ethnographic paradigm in the late 1950s and early 1960s was indirectly, although not exclusively, connected with Soviet ethnography. The chief and most thorough actor in Slovenia's 'farewell to folk life' was Slavko Kremenšek, an assistant instructor at the university who later became a professor in the ethnology department. He received a state scholarship to study in Moscow in the early 1960s.

---

[24] This is well illustrated by bibliographic facts such as the references cited in scholarly papers as well as the book reviews and reports published in *Slovenski etnograf* (Plestenjak-Jemec 1972), and later in *Traditiones* (Zemlič Golob 1993).

[25] Folklore specialists were the first to formally unite in a collective Yugoslav Folklore Society and they were followed by ethnologists. Both societies met regularly at biennial congresses until the collapse of Yugoslavia.

Prior to this, Slovenian ethnology had begun to draw closer to European ethnology in the 1950s.[26] Its main issues were summarised by Vilko Novak (1956), at that time an assistant professor at the university[27], who criticised past studies and advocated the fusion of ethnography (*Volkskunde*) and ethnology (*Völkerkunde*) by introducing a uniform focus on 'man as a cultural being' regardless of where he lives, and by terminologically merging ethnography and ethnology into ethnology.[28] These two significant issues in effect erased the boundaries between research in rural and urban settings and between studying past and contemporary cultural forms. Thus new conceptual shifts, following the agenda of European ethnology, were sketched out in the general absence of disciplinary self-reflection in the mid-1950s. These were realised only a few years later, when the ethnographic society started a series of debates and conferences to discuss the prominent matters of the discipline.

When researching issues linked to the Marxist paradigm, one should take into account Slavko Kremenšek's body of work due to its explicit historical and materialistic orientation that manifested itself in the first discussion in the Slovene Ethnographic Society on ethnology as a historical discipline. This debate – given ethnology's generally accepted historical basis – seemed excessive as a manifestation of superfluous theorising, or *Theoriefeindlichkeit*, as Hermann Bausinger (1969) put it. However, this debate also highlighted an issue that pre-war and post-war researchers had not particularly cultivated but that was a recurring theme in the professional tradition. This issue could be characterised most succinctly as the 'double nature' of ethnology: that ethnologists approach ethnological theory and empirical work – thought and practice – as if they could be differentiated or separated. In contrast, Kremenšek advocated a focus on the theoretical foundations, arguing that the successful development of the discipline was:

---

[26] The renaming of the discipline into *etnologija* (ethnology) first took place in 1957, when the Department of Ethnography at the university was renamed the Department of Ethnology.

[27] The university's ethnology department became an institution where ethnology developed most comprehensively and in multiple directions as a function of the department's central task, that of educating professionals trained in the discipline.

[28] Later criticism from the standpoint of cultural anthropology regarded this fusion in Slovenian ethnology as a failure (Muršič 2002: 153). However, when it comes to research opportunities, it is necessary to consider that the general circumstances for supporting research outside the domestic environment were indeed limited, primarily due to funding reasons (and thus staffing). Nonetheless, the university curriculum included survey lectures on non-European ethnology, at first by guest lecturers, later by Slavko Kremenšek, and from the 1970s by Zmago Šmitek.

> dependent on both concrete, inductively established scientific study as well as the general development of theoretical scientific thought ... every individual, concrete, scientific investigation [must] be accompanied by scientifically substantiated ideological and methodological principles that inductively orient scientific work and define its place and meaning within the broader framework of scientific research ... . The development and fulfilment of scientific theory is directly connected with the success of concrete research, just as this ... is connected with the development of theoretical premises. Only their mutual dialectical relationship creates the condition for truly scientifically oriented and substantiated scholarly work (Kremenšek 1960b: 7).

In this way, Kremenšek defined ethnography as a historical discipline[29], but not a discipline about the past. More specifically, he argued that ethnography and historiography both deal with social events that in their essence are historical. His epistemological point of view was that science is 'dependent on every socio-historical developmental stage', that 'it solves the problems that life poses', meaning that its key issues continually change. Evidence of these issues in ethnography is to be found in its history, with its positive and negative traditions, that together also generate modern theoretical premises (Kremenšek 1960b: 7). Kremenšek's criticism was addressed primarily at inconsistencies of cultural-historical, psychological, and functionalist interpretations (Kremenšek 1960b: 8-10). He explicitly gave preference to the ideological and methodological principles of historical materialism. In his view ethnology should focus on historical developments among the broad human masses within a particular ethnic group. The sources and methods to be employed depended on ethnology's appointed problems and goals, with its primary objective being common to all of social science: to study human society in all of its phenomena and to determine the laws of its development.

Because the paramount ethnographic research object until that time had been summed up in the concept of folk culture, Kremenšek focused on it in particular. Folk culture, he maintained, is not an autonomous cultural system or structure, but rather a segment of the overall socio-historical process.[30] It is not possible to separate folk culture from this process, even if it is defined as a (non-historical) type of culture (determined by tradition and community); this holds in equal measure in the case of contemporary culture, which from the perspective of historical materialism is also historically determined and thus historical in and of itself (Kremenšek 1960a: 13).

---

[29] Although *etnologija* was becoming the preferred term, Kremenšek continued to use the term *etnografija* in his publications of 1960 and 1961.

[30] Later he defined it as part of the cultural structure of feudal society (Kremenšek 1983).

Therefore the typological oppositions between folk and non-folk, between past and present, and between rural and urban seemed, to him, implausible. He thus provided a definition of ethnology without the concept of folk culture as a discipline 'of specialised historiographic character, committed to the study of everyday, common, typical cultural forms and the content of everyday life of those social strata and groups that give a particular ethnic or national unit its specific character' (Kremenšek 1961: 7).[31]

Kremenšek's new definitions inaugurated a much more extensive field of study. Following his lead, ethnologists studied distinctive ways of life, the everyday, and the cultures of various social, professional, local, and other groups, framed within the concept of lifestyle. This extension of ethnology's field of study relocated the focus on man, human groups, and their relationships with the material and non-material phenomena of the world in which they live. The implementation of the concept of lifestyle also had a model in Soviet ethnography (Kremenšek 1963, 1964b); however, there were also plenty of remarkable insights to be found in contemporary ethnological theory (Kremenšek 1962).[32] Furthermore, the way of life became at that time a distinctive ethnological concept with which to engage the existing heterogeneous cultural landscape.[33] In general, it seems that the claims that Kremenšek relied on the model of Soviet ethnography are exaggerated. It is true that he was most inspired by Soviet ethnography's studies of contemporary cultural processes among various ethnic groups and especially among the working class; he also appreciated their complete abandonment of the study of cultural relics, and implementation of the historical-materialist orientation. However – with the exception of this last element – he found many comparable examples elsewhere, evidence of this was apparent in the ways he substantiated research on contemporary ways of life, urban culture, work-

---

[31] Kremenšek was not alone in redefining the field's focus. The lawyer Sergij Vilfan had also written that the 'subject of ethnography is … everyday life and work such as it really was' (Vilfan 1951: 443). A few years later, Angelos Baš also dropped 'folk culture' from his definition of the discipline, which he defined as the 'discipline of the lifestyle or, more precisely, of the history of the lifestyle of individual peoples' (Baš A. 1968, 1978). Earlier, Baš had defined 'ethnography' as the 'science of the history of folk culture', whereby he understood folk culture within the framework of the triple-layered theory of culture. Baš was the only person who explicitly wrote about shaping a uniform 'socialist culture' (Baš A. 1960).

[32] Kremenšek published a series of articles dealing with the concepts 'way of life', 'lifestyle', 'everyday life' in a broader comparative perspective; they are summarised in two extensive discussions on 'way of life' as an analytical concept (Kremenšek 1985, 1987). Cf. Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 332–62.

[33] In Slovenia, an increased interest in everyday cultural phenomena grew in historiography, sociology, and cultural studies in the following decades. Folklore scholars kept folk culture as their key concept.

ers' culture, industrialisation, and ethnic relations (Kremenšek 1962, 1964a, 1966, 1968; cf. Rihtman-Auguštin 1976).

Kremenšek himself authenticated the programmatically expanded ethnological horizons with his pioneering studies of culture in the city (Kremenšek 1964a, 1970, 1979). These works conveyed his critical assessments of the concepts that outline the field of research (folk culture, lifestyle); his criticisms of cultural-historical methodology and of positivism; his consequent favouring of the historical (i.e. genetic-structural) method; his critical study of the history of the discipline; and his insistence on the autonomy of ethnology as well as its interdisciplinary openness. In all of these issues, Kremenšek's view was primarily critical-historical and comparative: he highlighted the gaps and fallacies of older approaches to ethnography, as well as its relatively static object of research. His critique also provoked a great deal of resistance, especially on the part of the older generation of folklore scholars, who characterised the new agenda as a kind of ethnosociology. Most importantly, Kremenšek opened (and allowed) new horizons and new interpretive possibilities to his successors, even if he also sometimes engaged in polemics with them.

Kremenšek's research and teaching primarily had an impact on the group of researchers who were professionally socialised from the 1970s to the mid-1990s.[34] From the 1970s onwards, the university's ethnology department gradually consolidated its teaching faculty and became a centre at which teaching and training helped substantiate the inception of research on contemporary cultural phenomena; on culture in cities and industrial neighbourhoods; among various social and professional groups; on life during the Second World War; among Slovenian émigrés; and on interethnic contacts. Research in this vein also included monograph studies of local communities, topographic research of Slovenian ethnic territory, and the applied aspects of ethnological research. Kremenšek's role as a mentor cannot be overlooked; he knew how to motivate students, advise them, and guide them professionally, even helping them to find employment. He personally also took it upon himself to expand jobs in ethnology from the central institutions in Ljubljana into all museums and institutions for monument protection. And, he invested much of his zeal in linking ethnologists into their professional society.

[34] They were aided in their ethnological studies in great measure by the first and only general ethnology textbook to have been published in Slovenia, *Obča etnologija* (*General Ethnology*) (Kremenšek 1973); Kremenšek also published his later lectures (Kremenšek 1983–90).

Aftermath: A Personal Account and Commentary

Kremenšek's writings contain very few explicit references to scientific Marxism, which was, from the standpoint of official science policy, obligatory for all sciences. Similarly, it is important to emphasise that the majority of ethnologists and folklore specialists in Slovenia before and after the war, as well as even through the end of socialism, had a generally non-Marxist orientation. In contrast, Marxist thought already influenced historians before the Second World War. Historians in Slovenia also drew on apostrophised ethnological evidence, as had Engels (e.g. in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* [1884]) in their analyses of socio-historical processes. For example, Boris Ziherl (1951) included the everyday life of 'direct producers, the Slovenian working people' in social issues alongside political and economic history (Kremenšek 1980: 416-17). However, it is worth noting that debates explicitly addressing Marxism in scholarship from the perspective of epistemology and methodology took place in ethnology only in the mid-1970s (see Supek-Zupan 1976).

The way in which Kremenšek's basic perceptual premise was shaped is most directly revealed in his auto-biographical reflection[35] on the path that led him to ethnology and of course on the broader context in which he lived and worked. Kremenšek was born in 1932 to a smallholder family. As a boy he read everything that was possible to find in the small town of Kozje, where he lived. His father was a subscriber to the liberal newspaper *Jutro* (*Morning*), but Kremenšek equally liked to read *Vrtec* (*Kindergarten*), a magazine for young people published by Catholic circles, and the compendium *Leto svetnikov* (*The Year of the Saints*). He made a break with religious education and the Church very quickly after he noticed the different grades given to students from Catholic and non-Catholic families in secondary school. He became a member of the Communist Party in 1950, while still a secondary school student. Upon completing secondary school he studied history at the University of Ljubljana.

An external influence was the driving force behind his decision to become an ethnologist. He knew little about ethnology before 1958 when he was approached to become an assistant instructor in ethnology (not ethnography, for which Vilko Novak was responsible) during a search for a replacement for the retiring professor Niko Zupanič. Kremenšek was a protégé of the historian Metod Mikuž, who among all professors in the Faculty of Arts also knew the most about ethnology. As a theology student, Mikuž had

[35] During the years of our acquaintance, I had many conversations with him, the last ones on this topic in 2010. If not marked differently, the quotations that follow come from my interview with Kremenšek in May 2010.

attended lectures by Lambert Ehrlich[36] on comparative religion that also included some discussions on 'primitive cultures'. Along with ethnography (the study of domestic folk traditions), Mikuž understood ethnology in the sense of *Völkerkunde.* Knowledge of non-European primitive peoples or proto-communities was (also in Slovenia) an integral part of the materialist historical understanding of history (Ziherl 1974: 157; Kremenšek 1980: 416). For Kremenšek, the offer to continue his studies in England was hard to refuse: 'at that time I was not tempted by ethnology, I was tempted by studying abroad. Can you imagine what it meant to study abroad at that time?!'. However, before studying abroad, he had to do his military service, receive a degree in ethnology under Novak, and improve his knowledge of English. After that he was to be appointed to study at Oxford or Cambridge. In this regard Kremenšek saw himself as a modernised 'copy of Ehrlich' who had also studied at Oxford (Kremenšek 2010: 85; personal communication). At least in this case there were no reservations about him leaving for the West, or any response about Western ethnology being a bourgeois science.

Nevertheless, after he had completed all the agreed requirements, he was told: 'England is off. Your generation has too little Marxist education and does not come back'. Because he had left a relatively unpromising job at the National Museum (*Narodni muzej*) before learning about this decision, he became a trainee under Boris Ziherl at the newly founded Sociology Institute until an assistant instructor position in ethnology opened.[37] When he finally entered the ethnology department, 'at the first possible opportunity I applied for a scholarship that would have enabled me to study abroad. So that nobody would be afraid that I would not come back because of a lack of ideological education, I chose the Soviet Union' (Kremenšek 2010: 85). In 1961-62 he studied under the internationally recognised professor Sergei Aleksandrovich Tokarev[38], who 'gave [him] complete freedom'. In Moscow, he became acquainted with contemporary ethnological studies and with Russian local studies, and he read extensive literature from European ethnology.

Yet Kremenšek's incentives and ideas for a renewal of ethnology were not the fruit of this thorough study of literature in ethnology and methodol-

---

[36] Cf. footnote 5.

[37] The assistant instructor position was not opened for an unusually long time; Novak allegedly resisted Kremenšek's appointment because of the latter's reputation as a communist, but eventually yielded to pressure (Kremenšek 2010: 85).

[38] Professor Tokarev was also a member of the Soviet Border Demarcation Committee. In this capacity, he spent several months in the Slovenian littoral; he also visited Ljubljana at that time and on several later occasions.

ogy. Rather, it would be possible to argue that in this literature study he found a confirmation of his own observations, experiences, and reflections:

> Not based on literature at all. Precisely because I was a stranger to ethnology, I looked at matters as a historian. If things, (if) ethnology really is not organised in some kind of historical context, everything is together... . I am still firmly convinced, I came to ethnology as a historian, and this is how I left ethnology. You could say that I did not learn anything from it ... Only in a historical way, a historical approach.

He considered the historical perspective as the core of methodology:

> this methodology, I developed it myself. Well, of course, here and there I read something else, but all of this came out of some kind of life practice. Also from the good knowledge, like I said, of Slovenia'a complex history.[39] I also read relatively little Marxist literature and theory. Let us say ... I came across [Georgi] Plekhanov, ok, but even so, this all seemed clear to me. To me, Marxism and history seemed ... nothing but mere life experience. You instinctively understand these things. […] I was pretty damn walled in on the other side as well[40], I did not close myself up just in that communist world.

The 'spontaneous Marxism' of Kremenšek's ethnology has the potential of operating as a stepping stone in the post-factum searches for the limitations or, more precisely, for the potentially detrimental effects of the Kremenšek school in its emphasis on a historical paradigm and national orientation; its lack of a worked-out methodology; and its omission of productive Marxist premises.[41] Such a critique, however, is a theoretically pretentious undertaking that seeks more than it can find, and for the most part overlooks the adopted achievements and outcomes of that paradigm, however it may be called: Marxist, historical, materialist, or perhaps even enlightened.

---

[39] One of his important experiences was his study of the student movement from 1919 to 1941 (Kremenšek 1972), in which it was necessary to encompass the entirety, not just one side, and to set differences alongside one another and explain them.

[40] What he had in mind here is primarily the fact that his wife, also a historian, was a Catholic and the niece of a priest and member of the White Guard. Because of this and her 'unsuitable' explanation of a materialist and idealistic worldview in the classroom, her path as a teacher was terminated before it began because she could not get a job. When she started a family, she changed her maiden name and moved to Ljubljana. After two years she succeeded in resuming her teaching career (cf. Balkovec Debevec 2008).

[41] This primarily involves later criticism by advocates of the 'anthropological turn' in Slovenian ethnology. Earlier critics reproached for emphasising the social determinants of culture, as if the field were simply some kind of sociology.

Because Kremenšek's vision of ethnology was primarily established through new, hitherto overlooked and uninvestigated topics and issues, the reproach that the new ethnological agenda gave preference to certain issues and overlooked many obvious problems is understandable.[42] However, the long-reaching consequences of his teaching are unquestionable given that, with Kremenšek's insight into the material basis and social structure, his teaching opened an analytic space for research on cultural differentiation and cultural dynamics, conflict included. From this perspective, culture is at least in principle determined more by class than ethnicity.[43] Along with this, the analytical approaches that were established in the Marxist spirit gave rise to numerous challenges for research practice and to room for animated discussions in which various points of view were engaged. From this point of view, the Marxist agenda was the driving force of the disciplinary landscape for nearly three decades.

It is worth mentioning another small detail about political influences on scholarly life that do not fall under the category of ideology, but concern concrete interventions by the main political institution of the time – the Communist Party. Kremenšek, explained the Party's role this way:

> Yes, I was set up by the Party, but you can see how the Party set me up. After that this Party, which of course had nothing to do with the matter and deserved no credit, left me completely alone ... . I also never considered myself a member of the Party. Oh, it is interesting, after all that, when Mikuž told me 'England is off', but after that, by God, nobody ever stuck their nose into anything to do with ethnology. There is nobody to thank for anything – I am thinking about Party members or the Party – for ethnology being the way it was, at least the way I got it going ... . That really did not have anything to do with the Party.

It can be seen that direct Party influence somehow bypassed ethnology, even in the case of hiring people for leading positions at the central ethnological institutions. The Department of Ethnology at the university was led by a Yugoslav federalist, Niko Zupanič, after the war, and in 1948 Vilko Novak, who belonged to the Catholic intellectual circle, became his assistant and later the head of the department. Ivan Grafenauer, the head of the Committee for Slovenian Ethnography (later Institute), also came from Catholic intellectual circles as did Boris Orel, the first post-war director of the Ethnographic

[42] I am primarily thinking of the critical engagement with with 'socialist culture', which points to ethnology's reticence to analyse the present and everyday life (cf. Rihtman-Auguštin 1988, 2004). However, this fact is not a Slovenian peculiarity (e.g. Hann 1993; Burawoy and Verdery 1999; Roth 2005; Čale Feldman and Prica 2006).

[43] In concrete research practice there was a focus on the Slovenian ethnic territory.

Museum. Although Orel was also part of the Catholic circle, he shifted his research priorities after the war, probably because of his new position. All of these and others found niches that made professional research possible. If the regime had been truly orthodox and rigid in the implementation of its ideology, one would question whether a discipline with such a character would have survived. One could argue the somewhat tendentious but still noteworthy point that post-war ethnography was a small and marginalised discipline that did not bother anyone, and that here and there someone was also able to see something positive in the study of ethnic traditions.

Outside of this discussion, however, the following questions still remain unanswered: how did socialist ideology and its concrete mechanisms regulate the lives of all citizens – including scholars and, more specifically, ethnologists – at the level of everyday and professional life? What kind of regime were institutions subjugated to, and what was the position of individuals in them?[44] What kind of official and unofficial pressures existed; how did people resist them; and, if possible, avoid them? Scholars were not immune to the impact of socialist politics that to varying degrees permeated many aspects of everyday life over the years. The same instruments and mechanisms of the political sphere also shaped the institutional habitus at universities and research organisations. Knowledge about everyday routines may also illuminate knowledge on scholarship because researchers adapt to the imposed routines, as party cells also formed part of their institutions. Yet despite the general belief in party influence on academic life, there have been few documented personal experiences and narratives (see Fikfak 2011) that would point to more significant interventions in the ethnological sphere (an exemption to this being the dramatic purging of professors from the Faculty of Sociology, Political Science, and Journalism in the 1970s) (cf. Godina this volume).

These and many other questions arise in a more focused perspective when examining a phenomenon that formally no longer exists but whose traces have not yet been erased. However, it is unequivocal that, at least in Slovenia, the socialist period was an important time for the development of ethnology as a discipline. In addition, a number of the local details discussed here shift the focus away from the phenomena of 'socialist' science policy and explicit political interventions in scholarship. Nevertheless, along with

[44] From what is known, the leading positions in institutions were occupied by individuals regardless of the greater or lesser suitability of their worldview. Thus the socialist period can be characterised as the Novak and Kremenšek periods at the university department – that is, two periods shaped by completely different personalities, views, and disciplinary perspectives (Kremenšek 2010) – the Orel period at the Ethnographic Museum, and the Grafenauer-Kuret period at the Institute of Slovenian Ethnography.

the strong impact of the traditional positivist ethnographic paradigm, the characteristics of the academic landscape between 1945 and 1991 exhibit a powerful imprint of the expanded disciplinary field. This was not implemented as an explicitly Marxist agenda but rather as a deliberate materialist and historical program that inspired and instituted a critical debate that paved the way to a much more diversified research agenda from the 1990s. The case of ethnology in Slovenia may thus be significant for analogous interdisciplinary and comparative lines of inquiry.

The developments in ethnology after the formal dissolution of socialism, the collapse of Yugoslavia, and the independence of Slovenia are not discussed here. However, it is worth noting that as in the case of other former Communist Bloc countries, ethnology was characterised– in both name and practice – by the introduction of cultural and social anthropological orientations during the postsocialist period.[45] The lines of anthropology developed by Professor Stane Južnič at the Faculty of Political Science and Journalism and by Božo Škerlj have been overlooked, while the work of Niko Zupanič has been held in high esteem (Muršič and Hudelja 2009; Godina this volume). At the same time new Slovenian anthropologists were not reluctant to retroactively recast as anthropological a number of authors and works that had belonged to the ethnological disciplinary tradition (Šmitek and Jezernik 1992, 1995).

Looking back, it is not surprising that there is a general post-factum conviction concerning the negative, harmful ideological constraints that socialism placed on scholarship, and concretely on ethnology, which was ultimately able to blossom only with the 'anthropological turn' after the end of socialism (Brumen 2001, 2002). An identity crisis of the discipline was said to be characteristic in the countries that emerged from behind the Iron Curtain that, 'with the fall of totalitarian regimes and their ideological apparatus – in places these also had a greater or lesser effect on research policy – found (themselves) facing new academic challenges' (Brumen 2001: 11). Consequently, for understanding the socialist period, not only are references from the socialist era key, but so too are later critical historical evaluations of the discipline, especially those analyses that employ criticism of (presumably orthodox historical) past developments to affirm new orientations

[45] Intense discussions about this took place especially in the 1990s in nearly all countries, and most of them were published in prominent journals. They dealt with the history, situation, and goals of the discipline, and later on also with the findings of social and cultural anthropology in the postsocialist countries. These discussions also quickly made their way to the international arena, to conferences and published volumes (e.g. Vermeulen and Roldán 1995; Skalník 2000, 2002; Dracklé and Edgar 2003; Dracklé, Edgar, and Schippers 2003; Kürti and Skalník 2009). All of these also drew critical attention to the preceding period, when the issue of culture research was the domain of ethnology, ethnography, and folklore studies.

(e.g. Brumen 2001; Muršič 1994, 1995, 2001, 2002). Such analyses primarily involve criticism of the historical paradigm and the national focus in ethnology during socialism that, according to its critics, inhibited development in the direction of diverse anthropological theories, methodologies, and research topics. However, this critical stance lacks 'a sympathetic understanding of the context in which this history was made' (Hann, Sarkany and Skalnik 2005: 1).

A question that should be addressed in another study concerns the ways in which research policy and institutions' and individuals' concrete research practices actually changed after the end of socialism (cf. Godina 2002). How did everyday socialist culture permeate the opinions, values, and behaviours of individuals and institutions (cf. Rihtman-Auguštin 1992, 2004)? And, how did it continue to operate after its bases had started gradually disintegrating during the transition to the new system?

References

Balkovec Debevec, M. 2008. 'Moj ideal je vzgojiti dobrega človeka, odkritega človeka…'. Iz pisem prof. Marije Kremenšek, roj. Glavač. *Šolska kronika* 17 (2): 536–546.

Baš, A. 1960. Etnografija - zgodovinska znanost. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnografskega društva* 2 (2): 9–10.

———. 1968. O predmetu etnologije. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 4 (34): 273–277.

———. 1978. O 'ljudstvu' in 'ljudskem' v slovenski etnologiji. In S. Kremenšek, and A. Baš (eds.), *Pogledi na etnologijo*, pp. 67–115. Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga in Filozofska fakulteta (Pogledi; 3).

Baš, F. 1949. Delo Zgodovinskega društva v Mariboru. *Slovenski etnograf* 2: 114–115.

Bausinger, H. 1961. *Volkskultur in der technischen Welt.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag.

———. 1969. Zur Theoriefeindlichkeit in der Volkskunde. *Etnologia Europea* 2–3: 55–58.

Bogataj, J., and M. Terseglav (eds.). 1983. *Zbornik 1. kongresa jugoslovanskih etnologov in folkloristov*. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva; 10/ 1, 2).

Bošković, A. 2010. Anthropology in Unlikely Places: Yugoslav Ethnology Between the Past and the Future. In A. Bošković, *Other People's*

Anthropologies: Ethnographic Practice on the Margins, pp. 156–168. New York and Oxford: Berghahn.

Brumen, B. 2001. 'Refolucija' slovenske etnologije in kulturne antropologije. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 41 (1–2): 8–16.

———. 2002. Struggle for Identity – Present Situation in Slovenian Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology. In K. Köstlin, P. Niedermüller, and H. Nikitsch (eds.), *Die Wende als Wende? Orientierungen europäischer Ethnologien nach 1989*, pp. 135–149. Wien: Institut für Europäische Ethnologie (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie der Universtität Wien; 23).

Burawoy, M., and K. Verdery (eds.). 1999. *Uncertain Transition: Ethnographies of Change in the Postsocialist World.* Lanham, Boulder, New York and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

Čale Feldman, L., and I. Prica (eds.). 2006. *Devijacije i promašaji. Etnografija domaćeg socijalizma*. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku (Biblioteka Nova etnografija).

Čapo Žmegač, J. 2004. From 'the Science of People' to Contemporary Ethno-Anthropology. (Editor's Preface). In D. Rihtman-Auguštin, *Ethnology, Myth and Politics: Anthropologizing Croatian Ethnology*, pp. vii–xvii. Aldershot: Ashgate (Progress in European Ethnology).

Dracklé, D., and I. R. Edgar (eds.). 2003. *Current Policies and Practices in European Social Anthropology.* New York and Oxford: Berghahn (EASA series; 2).

Dracklé, D., I. R. Edgar, and T. K. Schippers (eds.). 2003. *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology.* New York and Oxford: Berghahn (EASA series; 1).

Ehrlich, L. 1929. Razvoj etnologije in njene metode v zadnjem desetletju. *Etnolog* 3: 7–13.

Fikfak, J. 2008. Med delom in celoto. Nekatera vprašanja etnološkega raziskovanja in reprezentacije. In I. Slavec Gradišnik (ed.), *Etnološki pogledi in podobe*, pp. 27–44. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.

———. 2010. The 'Agenda' of 'Non-Marxist' Folklore Studies. In G. Kiliánová, and E. Krekovičová (eds.), *International Conference of the Institute of Ethnology SAS: Programme and Abstracts*, p. 18. Bratislava: Institute of Ethnology SAS.

———. 2011. *Niches and Interplay: 'Non-Marxist' Folklore Studies under Communism*. Paper presented at the Workshop: "The Rise of Anthropology 'on the Margins of Europe', 1945-1991". Halle/ S., March 2011 (cited with author's permission).

Geiger, P., U. Jeggle, and G. Korff (eds.). 1970. *Abschied vom Volksleben.* Tübingen: Ludwig-Uhland-Institut der Universität Tübingen (Untersuchungen der Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts der Universität Tübingen; 27).

Gippius, E. V., and V. I. Čičerov. 1949 [1947]. Trideset let sovjetske folkloristike. *Slovenski etnograf* 2: 72–93.

Godina, V. 2002. From Ethnology to Anthropology and Back Again: Negotiating the Boundaries of Ethnology and Anthropology in Post-Socialist European Countries. In P. Skalník (ed.), *A Post-Communist Millenium: The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*, pp. 1–22. Prague: Set Out.

Halpern, J. M. 2005. Yugoslav Socialism and its Aftermath as Viewed Through the Lens of Personal Experiences in the Balkans, 1953-2004. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 45 (4): 25–37, 134.

Hann, C. M. (ed.). 1993. *Socialism: Ideals, Ideologies, and Local Practice.* London and New York: Routledge.

Hann, C., M. Sárkány, and P. Skalník (eds.). 2005. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East-Europe*. Münster: LIT.

Johler, R., H. Nikitsch, and B. Tschofen (eds.). 1999. *Ethnische Symbole und ästhetische Praxis in Europa.* Wien: Institut für Volkskunde. (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Volkskunde der Universität Wien; 17).

Köstlin, K. 1994. Das ethnographische Paradigma und die Jahrhundertwenden. *Ethnologia Europaea* 24 (1): 5–20.

Kremenšek, S. 1960a. Etnografija in zgodovinopisje. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnografskega društva* 2 (2): 13.

———. 1960b. Etnografija in zgodovinopisje. *Slovenski etnograf* 13: 7–12.

———. 1961. Nekaj pripomb. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnografskega društva* 3 (2): 7–8.

———. 1962. Težnje v sodobni etnološki znanstveni teoriji. *Slovenski etnograf* 15: 9–62.

———. 1963. Proučevanje sodobnega življenja v sovjetski etnografiji. *Etnološki pregled* 5: 93–97.

———. 1964a. *Ljubljansko naselje Zelena jama kot etnološki problem*. PhD Dissertation. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

———. 1964b. Nekaj značilnosti sodobne sovjetske etnografije. *Slovenski etnograf* 16–17: 109–114.

———. 1966. Industrializacija, urbanizacija in etnološki vidik. *Slovenski etnograf* 18–19: 133–154.

——. 1968. Etnologija sedanjosti in njena temeljna izhodišča. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 4 (34): 278–285.
——. 1970. *Ljubljansko naselje Zelena jama kot etnološki problem*. Ljubljana: SAZU (Dela. Razred za zgodovinske in družbene vede; 16).
——. 1972. *Slovensko študentovsko gibanje 1919-1941*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
——. 1973. *Obča etnologija*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
——. 1978. Družbeni temelji razvoja slovenske etnološke misli. In S. Kremenšek, and A. Baš (eds.), *Pogledi na etnologijo*, pp. 9–65. Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga & FF (Pogledi; 3).
——. 1979. *Suburban Villagers: A Case Study of the Village of Moste near Ljubljana (Slovenia, Yugoslavia): The Transformation of a Rural Society, 1780-1931*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts (Occasional papers series: Program in Soviet and East European Studies 2).
——. 1980. Boris Ziherl in etnološka misel. *Teorija in praksa* 17 (4): 414–418.
——. 1983. O ljudstvu in ljudski kulturi. In S. Kremenšek, *Etnološki razgledi in dileme 1*, pp. 99–130 (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva; 11).
——. 1983–1990. *Etnološki razgledi in dileme 1–4*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva; 11, 13, 17, 20).
——. 1985. Način življenja – 1. In S. Kremenšek, *Etnološki razgledi in dileme 2*, pp. 102–167. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva; 13).
——. 1987. Način življenja – 2. Pojem način življenja v jugoslovanskih etnologijah. Razumevanje načina življenja v družbeni praksi. In S. Kremenšek, *Etnološki razgledi in dileme 3*, pp. 5–46, 47–146. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva; 3).
——. 2010. Profesor Vilko Novak in drugače misleči. Po spominu. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 50 (3–4): 84–86.
Kuhn, T. 1998 [1969]. *Struktura znanstvenih revolucij*. Ljubljana: Krtina.
Kürti, L., and P. Skalník (eds.). 2009. *Postsocialist Europe: Anthropological Perspectives from Home*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
Kuret, N. 1972. Naša 25-letnica. Komisija (1947–1941) in Inštitut za slovensko narodopisje (od 1951). Nastanek, razvoj, delo (prvi del). *Traditiones* 1: 9–18.
Löfgren, O. 1989. The Nationalization of Culture. *Ethnologia Europaea* 19 (1): 5–24.

Ložar, R. (ed.). 1944. *Narodopisje Slovencev I.* Ljubljana: Založba Klas.
Matičetov, M. 1948. 'Sovjetska etnografija' 1947. *Slovenski etnograf* 1: 121–125.
———. 1959. Vinko Möderndorfer. *Slovenski etnograf* 12: 221–222.
Michăilescu, V., I. Iliev, and S. Naumović (eds.). 2008. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*. Münster: LIT.
Möderndorfer, V. 1938. *Slovenska vas na Dolenjskem*. Ljubljana: [publ. by the author].
Muršič, R. 1994. O razmerju med etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo ter predvsem o teoriji v etnologiji. Žolčno provokativni esej za enkratno uporabo. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 34 (1–2): 10–16.
———. 1995. Oddaljeni pogled na preplete etnološke samorefleksije. Etnološki raziskovalni programi. In R. Muršič, and M. Ramšak (eds.), *Razvoj slovenske etnologije od Štreklja in Murka do sodobnih etnoloških prizadevanj*, pp. 147–154. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva; 23).
———. 2001. Slovenska etnologija in marksizem. V vrtincu stoterih možnosti. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 41 (1–2): 19–26.
———. 2002. In the Arms of the Sublime Objects of Desire: On Politics and Anthropology / Ethnology in Slovenia. In P. Skalník (ed.), *A Post-Communist Millenium: The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe,* pp. 147–165. Prague: Set Out.
Muršič, R., and M. Hudelja (eds.). 2009. *Niko Zupanič, njegovo delo, čas in prostor. Spominski zbornik ob 130. obletnici rojstva dr. Nika Zupaniča*. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba FF (Zupaničeva knjižnica; 32).
Novak, V. 1947. *Ljudska prehrana v Prekmurju. Etnografska študija*. Ljubljana: Slovenski knjižni zavod.
———. 1956. O bistvu etnografije in njeni metodi. *Slovenski etnograf* 9: 7–16.
Orel, B. 1948a. V novo razdobje. *Slovenski etnograf* 1: 5–8.
———. 1948b. Etnografski muzej v Ljubljani, njega delo, problemi in naloge. *Slovenski etnograf* 1: 107–120.
Plestenjak-Jemec, B. 1972. Bibliografija Slovenskega etnografa I–XXII. *Slovenski etnograf* 23–24: 131–153.
Portis-Winner, I. 2005. *Semiotika kmetstva v tranziciji. Slovenski vaščani in njihovi sorodniki v Ameriki.* Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU (Opera ethnologica slovenica).
Prica, I. 2004. Nasljeđe jugoslovenskih etnologija i suvremeno istaživanje postsocijalizma. *Traditiones* 33 (1): 19–34.

Rihtman-Auguštin, D. 1976. Pretpostavke suvremenog etnološkog istraživanja. *Narodna umjetnost* 13: 1–24.
———. 1992. Etnologija socijalizma i poslije. *Etnološka tribina* 15: 81–91.
———. 1987. Teorija o dvije kulture. Od Radića do Gramscija, Ciresea i Burkea. *Narodna umjetnost* 24 (1): 177–192.
———. 1988. *Etnologija naše svakodnevice*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
———. 2004. *Ethnology, Myth and Politics: Anthropologizing Croatian Ethnology*. (J. Čapo Žmegač, ed.). Aldershot: Ashgate.
Roth, K. (ed.). 2005. *Sozialismus: Realitäten und Illusionen. Ethnologische Aspekte der sozialistischen Alltagskultur*. Wien: Verlag des Instituts für Europäische Ethnologie.
Simikič, A. 1983. Pomen Orlovih ekip za muzejski dokumentacijski fond. In J. Bogataj, and M. Terseglav (eds.), *Zbornik 1. kongresa jugoslovanskih etnologov in folkloristov; 2*, pp. 466–476. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo (Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva; 10/2).
———. 2003. 'Jaz sem pa mislila, da je kakšen vohun'. Ob stoletnici rojstva dr. Borisa Orla in petinpetdesetletnici odhoda prve t. i. Orlove ekipe na teren. *Etnolog* 3 (64): 109–131.
Skalník, P. (ed.). 2000. *Sociocultural Anthropology at the Turn of the Century*. Prague: Set Out.
———. (ed.). 2002. *A Post-Communist Millenium: The Struggles for Sociocultural Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*. Prague: Set Out.
Slavec Gradišnik, I. 2000. *Etnologija na Slovenskem. Med narodopisjem in antropologijo*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
———. 2008a. Pogledi in podobe. K vprašanjem o produkciji znanja v etnologiji I. In I. Slavec Gradišnik (ed.), *Etnološki pogledi in podobe*, pp. 217–250. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU.
———. 2008b. Scraps of the history of ethnology in Slovenia. *Český lid* 95 (1): 37–62.
———. 2010a. Etnologija v Sloveniji in Srbiji. Dve tradiciji 'jugoslovanske' etnologije? *Traditiones* 39 (1): 17–35. (DOI: 10.3986/Traditio 2010390103).
———. 2010b. 'Marxistický program' v slovinskej etnológii? *Slovenský. národopis* 58 (4): 478–495e.
Stanonik, M. 2011. Ivan Grafenauer. Njegove kulturnohistorične in etnološkoprimerjalne raziskave (slovenske) slovstvene folklore. *Traditiones* 40 (1): 11–114.
Stocklund, B. 1999. How the Peasant House became a National Symbol. *Ethnologia Europaea* 29 (1): 5–18.

Supek-Zupan, O. 1976. Od teorije do prakse i nazad. Mogućnost marksističkog shvaćanja u etnologiji. *Narodna umjetnost* 13: 57–75.

Šmitek, Z., and B. Jezernik. 1992. Antropološka tradicija na Slovenskem. *Etnolog* 2 (2): 259–274.

———. 1995. The anthropological tradition in Slovenia. In H. F. Vermeulen, and A. A. Roldan (eds.), *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*, pp. 171–183. London and New York: Routledge (EASA).

Toš, N. 1960. Znanost in ideologija. *Naša sodobnost* 8 (6): 538–545.

Verdery, K. 1996. *What was Socialism and what comes next?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vermeulen, H. F., and A. A. Roldán (eds.). 1995. *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the History of European Anthropology*. London and New York: Routledge (EASA).

Vilfan, S. 1951. Nova slovenska etnografija. *Tovariš* 7 (28): 443.

Ziherl, B. 1951. O nekaterih teoretičnih in praktičnih problemih slovenskega zgodovinopisja. *Novi svet* 6: 481–495.

———. 1974. *Včeraj in danes. Izbor člankov in razprav iz let 1934–1974*. Ljubljana: DZS.

Zemljič Golob, S. 1993. Bibliografia Traditiones 1-20, 1972-91. *Traditiones* 22: 153-190.

Chapter 10

On the Work and Activity of Prof. Stane Južnič: Or, How and When Socio-Cultural and Political Anthropology Were Initiated in Slovenia

Vesna V. Godina

To the memory of Prof. Stane Južnič

Introduction: The Work and Teaching of Stane Južnič

During the twentieth century there were several attempts to introduce anthropology as part of the Slovenian sciences, scientific tradition, and academic curricula (Gradišnik Slavec 2000: 115-21; 509-24; Muršič 2008: 111-16). In the field of physical or biological anthropology the most important figure was Professor Božo Škerlj, who introduced the classical study of physical anthropology (Škerlj 1934, 1959a; Gradišnik Slavec 2000: 116), and is today considered the godfather of Slovene physical anthropology. Socio-cultural anthropology, which was known and read among Slovene ethnologists after the Second World War (Gradišnik Slavec 2000: 115-19), was not accepted as a sub-discipline to be incorporated into ethnological study (ibid.: 115-16, 509-11). On the contrary, it was understood as a scientific discipline entirely different from ethnology, the results of which could nevertheless be of interest to ethnologists.

Socio-cultural and political anthropology was introduced into post-war science and scientific tradition, as well as into Slovene university curricula, in the 1960s, when Stane Južnič started teaching social and political anthropology at the Faculty of Sociology, Political Science, and Journalism (FSPJ).[1] In 1969, he first introduced a basic course at the undergraduate

[1] Prof. Stane Južnič did his postgraduate studies in Rome and completed his PhD at the University of Belgrade. His early specialisation was on the genesis of capitalism in non-European societies. As a diplomat, he spent several years in Great Britain (where he attended lectures by Evans-Pritchard) and in the United States. He also travelled throughout Latin America, which became a central topic for his research. He chaired the Department for Underdeveloped Countries at the Institute for International Politics and Economy in Belgrade.

level, Social and Political Anthropology, and then several other courses at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels, such as Linguistic Anthropology, Civilisations, and Racial Anthropology. His teaching was accompanied by intensive writing, especially of textbooks, which were obligatory study materials for students taking his courses.[2] In 1977, Južnič published his first undergraduate level textbook *Socialna in politična antropologija* (*Social and Political Anthropology*) for use in the course of the same title. The graduate textbook *Lingvistična antropologija* (*Linguistic Anthropology*) was published in 1983. His third textbook, *Antropologija* (*Anthropology*), was published in 1987. He presented several further anthropological topics in other texts and books, such as *Identiteta* (*Identity* [1993a]), *Človekovo telo med naravo in kulturo* (*Human Body between Nature and Culture* [1998]), *Kolonializem in dekolonizacija* (*Colonialism and Decolonisation* [1980]), and *Politična kultura* (*Political Culture* [1973 and 1980]).

At the Faculty of Sociology, Political Science, and Journalism, socio-cultural and political anthropology was a marginal and marginalised subject of study. Introduction of the course Social and Political Anthropology was not intended as a first step towards the study of socio-cultural and political anthropology as a separate scientific discipline. On the contrary, it was understood as a course that would introduce some new perspectives and knowledge into the study of sociology, political science, journalism, and communicology (Južnič 1987: 8). This was why, as Južnič stressed, it was called 'social and political anthropology', and not, for example, anthropology (ibid.).

Despite its marginal position, social and political anthropology and the other anthropological courses which Južnič taught first at FSPJ and then at its successor institution, the Faculty of Social Sciences, had an extremely good reputation. Južnič was popular and highly respected among students; he was an extraordinary teacher. His lectures had a sound theoretical foundation, they were systematic, and they were accompanied by his special brand of personal humour. In each lecture, he opened new theoretical, social, and political perspectives on theoretical problems, as well as on the social and political practices of the society in which we lived. His lectures were considered to be the best in the faculty, and he was one of the most popular supervisors of undergraduate, master's, and doctoral theses. He supervised more

---

He also participated in the work of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. Južnič lectured at several universities in former Yugoslavia and abroad, including the Johns Hopkins University. He also participated in numerous conferences and workshops, from Athens to Stockholm and from Warsaw to London.

[2] Južnič's more than 120 publications include 19 books and numerous articles, research reports, etc. His work deals primarily with problems of non-European societies, anthropology, and history.

than one hundred student theses in total[3], as well as the first PhD thesis in social anthropology that was recognised by the FSPJ at the University of Ljubljana.[4] Not only was Južnič's extensive teaching successful, but between the 1960s and 1990s, he was the personification of social, cultural, and political anthropology in Slovenia, and was recognised as the doyen of Slovenian anthropology.[5]

Južnič's reputation as the 'doyen' of anthropology had several sources. In addition to the course development, teaching, and publications mentioned above, Južnič's knowledge of the social sciences and humanities was extensive; he was familiar with history, political science, social and cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, and law, among other disciplines. He was considered erudite for having read most of the classics in the human sciences, as well as contemporary authors, and for his knowledge of several foreign languages.[6] He was also known as someone who regularly read *Le Monde*, an activity which imbued him with special prestige in the eyes of students. Last but not least, he was a person with strong personal charisma. He was a small, funny guy with old-fashioned reading glasses, who was obsessed with the weather and constantly scrutinised the latest forecasts. In sum, his behaviour was that of a classic, old-fashioned professor of humanities.

In 1994 Južnič gradually retired from teaching, but his legacy remained strong.[7] Nevertheless, when the conference of the European Associa-

---

[3] Južnič supervised 129 undergraduate (diploma) theses, 31 master's degree dissertations, and 15 PhD dissertations. Most of them were anthropological. He was known as the only professor at the University of Ljubljana who supervised anthropological dissertations.

[4] That was the PhD dissertation of the author of this chapter.

[5] The fact that he formally introduced a course on social and political anthropology seems to be an argument supporting the claim that he can be considered the godfather of Slovenian social and political anthropology, but not the godfather of Slovenian cultural anthropology. However, it should be stressed that in his seminar, as well as in his textbooks he introduced modern cultural anthropology to Slovenia. During his seminars and in his textbooks he discussed not only the concepts of culture and cultural anthropology as an anthropological sub-discipline (Južnič 1977: 109-44), but also several other problems and topics, which are traditional topics in cultural anthropology.

[6] Južnič spoke several languages. As a former student of a classic gymnasium, he was familiar with classical Greak and Latin. He was also fluent in English, German, Spanish, French, Italian and Serbo-Croatian.

[7] After his retirement, the author of this chapter, who had worked since 1981 as Južnič's assistant, took over his teaching and research. In 1995, the master's level study of anthropology was established, which featured both social and cultural anthropology and physical anthropology (Gradišnik Slavec 2000: 120). The idea of the master's degree program was to introduce a discipline with internationally valid standards of anthropological education in Slovenia, an aim which has succeeded. Participants in the development of the program included Adam Kuper, Marilyn Strathern, Petr Skalnik, Aleksandar Lopašić, Christina Toren,

tion of Social Anthropologists (EASA) was organised in 2008 in Ljubljana, he was not invited to participate. He was not invited to give an opening lecture, which was instead given by Rajko Muršič. Nor was Prof. Južnič invited to sit in the first row as a distinguished guest. The conference was organised by the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, in the Faculty of Arts, at the University of Ljubljana, which ignores Južnič and his work (also Muršič 2008), despite his recognition by Slovene ethnologists (Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 43, 105-06, 119-20, 517).

Basic Social and Political Characteristics of Slovenia and Yugoslavia during the Period that Prof. Južnič Introduced Socio-Cultural and Political Anthropology

In the 1960s, when Južnič introduced social, cultural, and political anthropology at FSPJ, the former Yugoslavia was already known as an atypical socialist state with a self-styled form of socialism and a non-bloc foreign policy. After a dispute with Stalin in 1947[8], processes of emancipation from the Soviet Union began in the former Yugoslavia, resulting in socialist self-management at the domestic level and a policy of non-alignment at the international level.

Jos Platenkamp, Aleksandar Bošković, and many others. At the Faculty of Social Sciences, a Centre for Anthropological Research was also established. The author of this text also established a Section of Social Anthropology within the Slovene Sociological Association (Gradišnik Slavec 2000: 121); began to publish the journal *Anthropological Notebooks* (published between 1990 and 1995 in Slovenian, and since 1995 in English); established and chaired (until 2009) a Commission on Theoretical Anthropology (COTA) of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES); and was one of the founding members of the Commission on Ethnic Relations (COER) at IUAES. Thus, even in Južnič's retirement, his anthropological school continued with its activities, and as stressed by Rajko Muršič, performed an important job in establishing social and cultural anthropology in Slovenia (Muršič 2009).

[8] The dispute with Stalin, which occurred in 1947, was of prime importance for all of post-war Yugoslav history, as well as for Yugoslav identity. In Yugoslav history that period was known as 'Tito's "No!" to Stalin' (Adrić, Arsenijević and Matič 2004: 28). One of its results was a general anti-Stalinistic and anti-Russian Yugoslav orientation. The Russian type of socialism was understood as a totalitarian type of socialism that was considered unacceptable in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia developed its own particular form of socialism, in which the means of production were in the hands of workers (not the state), thus forming the basis for Yugoslavia's 'self-management'. The Soviet Union and all the countries that had adopted the Soviet type of socialism were understood as the most dangerous among the enemies of Yugoslavia. The anti-Russian orientation and anti-Russian sentiments were central pillars of Yugoslav politics and identity, and they were particularly strong in the non-Orthodox (i.e. Catholic and Muslim) regions of Yugoslavia such as Croatia and Slovenia.

At the domestic level, the application of the ideology of self-management began with the new constitution of 1964. It was connected with a process of *deetatization* (Burg 1983; Rusinow 1989; Cohen 1995; Jović 2003). At the VIII Congress of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, Tito and Edvard Kardelj joined forces in an anti-centralist front and opened the way for spontaneous decentralisation of economic and political life in Yugoslavia.[9] The process continued until the constitutional reform in 1974, which resulted in final decentralisation of the federal economic and political system. With the constitution of 1974 Yugoslavia consisted of six socialist republics (Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Macedonia, and Montenegro) and two socialist autonomous provinces (Kosovo and Vojvodina), which all had autonomy in most aspects of social and political life. From the second half of the 1970s, Yugoslavia was therefore practically a confederated state and functioned as such. This decentralisation was strongly connected with the rise of ethnic and nationalistic ideas in certain aspects of daily social and political life, as well as in the sciences (Godina 1998).

After 1964 the formation of national political elites also began. Through decentralisation of both the Yugoslav state and the League of Communists[10], separate political elites were established in all of Yugoslavia's republics and autonomous provinces. Thus even in socialist Yugoslavia before Tito's death in 1980 there existed at least eight distinct, strong and separate political elites.[11] The power of those political elites was based on the concrete political and ethnic interests of the groups living in the republics and provinces, as well as on the ethnic identities characteristic to these republics and provinces. For the political elites, therefore, ethnic identity – and not the Yugoslav supra-ethnic identity - was of prime importance (Godina 2007).

---

[9] Edvard Kardelj was one of the most important ideologists of Yugoslav socialism and the inventor of self-management (Kardelj 1977; Pirjavec 2011).

[10] The Yugoslav state was decentralised through its organisation into six socialist republics and two autonomous provinces. The republics and provinces controlled policy in education, mass media, and most other aspects of everyday life; the exceptions were military and foreign policy. The Yugoslav League of Communists was similarly decentralised. Each socialist republic and autonomous province had its own League of Communists; each individual was a member of his or her Republic's or Province's League of Communists, and only through that membership was she or he also a member of the Yugoslav League of Communists. It was not possible to be a direct member of the Yugoslav League of Communists.

[11] In addition to the official political elites who represented the majority ethnic groups in each administrative unit, there were also other elites who represented minority interests. These elites later attained great importance, especially during the collapse of socialist Yugoslavia and throughout the Yugoslav War (Godina 2007).

It is not surprising that the 1960s were also a period in which Slovene ethnology transformed itself into a national ethnology (Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 118). This orientation was in tune with the above mentioned political and social climate in the former Yugoslavia, as well as with trends in other European ethnologies (ibid.: 118-19). The concept of national ethnology had several characteristics. One of these was that national ethnology was understood as different from general ethnology (French *ethnologie générale*). This difference was connected with the fact that general ethnology included physical anthropology, while national ethnology did not (ibid.: 119). The Slovene orientation towards national ethnology involved the introduction of several new theoretical and methodological standards, as well as some new ethnological topics (ibid.: 118-99, 279-379).

The reorientation of Slovene ethnology towards a national ethnology also rendered impossible the realisation of Škerlj's idea of anthropology as a synthesis of physical anthropology and ethnology. From the 1940s, Škerlj, despite his personal preoccupation with physical anthropology, had tried to establish anthropology as a holistic discipline in Slovenia and in the former Yugoslavia, incorporating physical anthropology and ethnology (Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 118-20). His ideal synthesis was American-style anthropology, with which he had become especially familiar during his visit to the United States, where he met Clyde Kluckhohn (Kneževič Hočevar 1994: 29). Škerlj promoted his idea of holistic anthropological study in several ways: he lectured physical anthropology to students of ethnology and ethnography; he sought cooperation between the physical and socio-cultural study of human beings at an academic and university level; he tried to persuade Yugoslav ethnologists and ethnographers that such cooperation was important and necessary; and he tried to establish an anthropological institute within Slovenia's Academy of Sciences and Arts (Škerlj 1959b). Through the 1960s, however, in Slovenia and in the former Yugoslavia, ethnology and ethnography were preoccupied with other ideas and paradigms. These preoccupations included, as Gradišnik Slavec has pointed out, some references from social and cultural anthropology, but in principle no reference to the physical or biological dimension of human existence (Gradišnik Slavec 2000: 119).

It was into such a social, political, and scientific situation that Stane Južnič first introduced his course on social and political anthropology in 1969. The introduction of the course was in itself a peculiar act. It was in opposition to the Marxist paradigmatic frame, that was preferred and supported by Slovenian and Yugoslav science of the time, and it also sharply contrasted with contemporary trends in Slovene and Yugoslav ethnology and ethnography. Although Južnič did incorporate Marxism into some parts of

his social and political anthropology (for example, in discussing the importance of work for human beings; economic anthropology; and non-European modes of production [Južnič 1977: 159-227]), his social and political anthropology was widely described by others as a 'bourgeois science' that digressed from acceptable Marxist science. For Južnič, it was impossible to transform social, cultural, and political anthropology into a science citing only Marxist authors and references (Južnič 1977, 1987). His books and especially his lectures included many references to scholars from other theoretical schools and paradigms. In his textbooks, for example, he quoted anthropological classics such as Ruth Benedict, Margaret Mead, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Bronislaw Malinowski, A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, E.E. Evans-Pritchard, and many others. As a result, his version of social, cultural, and political anthropology was always considered to be an ideological digression and a discipline that was 'not Marxist enough'. At the time, students understood this non-Marxist dimension of Južnič's anthropology very clearly[12], and it formed one of the most important fascinations of his approach. It was precisely this dimension that contributed to making his anthropology courses popular and highly regarded among students. However, his non-Marxist orientation was also a significant reason that Južnič and his anthropology have been permanently and systematically marginalised, and even ignored, in the wider context.

Basic Characteristics of Južnič's Anthropology

Over 25 years of writing and teaching social, cultural, political, and linguistic anthropology, Južnič produced his own type of anthropology which even today is distinguished by its personal style and charm. His version of anthropology has several characteristics that are important for understanding and evaluating his work. Here I will mention just a few.

The first characteristic is that Južnič's idea of anthropology considers it as social and cultural anthropology. His understanding was similar to that of Claude Lévi-Strauss, whose definition of social and cultural anthropology (Lévi-Strauss 1958: 388) he quoted with approval (Južnič 1977: 233). However, Južnič disagreed with Lévi-Strauss's incorporation of ethnology as a component of social and cultural anthropology (1977: 144-50, esp. 147-

[12] This perception of Južnič's anthropology is in clear contradiction to the perception of more recent students. My master's level students, for example, study Južnič's anthropological textbooks as part of a unit on the history of the discipline. In the last ten years, they have perceived Južnič's anthropology as Marxist anthropology that contains strong elements of philosophical anthropology.

48).[13] Throughout Južnič's work, writing, and teaching, a basic aim was to understand an individual as a social and cultural being, and to understand human societies and human cultures in their complexities and interconnection. He was interested in formulating theoretical aspects of those problems, for example, with questions such as 'What does it mean to be human?' (Južnič 1977: 225), or 'The nature of human nature' (ibid.: 35-53; Južnič 1987: 71-97). The issue that preoccupied him throughout all of his career was the question of what it meant to be a particular human being in a particular society and culture. In his analysis of this question, he stressed several topics that were, in his opinion, central to understanding individual existence in a concrete human society and culture: the problem of human eccentricity in comparison to other living organisms as introduced by Helmuth Plessner (Južnič 1977: 42-43;1987: 82-84, 170); socialisation and enculturation (Južnič 1973, 1989; 1977: 221-25); social status and social roles (Južnič 1973: 314-16); sexual dichotomy and gender (1973: 318-35; 1987: 155-63); age and the organisation of age grading (1973: 335-42; 1987: 142-55); family and family organisation (Južnič 1973: 342-57); kinship (1973: 357-70); perception of time (Južnič 1987: 301-27); perception of space (1987: 279-301); concept of the human body (1987: 163-185; 1998); the problem of ethnicity and ethnic identification (1987: 221-241;1993a: 268-306); the problem of race and racial stereotypes (Južnič 1987: 185-86, 241-55); the problem of identity (Južnič 1993a); the problem of rationality as only one human dimension among many (Južnič 1977: 48-52); and the problem of human self-reflexivity (Južnič 1987: 20-27).

In his anthropological writing Južnič also defined an anthropological understanding of society and culture, as well as the relation between them (1977: 297-371; 135-39; 109-59). He explicitly elaborated the characteristics of social anthropology and cultural anthropology (1973: 225-71; 109-59; 371-435), as well as on their relations to other anthropological sub-disciplines, and to physical or biological anthropology (1973: 211-17; 217-25; 53-109; Južnič 1987: 36-49). Political, philosophical, and psychological anthropology were among the sub-disciplines that drew Južnič's special interest. Additional basic topics he connected with social and cultural anthropology include the question of human ecology (Južnič 1987: 256-64), the anthropological study of colonialism and decolonisation (1977: 435-95),

[13] Južnič considered that the relation between ethnology and anthropology must vary in different countries. In Slovenia, ethnology had been established as a discipline that corresponded with the German *Volkskunde*, and not with *Völkerkunde*. In the Slovenian context, research done on non-European societies was generally considered only a supplement to ethnology as an otherwise nationally-defined field.

anthropological studies of social and cultural change (1977: 495-529), acculturation (1977: 529-53); and the study of human language (Južnič 1983).

The second important characteristic of Južnič's anthropology is its tendency to holism. Even though Južnič's agenda favoured social and cultural anthropology, he was convinced that cultural and social dimensions of human existence could be fully understood only when physical and biological dimensions of human existence were taken into account. For this reason, he systematically included selected material from physical anthropology into his social and cultural anthropology courses. This is also why all of his textbooks include some topics related to physical anthropology. In his textbook *Socialna in politična antropologija* (1977) these are: anthropogenesis (66-78); race (78-79); human biology (79-86); ontogenesis (86-93), and genetics and eugenics (93-104). His textbook *Antropologija* (1987) included discussion of human beings as biological beings (79-89); the issue of human species and its place in a systematisation of other biological species (99-106); anthropogenesis (106-33), and the biological dimensions of race (186-221). Additionally, when he discussed socialisation and enculturation, some topics, such as heredity, ontogenesis, and human biological needs are also addressed (Južnič 1989: 39-46).

In other words, the holism of Južnič's anthropology corresponded with the holism that Škerlj tried to introduce into Slovene science and university curricula (Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 116-17). Južnič's understanding of anthropology was that 'anthropology is a kind of a general science of human beings' (Južnič 1987: 15), which is close to Škerlj's understanding of anthropology as a science of the 'human being as an entity' (Kneževič Hočevar 1994: 29), which includes socio-cultural anthropology and physical anthropology. Južnič also shared Škerlj's opinion that 'physical anthropology should not be excluded from a study of anthropology as a social science' (Kneževič Hočevar 1994: 29). It could be said that it was Južnič himself who succeeded in realising Škerlj's aim of connecting the study of a human being as a social and cultural being with the study of a human being as a biological being. However, there are some important differences between the two visions of anthropology. First, Južnič's holism starts from a different perspective than that of Škerlj: Škerlj tried to combine physical anthropology with ethnology into a single field (Škerlj 1959a: XI), but Južnič only incorporated selected data from the field of physical anthropology into his analysis of human beings as social and cultural beings. As a result Južnič's holism does not represent a general holistic synthesis of social and cultural anthropology with biological anthropology. What Južnič achieved was only a partial synthesis of social and cultural anthropology with very selected and partial knowledge from the field of physical anthropology.

The third characteristic of Južnič's social, cultural, and political anthropology is the fact that it was a 'homemade' anthropology. Thus Južnič developed his anthropology without being incorporated into the international anthropological community. He was not a member of any international anthropological organisation, and his bibliography shows (Južnič 2011) that he did not participate in international anthropological conferences or congresses. He developed his anthropology from his office in Ljubljana; his anthropology was a classic example of an 'armchair anthropology', connected with international anthropology and foreign (Western and non-Western) anthropologists primarily through his reading of anthropological texts. His writings were full of both classic and contemporary anthropological references. The extent of his general knowledge was extraordinary.

Furthermore, Južnič's writings were written in Slovenian and never translated into English or any other non-Yugoslav language. His idea was, as he pointed out, to introduce socio-cultural and political anthropology to Slovenia, where this science, especially its social branch, did not exist: 'It is well known to all who deal with the development of science in Slovenia that anthropology was ignored, a situation that was especially true for its social branch. Amidst strong counterforces, it needed to break fresh ground. That was not always easy, nor often accompanied with recognised and published results' (Južnič 1990: vi). This is why, when anthropology was in question, he 'imported' more than 'exported'. To-date, Južnič remains unknown to Western anthropology. He has so far only been 'discovered' by Robert G. Minnich who met Južnič during fieldwork, and later invited him to write the introduction for *Socialni antropolog o Slovencih (A Social Anthropologist about Slovenes* [Južnič 1993b]).

As the fourth important characteristic of Južnič's social and cultural anthropology one could stress its contemporaneity. Bearing in mind that Južnič wrote his textbooks during the1970s and 1980s, it is remarkable how the data incorporated in his books, as well as his analyses and conclusions are still relevant, even when compared with the standards of contemporary social and cultural anthropology. Južnič's social and cultural anthropology is very near, for example, to Thomas Hylland Eriksen's idea of social and cultural anthropology (Eriksen 2001), but also to that of Tim Ingold (2005). Although Južnič wrote his textbooks many years before Eriksen's textbook was published, and bearing in mind that Eriksen's textbook is today treated as a one of the standard textbooks in social and cultural anthropology, it is noteworthy how closely these books correspond. The list of topics analysed in Južnič's textbooks is almost completely congruent with the topics included in Eriksen's *Small Places, Large Issues*. For both Južnič and Eriksen key topics for the discipline include fieldwork cultural relativism; the prob-

lem of the social person; social status and social roles; the relationship between a person and a society; gender; age and age organisation; kinship; perception of time; concept of the human body; the problem of ethnicity and ethnic identification; the problem of race and racial stereotyping; the problem of identity; production and technology, and politics and power (Južnič 1973; 1977; 1987; 1993a; Eriksen 2001). Moreover, it is remarkable how some of Južnič's theoretical statements and conclusions correspond to more recent statements made by social and cultural anthropologists. In 1977, for example, Južnič concluded his analysis of the concepts of society and culture with the statement that culture includes 'a content and a pattern of behaviour, ideas and other systems of symbolic nature, as well as agents which form human behaviour; all products of human activity are also part of culture' (1977: 138). On the other hand, the concept of society is connected with 'a social system, i.e. [a] specific system of relationships and interactions among individuals and human groups (classes, ethnic groups etc.)' (ibid.), and: '"Society" emphasises (...) human beings and the relations among them; "culture" emphasises a dimension of accumulated sources, immaterial and material, which are learned, practiced, changed and transmitted by human beings"' (ibid.: 139). More recently, Eriksen wrote: 'The relationship between culture and society can be described in the following way. Culture refers to the acquired, cognitive and symbolic aspects of existence, whereas society refers to the social organisation of human life, patterns of interaction and power relations' (2001: 4).[14]

Furthermore, Eriksen's definition of anthropology as 'the comparative study of cultural and social life… [the] most important method [of which] is participant observation, which consists in lengthy fieldwork in a particular social setting' (Eriksen 2001: 4) closely corresponds with Južnič's under-

[14] Similar definitions can be found in a variety of dictionary and encyclopaedia entries. In *The Dictionary of Anthropology* Lewis A. Coster, defines society in the following way: 'Society refers to the totality of social relations among men and women in their various statuses and roles within a given geographical area or among humankind at large…. Kroeber and Parsons suggested that the concept of "culture" be confined to the contents and patterns of values, ideas, and other symbolically meaningful factors, whereas "society" should be used to designate the relational system of interaction between individuals and collectivities' (1999: 436-37), and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro wrote: 'The standard anthropological representation of "a society" in the functionalist and culturalist traditions is that of an ethnically distinct people, living in accordance with specific institutions and having a particular culture' (2008: 520). Ingold wrote: 'Questions about culture, therefore, typically have to do with how human beings differ in their forms of life... . Questions about social life have therefore to do with elucidating the dynamic properties of human relationships, properties conveyed by such stock-in trade anthropological notions as kinship, exchange, power and domination' (2007: 329, 737). For some other examples see Kuper (1992: 17-21) and Alexander and Seidman (1994: 1-27).

standing and practice of anthropology. What Južnič did in his social and cultural anthropology was exactly a comparison of different aspects of social life in various societies (including former Yugoslav and Slovene society), and involved a permanent search for interesting dimensions of such comparison. This is why he taught his students an approach which can be described as the 'anthropological imagination'.[15]

References

Adrić I., V. Arsenijević, and Đ. Matić (eds.). 2004. *Leksikon YU mitologije.* Beograd and Zagreb: Rende, Postscriptum.

Alexander, J. C., and S. Seidman (eds.). 1994. *Culture and Society. Contemporary Debates.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burg, S. I. 1983. *Conflict and Cohesion in Socialist Yugoslavia.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cohen, L. J. 1995. *Broken Bonds: Yugoslavia's Disintegration and Balkan Polities in Transition*. Boulder: West view Press.

Coster, L. A. 1999. Society. In Barfield, T. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Anthropology*, pp. 436-437. London, New York: Routledge.

de Castro, E. V. 2008. Society. In A. Barnard, and J. Spencer (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, pp. 514-520. London, New York: Routledge.

Eriksen, T. H. 2001. *Small Places, Large Issues*. London: Pluto Press.

Godina, V. V. 1998. The Outbreak of Nationalism on Former Yugoslav Territory: A Historical Perspective on the Problem of Supranational Identity. *Nations and Nationalism* 4 (3): 409-422.

———. 2007. Supra-ethnic Identity in Multi-Ethnic Societies: The Case of Yugoslav Multi-Ethnic Identity. *Ethnoculture* 1 (1): 59-71. http://www. emich.edu/coer/Journal/Godina.html.

Gradišnik Slavec, I. 2000. *Etnologija na Slovenskem. Med čermi narodopisja in antropologije*. Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU.

Ingold, T. (ed.). 2005. *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*. London, New York: Routledge.

Jović, D. 2003. *Jugoslavia- država koja je odumrla*. Zagreb: Prometej.

Južnič, S. 1973. *Politična kultura*. (1st ed.). Maribor: Obzorja.

[15] Prof. Južnič died on 5 November 2013. The Slovene Anthropological Association *(Slovesko antropološko društvo – SAD)* is considering establishing an award for contribution in anthropology (something like a 'lifetime achievement award') that would bear Južnič's name.

——. 1977. *Socialna in politična antropologija*. Ljubljana: Partizanska knjiga.
——. 1980. *Kolonializem in dekolonizacija.* Maribor: Obzorja.
——. 1983. *Lingvistična antropologija*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za sociologijo, politične vede in novinarstvo.
——. 1987. *Antropologija*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.
——. 1989. *Politična kultura*. (2nd ed.). Maribor: Obzorja.
——. 1990. Nekaj razmislekov o antropologiji. *Antropološki zvezki* 1: iii-vi.
——. 1993a. *Identiteta*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
——. 1993b. Nekaj o piscu in njegovem delu in malo o antropologiji. In R. G. Minnich, *Socialni antropolog o Slovencih*, pp. IX-XI. Kanalska Dolina: Slovenski raziskovalni inštitut – SLORI. Ljubljana: Amalietti.
——. 1998. *Človekovo telo med naravo in kulturo*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
——. 2011. *Stane Južnič /00302/. Osebna bibliografija za obdobje 1961-2011*. (COBISS Kooperativni online bibliografski sistem in servisi COBISS). http:/izumbib.izum.si/bibliografije/Y20110225085409-00302.html.
Kardelj, E. 1977. *Smeri razvoja socialističnega samoupravljanja*. Ljubljana: Komunist.
Kneževič Hočevar, D. 1994. Ameriško obdobje slovenskega antropologa. *Naši razgledi* 15.04.1994, pp. 28-29.
Kuper, A. (ed.). 1992. *Conceptualizing Society.* London, New York: Routledge.
Lévi-Strauss, C. 1958. *Anthropologie structurale*. Paris: Plon.
Minnich, R. G. 1993. *Socialni antropolog o Slovencih*. Kanalska Dolina: Slovenski raziskovalni inštitut – SLORI. Ljubljana: Amalietti.
Muršič, R. 2008. Forefathers and successors at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, University of Ljubljana: Paths in the development of Slovene ethnology/cultural anthropology. *Stud. Ethnol. Croat.* 20: 107-125.
——. 2009. *Habilitacijsko poročilo za Vesno V. Godina*. Ljubljana: Faculty of Arts.
Pirjavec, J. 2011. *Tito in tovariši*. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
Rusinow, D. 1989. *Yugoslavia - Fractured Federalism*. London: Wilson Center Press.
Škerlj, B. 1934. *Človek*. Ljubljana: Mala knjižnica 2.
——. 1959a. *Antropologija. Splošna antropologija v osnovnih potezah*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

——. 1959b. *Antropologija i etnologija*. Beograd: Biblioteka Etnološkog društva Jugoslavije.

Chapter 11
In Women's Arms: Croatian Ethnology between 1945 and 1990

Sanja Potkonjak

Inside the tradition of ethnological thought in Croatia there is a distinctly separate critical branch, originating in the second half of the twentieth century. This 'movement' started as early as 1948, and was aimed at a critical understanding and consistent questioning of the methodological and epistemological limitations of Croatian ethnological practice. In a broad time span, works of Vera Erlich Stein, Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, Olga Supek (Zupan), and Lydia Sklevicky point to the emergence of a female voice in Croatian ethnology which has been self-fashioned as post-traditional. Even though we cannot speak of a unique professional community – a school of thought or a 'scientific club', these female ethnologists/anthropologists were focused on a dialogue or negotiation between revolutionary pupils and normal science. The critical epistemological and temporal detachment that characterised their work is nevertheless embedded in the tradition of thought which they criticised. Their critical perspective is especially connected to their specific explorations of the role of women in society with the intention to turn the marginal subject of scientific interest into one of the programs of post-traditional ethnography.

I will discuss a tradition of ethnological thought in the works of these four women who set up exemplary ethnographic programs in Croatian ethnology. Those programs will be outlined here not as proscriptive models of thought, but as emancipatory strategies that have called for a different mode of ethnological thinking. In that respect, I am not going to fully cover either the professional biographies or bibliographies of these ethnologists. Rather, I will select and sketch those works that stand out as key texts in their scholarly projects and are respectively representative of a new way of thinking in Croatian ethnology during the second half of the twentieth century.

Vera Erlich Stein: 'The Last Stock-taking before the Fall of the Patriarchal Balkans'

Vera Erlich Stein has influenced Croatian ethnography as a social anthropologist who attempted to interpret the dissolution of the patriarchal family (Rihtman-Auguštin 1984: 166), and as a social psychologist who tackled the idea of cultural change.[1] Though, in Erlich Stein's own words, her work might not be understood as 'pure ethnography' (Erlich Stein 1971: 26; Supek-Zupan 1984: 319) she nevertheless became an influential figure in the history of the anthropology of gender in Croatia. Liberated from the scholarly expectations that she would have faced if she had belonged to a formal ethnographic scholarly tribe, Erlich Stein's work did not hope to answer the questions that were to be answered in ethnology. By not being dependent on a school of thought, Erlich Stein managed to escape the drive for classification and search for proto-Slavic cultural traits that characterised much Croatian ethnology and to envision a scope of her own.

Erlich Stein began her research in 1937, a few years before the Second World War, by conducting an extensive survey of the family in Yugoslavia. The results of this work were later published in a book titled *Family in Transition: A Study of 300 Yugoslav Villages* (1971). Sending out more than 1,000 questionnaires, she managed to get 305 completed responses from teachers, physicians, and lawyers across Yugoslavia. However, her book was published almost 20 years after the Second World War (in 1964), as a miraculous document of a changing era that described the social relations that had been changed and severely altered by the time of publication. The idea of cultural change was one of the chief assets of the book. Vera Erlich Stein's interest in the two major crises, the First World War and Great Depression, influenced her study, and she tried to establish how family patterns had been changed due to cultural interference from economic environment, political changes, and cultural transfer of ideas.

Erlich Stein's study has been innovative in several aspects. Firstly, the scale of her study was unprecedented in family research of the region. Secondly, even if we take into account that her questionnaire resembled, to a

[1] Vera Erlich Stein (1897-1980) was one of the most prominent Yugoslav Jewish women scholars in the twentieth century (her husband perished in the Holocaust). Between 1945 and 1950 she worked for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration with displaced people in Italy. Between 1950 and 1960 she was Lecturer in Slavic languages and Research Fellow in anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley. She returned to Zagreb in 1960, and taught in the Department of Sociology. However, her work remained largely unnoticed in the former Yugoslavia until the 1980s. In English, she is often referred to as Vera Stein Erlich.

certain degree, Antun Radić's 1897 questionnaire[2], she succeed in overcoming the limitations of his design. Radić considered his questionnaire to have generated only 'fragmented' accounts because the data was regionally tied to a particular locale. This shortcoming was overcome in Erlich Stein's study through its large scale area rationale. In keeping with the large scale rationale, Erlich Stein went on to establish an overall Yugoslav family model. In doing so, Erlich Stein departed from an ongoing ethnological drive to romanticise the past, and instead underlined social change while emphasising historical and political context that informed the formation and changes of ethnological subjects as such. While she is known today for the bold pursuit of an ethnographic subject in the midst of change, she also offered several models of patriarchal family (in-transition) that were referenced in later research in a rather axiomatic and static way (e.g. Rihtman-Auguštin 1984; Sklevicky 1984, 1996; Supek-Zupan and Jasna Čapo 1994).

Vera Erlich Stein's approach to ethnology may well have been affected by her expatriation during the Second World War. During this time she managed to get a post as a research fellow at the University of California at Berkeley, with Alfred L. Kroeber and Robert Lowie as her mentors, and her work was enriched by new influences. As Supek argues, Kroeber had a significant influence over the interpretation of Erlich Stein's research material. It might be that the way in which she interprets changes in family forms and the way in which she was resilient toward theoretical explanations was encouraged by her mentor (Erlich Stein 1971: 22; Supek 1984: 320-21). Kroeber was famous for his development of a specific grounded methodological orientation, in which 'theory should result from fieldwork conducted as far as possible without theoretical preconceptions' (Harris 2001: 320, 326). Indeed, in her interpretative afterword of her study of the family, Erlich Stein evoked a strong Kroeberian impulse to address a specific cultural form with a system-oriented rather than a person-oriented form of ethnography (Supek 1984, 1988).

A lesson to be taken from Erlich Stein was that the family as the central cultural form of a society was highly influenced by the processes outside of it. Erlich Stein can still be criticised for the strong historical orientation in her classifications of several forms of family and lifestyles. Nevertheless, unlike many other ethnologists before her, she did not use classificatory systems to focus on what was inherited from the past, but on the way in which the story of the Balkan family was undergoing an adaptation to the internalisation of external influences.

---

[2] Antun Radić (1868-1919) was a Croatian politician, scientist, author, and also the man who set out the foundations of Croatian ethnology.

Attempts to evaluate Vera Erlich Stein's work face different interpretations of her contribution to Croatian ethnology/anthropology. Referring to her work, Rihtman-Auguštin briefly mentioned that '*Modern* research of the transformation of family relations in social and cultural anthropology… repeated some of the mistakes of stereotyping with regards to causes of the disintegration of extended family in the Slavic region' (Rihtman-Auguštin 1984: 166, my emphasis). Thus Rihtman-Auguštin situated Erlich Stein's work both as modern and socio-anthropological, but also as subject to the revision within the discipline. Rihtman-Auguštin also pointed out that, despite the modern quality of such research, it was still '(erroneously) thought that anthropological (social and cultural anthropology) research in Croatia starts with Vera Erlich Stein and her two books', namely, *In Company of Man* and *Family in Transition* (Rihtman-Auguštin 2001: 67).

On the other hand, Erlich Stein's work is considered to be the starting point in understanding the process of the transformation of family. Her book unsettled the pattern of a static concept of the family in the Balkans and pointed to change as constitutive in examining family life in the region (Sklevicky 1984: 153). The long-lived relevance of her work (Škokić 2011: 114-15) stems from her comprehensive immersion into what romanticists were reluctant to probe. Eventually, Erlich Stein's review of the limitations of women's worlds in a patriarchal family setting became pioneering work, which is why she is frequently evoked today in discussions about women's issues.

Enchanted by the idea of cultural change, Erlich Stein introduces a constructive confrontation with the idea of an ethnographic subject that had previously been considered the victim of a historical process that induced change, remodelling, and adaptation. Based on what she observed, she argued that culture was not simply transmitted to its bearers but was taking shape right in front of her, in relation to historical and political webs of influence. She was no longer interested in an imagined ideal type which encouraged arguments for national, regional, or local political sovereignty through the proof of authenticity. Instead, she posed basic questions which stepped outside the boundaries of the ethnographic ideal-type and of reified models of cultural self-preservation that were associated with more traditional approaches to research on the Balkan family.

The key to understanding Vera Erlich Stein's role in the development of Croatian ethnology is not only the research that triggered a large-scale rationale (i.e. the idea of including the widest possible area for research on a specific topic), but also her attempt at a holistic understanding of the processes of social and cultural change. At the same time, and perhaps even more importantly, her research showed an interest in the status of women in the

wider framework of the Balkan family, starting with the introductory statement revealing the motivation behind her research. She wrote that one of the reasons for her research lay not only in the descriptions of difficult village living conditions which she received, but also in the reaction of her associates concerning women's life conditions: 'They… thought that the position of women was disastrous and pointed to an unusually high mortality rate of women' (Erlich Stein 1971: 15). As she wrote in the acknowledgments, she owes the motivation for her interest in women's issues to three of her Bosnian students, naming and thanking them for bringing this problem to her attention and 'asking' that she be one who would 'lead the struggle for the emancipation of Muslim women' (1971: 20).

What did Erlich Stein analyse in her capital works? For one, she identified as constitutive the family based on patriarchal values and, as she wrote in the epigraph quoted above, she tried to record the moment of transformation of the family in the Balkans that took place before the researcher's eyes. In other words, Erlich Stein tried to do an anthropological stock-taking of a phenomenon she thought was disappearing from the social scene – the Balkan patriarchal family. She tried to explain her hypothesis of the patriarchal nature of the Balkan family by extracting variables suitable for testing by means of a questionnaire in order to define the hypothesis of the patriarchal nature of the family. In other words, she decided to ask the questions which would detect the deviations from the ideal type of the Balkan patriarchal family, and which would identify 'international' (economic) influences and cultural and social triggers of family transformation in the Balkans (1971: 392). One of the variables important for the attempted panoramic view of the destruction of the patriarchal family is the figure of the father. The typology of family transformation hinged on the acknowledgement of the father's absolute authority; this allowed Erlich Stein to distinguish the traditional Balkan family from its modernised version, and to distinguish areas where the traditional conceptualisation of family (and society) continued to predominate from those areas influenced by modern economic and political changes (1971: 30). Erlich Stein also used the relationship of children with their mother (the second most important person in the traditional family, and the one associated with emotional life and family coherence) as a variable measuring differences within the ideal type of patriarchy in the Balkan family. The relations between brothers and sisters; patterns of courtship; relations between husbands and wives; and extra-marital relationships were all topics of interest that Erlich Stein analysed with a special 'sympathy' for the position of women (1971: 207). Moreover, the Balkan family is no longer a research metonymy for the Balkans, but a platform for analysing

the cultural perception of the Balkan family and the fixed expectations that researchers placed on it.

Analysing the need to locate the Balkan family in the context of psychology or mentality, Erlich Stein in an unusual manner advocated the psychologised variety of the anthropological ideas of culture and personality, all under the impression of the intensive application of the idea of cultural contact as a determining factor in shaping mental conceptualisations of the Balkan family. This move overcame the idea of the authenticity of cultural articulation and its exclusivity that was characteristic of older Croatian ethnology. Situating the Balkan family in the conceptual centre of the idea of cultural contact between Austria and Turkey, with a clear indication of antagonistic stimuli these two major cultural impulses gave to the (trans)formation of the Balkan family, Erlich Stein derived a theory of Balkan family lifestyles – on the one hand the oriental and heroic, characterised by the culture of revolt, and on the other the elastic, tranquil lifestyle, characterised by conformism (1971: 428-37). Although at times insufficiently alert to the traps of invoking the existing ethnographic work, her view on the Balkan family escaped the homogeneity and taxonomy of hermetic typologies that dominated the ethnographic paradigm through the 1960s and 1970s. It is no surprise therefore that Erlich Stein saw *Family in Transition* primarily as a contribution to sociology rather than ethnology. But her processual approach to sociality and culture can also be seen as belonging to anthropology in a broad sense.

In the introductory anthropological handbook that she authored, *In Company of Man* (1968), Erlich Stein distinguished the fields of ethnology, anthropology, and sociology. Accordingly, ethnology 'focused on traditional culture'; social and cultural anthropology's interests partially corresponded to those of ethnology but without this focus on traditional cultures; while sociology (the discipline with which she identified herself) led to 'practical reforms in society' (1968: 345-46). Paradoxically, it seems that Erlich Stein became important for Croatian ethnology in the second half of the twentieth century due to this self-imposed differentiation, primarily because she triggered new developments in ethnology which embraced the possibility of a new concept of the discipline outside the framework of the long lasting orientation towards the romanticised past. Perhaps inadvertently, Erlich Stein offered a new rationale for Croatian ethnology with two important components: that the subject could be analysed without a sentimental retrospection of paradise lost, and that ethnographic research could result from a critical view on reality and advocacy for change.

Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin: A 'Militant' Ethnologist

'In modern science there is no eternal truth nor single school or thought. Therefore I don't want, nor should I, offer any prescription' (Rihtman-Auguštin in Muraj 1997: 236). With this sentence, a scholarly rebel, Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin[3], has symbolically wrapped up her academic career. However, this sentence does not give enough credit to the ways in which she influenced Croatian ethnology. The implication that the strongest counter-epistemological and methodological imprint in Croatian ethnology in the second half of the twentieth century has been provided by the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research (Rihtman-Auguštin 1984: 10; 2001: 65; Rihtman-Auguštin in Muraj 1997), heavily relies on addressing the work of Rihtman-Auguštin and post-traditional ethnography.[4] Her work could be seen as 'destructive towards tradition' (Giddens 1994: 86), although the destruction itself could be interpreted as a move invoking tradition; a kind of an attempt to understand it and to challenge it, motivated by the notion that 'everything could be doubted' (Giddens 1994: 86-87). This doubt can mean emancipation as well as disruption, depending on who is telling about it. From this starting point, Rihtman-Auguštin did not inaugurate the end of debate with the tradition of ethnological thought, but introduced polemics with the obligatory character of old canons.

Her work is therefore overtly critical towards the existing methodological and epistemological traditions, and should be seen as an attempt to dismiss the repetitive strategies of a cultural-historical paradigm and its retro-utopian subject of research. She called attention to the unwillingness of Croatian ethnologist in general to perceive contemporaneity as a suitable

---

[3] Dunja Rihtman Auguštin (1926-2002) studied in Zagreb, graduating in ethnology in 1961, and earning her PhD in 1976 at the Faculty of Sociology, Political Science, and Journalism in Ljubljana (Slovenia). Incarcerated twice as a teenage girl during the Second World War (first by Italians, and then by Germans), she joined the partisans, and after the war started working as a journalist, but then turned her attention to ethnology and folklore. Rihtman-Auguštin spent almost all of her career at the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research, and was the dominant figure in Croatian ethnology from the late 1970s. She was the Director of the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research (formerly Institute for Folk Art) between 1972 and 1984. However, her influence among students was limited, as she was only allowed to teach at the postgraduate level, and only very late in her career.

[4] I am borrowing the concept of post-tradition form Anthony Giddens (1994). The concept is informative in exemplifying how tradition inhabits the formation of modern societies and in showing what it means that repetitiveness, ritualistic behaviour, and a historical orientation were central to the construction of Croatian ethnology. While Giddens' concept has been used to address social transformation, here I use it to discuss how Dunja Rihtman Auguštin's idea of tradition could be perceived as a comment on the hibernation of scholarly thought. Dunja Rihtman Auguštin's post-traditional ethnology is bound to the ideas of modernisation and ideas of challenging truths, shaping a new intellectual project in Croatian ethnology.

subject of ethnographic interest and their prevailing orientation towards the past as an exemplary ethnographic subject (Rihtman-Auguštin 1974, 1984; Rihtman-Auguštin in Muraj 1997). By initiating criticism she enabled the old paradigms to be replaced and the anthropologist to 'save her soul' (Sontag 1966: 74-77), or so Rihtman-Auguštin would have us believe.

For her part, Rihtman-Auguštin, may be understood as a 'militant' ethnographer due to her intensive interest in the use and misuse of ethnography in the past, and her suggestions for how it could be further used (Rihtman-Auguštin in Muraj 1997: 90; Rihtman-Auguštin 2001: 135). She suggested that Croatian ethnology remained untouched by the strategies of critique and argued against ethnology rooted in an avoidance of engagement and the preservation of 'good mannered' anthropology (Rihtman-Auguštin 2001: 84). This was particularly evident in her plea for an anthropology in which the prime interest would be to establish a critique and unveil power relations rooted in the very object of study. The stated aim of Rihtman-Auguštin's work has overturned generally accepted ideas of folk life and of the role of women in the dissolution of the sustained way of living. In her re-reading of classic ethnographic texts (1984), Rihtman-Auguštin argued that women and women's subculture had been habitually blamed for overturning the traditional family structure. By exposing a political narrative and ideology that operated beyond mere ethnographic descriptions, Rihtman-Auguštin set an example of powerful ethnographic critique (see Rihtman-Auguštin in Muraj 1997).

In the early 1980s, Rihtman-Auguštin published two texts that addressed the status of women in traditional society and their parallel (mis)treatment by ethnology. Of these two, 'On Women's Subculture in a Slavonian Zadruga' (1982) and *The Structure of Traditional Thought* (1984), the second was subject to the economics of a lucky scientific coincidence that turned it into a significant contribution for understanding the relationship between the sexes in traditional culture and to the developing 'anthropology of women'. Its main strength was in making visible what had been previously invisible. As Lydia Sklevicky summarised: 'It seems relevant in this context to invoke the women's subculture, a significant *discovery* of Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin's. In the real culture of the past [women's subculture] established balance between the third-rate status of women proclaimed by the ideal culture and their real contribution to the life of the community' (Sklevicky 1985: 414, my emphasis. Rihtman-Auguštin is also proclaimed to have applied a specifically female insight in writing *The Structure,* in that she applies a women's theoretical model in which it is a group that is a social agent, and in that she applies a feminist theoretical model by locating the agency of a group that was formerly only indirectly involved in social proc-

esses. The observation that *The Structure* brings the explication of 'women "outside their proper place" – of an anomaly, similar to a woman taking over the management of the extended family' (Sklevicky 1985: 415), becomes the proper diagnosis – an aberration in the general sense.

The story of women's traditions in the book *The Structure of Traditional Thought* (1984) and in the paper 'On Women's Subculture in a Slavonian Zadruga' (1982) offered analyses of the negative construction of women's tradition in the writings of Rihtman-Auguštin's ethnographic predecessors. Some commentators argue that her work is best categorised as an 'anthropology of women' (Škokić 2004: 26), not unlike that of other female ethnologists in Croatia who, 'discovered and analysed the women's perspective'. Such a view incorporates Rihtman-Auguštin's work as a specialised topic within a dominant paradigm: '[her text on women in Slavonia] pointed to a different role of women in a village household. With its approach, belonging to the feminist emancipatory aspiration to writing ethnography with a difference, this text designated the space of researching women's culture in our ethnology' (Škokić 2004: 26). Yet in the books themselves, the analysis of women in traditional culture appears almost an accidental discovery for the writer and the reader. In reading the work, it is the disclosure of the ideational structure of early ethnographies, as well as the analysis and critique of non-ideational reality, that is the real subject of *The Structure of Traditional Thought.* Rihtman-Auguštin introduces herself into the 'anthropology of women' with a theory of the disorder women caused in the seemingly realised order of traditional culture. Rihtman-Auguštin argued that her description of the female subculture is the side-effect of the disempowerment of the archetype of village harmony (cf. Rihtman-Auguštin 1984: 14). Her analysis, she argued, was not an attempt at a conscious and systematic problematisation of women's issues in the manner of feminist anthropologists of the early 1970s. Such analyses would start with exposing the model of male domination in society and demonstrating the lower status held by women in society, their powerlessness, and the lack of authority and prestige ascribed to women as a generic category (cf. Milton 1979).

It is arguable whether Rihtman-Auguštin's work succeeded in deconstructing 'women' as a distinct ethnographic subject or whether it instead reified them as a social group. Kay Milton's (1979) analysis of other feminist writings, for example, is also applicable to *The Structure*: highlighting the 'fundamental principle of organization' also involves contrasting a male view of society with a material, real, and marginally mediated situation. As do other feminist writers, Rihtman-Auguštin, takes this marginally mediated situation as a structural argument for a female model of reality, though it

may not have been so. Or as Lydia Sklevicky put it: in analysing how women have been assigned responsibility for the dissolution of the traditional family, Rihtman-Auguštin 'confirms the continuity of some important determinants', and perpetuates 'traditional notions of women as a specific group whose existence [she has] established)' (Sklevicky 1985: 412). Although these critiques are valid, the value of Rihtman-Auguštin's explanatory model of imagined male order and realised female 'disorder' lies not so much in whether or not it can solve the problem of the ethnographic imagination of women by unburdening of the negative imagination of early ethnographies. Rather, the model's greater strength is in how it prompts an ongoing search for the mythical, political, and ideological dimensions of the ethnographic imagination of village families.

Rihtman-Auguštin's own search for these models continued in later publications as well, such as *Patrijarhalizam danas* [*Patriarchy today*], the constitutive part of *Etnologija naše svakodnevice* (Ethnology of the Everyday 1988). In this critique, she continued to refer to ethnographic material from *The Structure* and critiqued classical and traditional concepts of patriarchy as 'the ethos of family (…) in which power is in the hands of a single man' (Rihtman-Auguštin 1988: 193). The ideology behind the concept of patriarchy, she argued, actually identifies the double political usage of patriarchy. Even as traditional forms of patriarchy become viewed as economically backward conventions, the underlying ideology consolidates in the national being around romantically defined hereditary values.

In many ways, Rihtman-Auguštin's analysis anticipates the possibility of its own suppression to the hegemonic (masculine) structures of ethnology. If we locate the observations of the 'Slavonian' women's subculture within the attempt to exemplify the 'woman's point of view' in Croatian ethnology, we unveil an analogous observational key, in which women are represented as a deviation from the 'imagined patriarchal order' (Rihtman-Auguštin 1982: 38), regularly and interpretatively designated as those agents who trespass the borders of the assigned social status. By emphasising the male bias (cf. Rihtman-Auguštin 1982: 37; Milton 1979) present in the conscious theoretical framing of the research subject, but also in the selection of ethnographic data, Rihtman-Auguštin's research interest is realised as the voicing of an extant but inadequately designated phenomenon. Her general critique of ethnology is revealed in the articulation of the (previously ideologically) overlooked agent in the sociality of traditional communities. But, an unreformed ethnology finds it easy to re-assign her critical observations to the margins of the field as 'a woman's view', 'the anthropology of women', or a 'feminist critique'.

Olga Supek: What Does Marxist Anthropology Have to Do with Croatian Ethnography?

In 1976 Olga Supek published a programmatic article 'From Theory to Practice and Back: The Possibility of a Marxist Approach in Ethnology'. This text elicits a vision and desire to overcome certain conflict-laden methodological and theoretical discussions in Croatian ethnology. At the time Olga Supek entered Croatian ethnology[5], the most important changes in the disciple related to the voicing of objections to the influence that communist regimes had on science; the notorious Russian embargo on social sciences during Stalin's era was particularly criticised. The debate was initiated by the early works of Supek's father, Rudi Supek, the leading Croatian sociologist who claimed an emancipation for Marxist anthropology and other social sciences to pursue free thinking and intellectual independence. By claiming that the 'research of meaning and essence of human society' should be left to science, Rudi Supek made a platform for departing from the historical framework of Marxist real-politics, ideology, and its determinisms (1966: 86).

To illustrate what Marxist anthropology meant to Olga Supek in 1976, however, and to describe which aspects of Marxist social theory were considered valuable enough to be generally rehabilitated in the Croatian scholarly context – I have to go back to the most general reception of Marxist anthropology as a systemic description of the laws of evolution in human history. But even if I propose that the Marxist anthropology inscribed into Olga Supek's text seems quite odd, it is still just an anticipation of what Croatian ethnology could potentially take from Marxist anthropology. This envisioned borrowing comprised the whole of ideas about the 'confrontations of human societies and cultural values across a history' (Supek 1966: 37) and asserted the legitimacy of re-working Croatian ethnography by speaking to and of leftist American and European anthropological debates. In order to tackle static forms of the ethnological imaginary, Olga Supek

[5] Olga Supek was born in Paris in 1949, a daughter of Rudi Supek (1913-93), the famous Croatian sociologist and French communist, who was also a member of the resistance movement in France during the Second World War. The family moved back to Yugoslavia several years later, and Olga graduated with degrees in ethnology and sociology at the University of Zagreb in 1973. Supek then continued her studies in the United States, earning an MA and PhD in cultural anthropology at the University of Michigan in 1976 and 1982. She began teaching in Zagreb in 1983, and in 1988 was promoted to Assistant Professor (*docent*). Supek was Head of the Department in 1989-90, and in 1991 left again for the United States. Between 1992 and 2008 she taught at the University of Texas at Tyler. In early 2009 she returned to Croatia and joined the newly formed Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Zadar.

evoked Marxist anthropology as a 'critical and critical-theoretical world view' (Supek 1976: 62).

The Marxist anthropological reverie in Olga Supek's works was not intended to rehabilitate the ideological background of Marxism, but to challenge Croatian ethnography with another knowledgeable ethnographic worldview. One can state that Supek's ideas came out of the intention to juxtapose traditional ethnographic research subjects with historical and economic theoretical frameworks. It was a form of diversification and academic experiment that Supek proposed. During the 1970s a number of theoretical frameworks were on the market and Olga Supek adjusted one of these available frameworks to fit two purposes. Firstly, she wanted to envision new methodological tools by making the research subject more sophisticated than a 'frozen image'. Secondly, as she learned a lot from American anthropological theory, Olga Supek wanted to broaden ethnology by theoretical accounts that provided rich explanatory models. Through 'the most general philosophic postulates, through the broad theoretic notions and approaches'(Supek 1976: 57), she nudged ethnology to rethink its subject in a different register, and to think of theory as an aid in overcoming gaps in knowledge building (Supek 1976: 65). The initial effect caused by such a theoretical proposal was a genuine drive to compose the ethnographic subject as something constructed and not pre-given. Although those insights might seem overly general in the history of anthropological thought, Supek also introduced a local branch of cultural materialism which helped her to address emerging issues in ethnography and disturb the existing theories (Supek 1976: 67). For Olga Supek, a step into ethnographic concretisation meant finding a contingent interpretation of the Marxist concept of society through contemplating man's act of cultural creation (Supek 1976: 65). By highlighting man's role in shaping the community, Supek emphasised the need for a synchronic and diachronic understanding of the active dimensions of culture – that is, the need to comment on the relational dimension of man's reification in society. With a tactical sensibility for change, Supek insisted that man and his material products should not be analysed outside of the material world because the forms of culture and sociality that were produced and performed in space were more or less logical responses to the stimuli of the natural, cultural, and human environment of that space (Supek 1976: 67). The framework of Marxist anthropology also appealed to Supek because it incorporated the idea of changing the world, as inscribed in the Marxist philosophical promise; the culmination of the Marxist 'theoretical worldview' as offered to ethnology was in de-romanticising the past and turning to the present. In this move also lay the applicability of ethnology. Supek argued that the seemingly naive promise of the role of science in

'avoiding the drama and inhuman abyss of alienation' (1976: 73) that Western man had inherited from industrialisation was reduplicated in ethnology's discursive resistance to the social sciences that were better equipped in theoretical terms. Marxist anthropology also legitimated a renewed ethnology in a wider and changed social context.

When she announced the concretisation of her theoretical principles in 'Outline for the Research of a Prigorje Village' several years later (Supek-Zupan 1979), it did not move significantly from the aspiration to point to the appropriateness of a historical materialist insight into the subject of ethnology. However, this aspiration, illuminated by historical materialism, brings a theoretical orientation and a system of values in which Marxism represents only an optics for understanding 'human society and culture' as the relationship between 'social and economic organisation and the superstructure of ideas' (Supek-Zupan 1979: 58). Shifting attention from the village to 'revolutionary' literature in fact represents the promotion of the ethnologist's role into that of an active builder of a more just social community (cf. Supek-Zupan 1979: 62). This shifted attention inaugurated Supek's function as a mediator who inspired research on the level of interpretation and representation of culture, and drew attention to the relationship between the ethnologist and the community in which the ethnologist is another agent of social change. The revolutionary role of an ethnologist is thus to be obtained through a critical interpretation of cultural givens, as well as through a Marxist critical intervention in cultural and social reality. In Supek's own words, the critical relation of an ethnologist to the way of life that she studies 'does not mean to judge specific people and specific types of behaviour…, it means an attempt to find causes of certain general phenomena and behaviour and to suggest the ways to overcome them' (Supek-Zupan 1979:62).

Once laid down, the theoretical self-orientation towards a Marxist understanding in ethnology in Olga Supek's work materialised in the revalorisation of the subject of the discipline. Considering her anthropological and Marxist models, this was not an unexpected result. The appeal for a Marxist understanding in ethnology was not an appeal to abandon the traditional subject of research, and even the most naive questions that emerged from reading the platform of a 'Marxist Understanding' were not exclusively resolved in the search for a new subject. The new questions that arose stuck resiliently to the disciplinary tradition, but with a changed perspective.

Contrary to what might be expected, Supek's vision of Marxist anthropology did not focus on the emergence of a new 'socialist people' – the low waged industrial workers who had not been addressed by Croatian ethnology, but might have been of interest to the discipline. She did, however, trespass the conventional boundaries of subject matter by featuring new

disciplinary subjects in rural research. By debating the livelihood of ethnographic subjects such as 'farmers', 'common carriers', 'owners of agricultural machines' (former *Gastarbeiters*), small entrepreneurs, and public sector workers Supek dared to re-conceptualise the old paradigm and one-dimensional ethos of ethnographic work (Supek-Zupan 1979: 74; 1988a: 53).

How can we define, then, the activity of the ethnologist after 1945? It might be useful to look at what is different in how research questions were asked and to see what kind of objective came to be appreciated by ethnology. These are the most important questions Olga Supek systematically addressed. This complex issue preoccupied Supek from her earliest texts, 'From Theory to Practice' (1976) and 'Basic Characteristics of Croatian Ethnology from 1945 until Today' (1983). In them Supek tried to point to the institutional predilections for defining ethnology's subject; as the object of ethnology, she argued, people emerge with a different epistemological and ontological sense. If we see these texts as part of Olga Supek's professional program, in which the object of science was to be viewed from different aspects, it is obvious that such a multi-faceted viewing demands the re-articulation of the object. The overview of the object's content does not offer only a single option of interest, but interests multiply depending on professional pedigrees of the bearers of institutional knowledge. The object is critically vivisected through the questioning of its bearer and the effort to define new content for it, and through the analysis of the disciplinary practice of identifying the object with the concept of people as a form of controlled canonic and disciplinary imagination of the object.

Lydia Sklevicky: On the Necessity of a 'Female Perspective' in Ethnology

The changes that were brought to Croatian ethnology by Lydia Sklevicky's work on the anthropology of women were to be expected to some degree.[6] The straightforward and zealous programmatic text of Lydia Sklevicky on the necessity of a female perspective in ethnography, speaks of the very

[6] Lydia Sklevicky (1952-90) graduated in ethnology and sociology from the University of Zagreb in 1976. She earned an MA in 1984 in sociology, was one of the founding members of the Croatian Sociological Association, and combined her interest in social history with practical activism (she established the first symposia on the anthropology of gender and a shelter for battered women). Together with Olga Supek she organised a session on anthropology of women at the 1988 International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) Congress held in Zagreb. Sklevicky worked as Research Assistant at the Institute for the Study of Labour Movement in Croatia from 1976, and at the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research from 1988.

same problems that had been announced by her predecessors. By the early 1980s Sklevicky pointed towards a double ignorance: that of the symptomatic invisibility of women in major ethnographic research in Croatian ethnology along with the identification of women as a 'problem' in those ethnographies that did take into account women's worlds (Sklevicky 1983).

Sklevicky's programmatic paper 'On the Necessity of a "Female Perspective" in Ethnology' (1983) brought the anthropology of women into the mainstream of Croatian ethnology. Out of conviction that the 'women's question exists both as a theoretical and practical problem' (Iveković 1981: 5), Lydia Sklevicky inaugurated a comprehensive program to recognise the scholarly contribution of women's studies. Especially important was the idea that anthropology should be based on a historical materialist analysis of gender relations. The emerging discipline of the anthropology of women quickly obtained numerous followers through the work of Lydia Sklevicky and other pioneering figures in Croatia and elsewhere; Sklevicky's colleague Žarana Papić from Serbia was also influential in this developing field (Papić and Sklevicky 1980: 33; Sklevicky 1996: 160).

In her master's thesis, Sklevicky argued that the anthropology of women calls for an unconditional reshaping of scholarly limitations and of the linguistic burdens of conventional ethnographies, in order to render visible women – a structurally muted social group. The project of rendering women visible was the most important because 'the struggle for female perspective in science occurs as an aspect of struggle for the social emancipation of women', by which one can imagine '"demasculinisation" [as a] decolonialisation of science' (1983: 126).

The 'militant' intention (Papić and Sklevicky 1980: 29) of women's anthropology was perhaps the most radical form of the new optics that were introduced into the discipline. At the same time, women's anthropology was also syntagmatically located in the discursive-militant practice of neo-Marxism. The rhetoric of changing the world, or at least the local social reality, through a new disciplinary practice borrowed the language of militant movements and revolutions. The central relations between ideologised order, conflict, and destruction in the theoretical apparatus of the anthropology of women, especially when it was described as a 'militant anthropology', suggest that the revolutionary potential of the disciplinary branch rested in the field's capacity to effect social change (Papić and Sklevicky 1980; Sklevicky 1996).

The unrestrained quality of the new anthropology of women showed its face in the debate over conceptualisations of women in society and science. The example of a unique appeal for women's studies which found its place within Yugoslav academia can be found in Sklevicky's 'Women's

Studies in the 1980s' (1982). Notwithstanding the suspicion toward the reformist idea of feminism's structural integration, Sklevicky sees the use of a 'woman's perspective' as a way to de-reify science; it is a method for critiquing the humanist sciences and also embodies a Foucauldian impulse to use women's genealogies to question the ways in which the extant ethnological knowledge is power (Foucault 1980: 156). Namely, Sklevicky found the woman's perspective necessary because it 'points to the fact that science that has so far studied other divisions between people, such as class, racial, national, cultural and others, was blind to the most obvious one' – that is, the one based on gender or sex (1982: 160). Hence, she opted for seeing women's studies as 'an instance of epistemological critique of paradigms within social sciences as precursors of a future scientific revolution' (ibid.: 160).

Lydia Sklevicky's longest works, her master's and PhD theses, were both edited and published after her death by Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin (Sklevicky 1984; 1986; 1996).[7] Both works addressed the role of women in political organisations during the Second World War. The vitality of the research that was shown in her master's thesis, has become a key topical study, but also fashioned a distinction between gendered and non-gendered research to be followed later on by a number of feminist scholars and supporters of Sklevicky's enthusiasm for women's studies.

In her unfinished PhD thesis, Lydia Sklevicky more fully announced her vision of a history of women that had already begun to take shape as a domesticated brand of women's history. Sklevicky's desire to incorporate the use of scholarly critique into Croatian ethnography with the intent to engender disciplinary and social change separated her from the mainstream of the discipline. For Sklevicky, the problem of mainstream ethnography remained its unwillingness to begin to think of the position of women. Ethnography was unwilling to distinguish the historical conditioning of gender – as manifest in the ways that women traditionally performed their selves, roles, and identities – from the 'emancipatory potential' of a new model for performing gender as culturally and socially oppositional that had been inaugurated by the 'proletarian' women's movement.

The exceptionality of Sklevicky's program lies in the establishment of a gender-focused historiography which enriched social history with a par-

[7] Sklevicky's unfinished doctoral dissertation, kept in the Documentation Department of the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Research in Zagreb (1989; 127 pages, IEF manuscript 1444), was titled *Emancipation and Organisation: Women's Anti-Fascist Front in Post-revolutionary Changes of Society (and Culture) (People's Republic of Croatia 1945-1953)*. This is different from the title in the posthumously published book *Konji, žene, ratovi* (*Horses, Women, Wars*) edited by Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin in 1996. The book left out the original ending of the title, noted in parentheses previously in the text.

ticularly woman's experience. Her program showed a decisive tendency towards the use of the specific to illuminate general historiography, but also pointed to the difficulties of doing so through traditional historiographic methodologies. For her, traditional methods also betrayed a the hierarchical unwillingness within historiography to invoke knowledge of women. As she put it, a 'significant lack of women's historiographic consciousness was a logical result of referent historiographic tradition in the research of the history of women's activities, let alone in the research of emancipation struggles' (Sklevicky 1989: 93). Sklevicky warned those that would write about the history of women that the archives were silent and that historiography was short-sighted. Her warnings came through a critique of both archive and historiography, and by her own search and location of a methodological foothold in the women's archive. The epistemological sensitivity of this foothold, however, she described as relatively limited by the very manner of the archive's construction. The 'deficit, lack of traces…' (Perrot 2009: 18) in the archives was itself the result of what Sklevicky described as archival historiographic blindness to women and the traces they might have left of their activities. This critique of the archive's secrets and the advocacy of oral history as the next step in researching women's reality (Sklevicky 1989: 95), constitutes the primary function of Sklevicky's pioneering historiographic work in the 'women's key' – inscribing the invisible into history. In so doing Sklevicky rehabilitated 'archival sources and literature' and 'documents' that empowered the archive as a source for also conducting more nuanced research on social memory (Sklevicky 1984: 32).

Sklevicky's program thus advanced similar ideas to those promoted elsewhere by historians studying women. As described by Francis Blouin and William Rosenberg, the shift towards women's reading of the archive has been unconventionally realised through an 'ethnographic reading of the archive' in which the historian 'tries to understand explicit practices (that created the archive, that regulate, manage and interpret it) and decipher their implications' (2007: vii). Archival practices are now widely recognised to have contributed to the silence of women's history through the signal of a Derridean logic. As Derrida argued, the archive occupies a place in which original and structural memory breaks and disappears (Derrida 1995: 11). By reading the archives ethnographically in Croatia, it has also been possible to uncover the existing social practice of the archive, and to document the ways in which women's movements and the opposing men's movements (i.e. the bearers of revolution in the form of the People's Front, People's Committees, and Communist Party) were treated in ideologically different ways by the archive itself.

Sklevicky's understanding of the historical development of women's organisations does not rest on adopting a dogmatic or moralistic polarisation of women's activities. She did not, for example, distinguish women's organisations before or during the Second World War in terms of whether they segregated or were inclusive of women regardless of their class or political orientation; thus she found neither 'backward' nor 'progressive' organisations as they had previously been labelled. By withholding from such distinctions, Sklevicky also introduced a disruptive technology into traditional readings of the women's archive; in her interpretation, archives do not speak of women unless a researcher makes them speak. Only a specific historical approach can make women visible (Sklevicky 1984: 8).

Sklevicky primarily triggered the sequence of disruptiveness of general history through which feminist hermeneutic tradition is inscribed into the body of science. By adopting a feminist mandate which emphasises the epistemic value of counter-discursive practices by giving voice to women, her work anticipated two scientific revolutions in Croatian ethnology –one based on the new tendencies of feminist scientific persuasiveness and the other dealing with evocation of emotions and reflexivity (Lincoln 1989: 8-9).

Concluding Remarks

My purpose here was to discuss the works of four women ethnologists because they set up exemplary ethnographic programs in Croatian ethnology during the second half of the twentieth century. These women did not concentrate their efforts in building institutional structures for ethnology, but constructed ethnographic discourse and took part in academic life in other ways. I argued for their role as pioneers in ethnographic innovation and paradigmatic change.

One of the most important outcomes of the work of these four women was to contest the ways ethnographic activity was conducted in the first half of the twentieth century. There occurs, than, the striking fact that Vera Erlich Stein, Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, Olga Supek (Zupan), and Lydia Sklevicky each methodologically shaped new forms of ethnography, but also shook the epistemological nature of the ethnological subject. Each of these women opened some of the boundaries of the powerful national ethnographic imaginary to international discourses. The basic shift within Croatian ethnography occurred in the study of family transformation by Vera Erlich Stein – an outsider to discipline who pictured most vividly the patriarchal family and revealed the culture and personality traits of the traditional Yugoslav family. The second and more radical shift was demonstrated by Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, who appeared not just oriented towards women's subculture in traditional society, but also fostered critical readings of the andro-centrism in

ethnography's preferred questions, subjects, and theoretical frameworks. Approximately at the same time as Rihtman-Auguštin advanced her major critiques, Olga Supek worked to create a bridge between the theoretical vacuum of old ethnographies and the obvious need for theory in contemporary ethnography. Finally, Lydia Sklevicky advanced a sophisticated theoretical apparatus, which contained a powerful evaluation of both the need to speak of women's worlds in ethnographies and the need to make native ethnographies converse with their global contemporaries for both theoretical and activist purposes.

References

Blouin, X. F., and W. G. Rosenberg. 2007. Preface and Acknowledgments. In X. F. Blouin, and W. G. Rosenberg (eds.), *Archives, Documentation and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*, pp. vii-ix. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Derrida, J. 1995. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erlich Stein, V. 1968. *U društvu s čovjekom*. Zagreb: Naprijed.

——. 1971. *Jugoslavenska porodica u transformaciji*. Zagreb: Liber.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Language, Counter-memory, Practice. Selected essays and interviews*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Iveković, R. 1981. Studije o ženi i ženski pokret. *Marksizam u svetu* VIII (8-9): 5-48.

Giddens, A. 1994. Living in a Post-Traditional Society. In U. Beck, A. Giddens, and S. Lash (eds.), *Reflexive Modernisation. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, pp. 56-109. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Harris, M. 2001. *The Rise of Anthropological Theory. A History of Theories of Cultures*. Walnut Creek, Lanham, New York and Oxford: Altamira Press.

Lincoln, B. 1989. *Discourse and the Construction of Society. Comparative Studies of Myth, Ritual, and Classification*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milton, K. 1979. Male bias in anthropology. *Man* 14: 40-54.

Muraj, A. 1997. Moj razgovor s Dunjom. *Etnološka tribina* 20: 221-237.

Papić, Ž., and L. Sklevicky. 1980. K antropologiji žene. *Revija za sociologiju* X (1-2): 29-46.

Perrot, M. 2009. *Moja povijest žena*. Zagreb: Ibis grafika.

Radić, A. 1897. Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu. In A. Radić (ed.), *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena*, pp.1-88. Vol. 2. Zagreb: JAZU.

Rihtman-Auguštin, D. 1974. O nekim metodološkim problemima etnološkog istraživanja sadašnjosti. *Etnološki pregled* 12: 121-127.

———. 1982. O ženskoj subkulturi u slavonskoj zadruzi. In V. Domaćinović (ed.), *Etnographia Panonica*: *Žena u seoskoj kulturi Panonije*, pp. 33-38. Zagreb: HED.

———. 1984. *Struktura tradicijskog mišljenja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

———. 1988. *Etnologija naše svakodnevice*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

———. 2001. *Etnologija i etnomit*. Zagreb: Naklada Publica.

Sklevicky, L. 1982. Ženske studije u osamdesetim godinama. *Revija za sociologiju* XII (1-4): 157-162.

———. 1983. Nužnost ženske perspektive u etnologiji. *Etnološka tribina* 4-5: 121-126.

———. 1984. *Žene i moć – povijesna geneza jednog interesa*. MA Thesis. Zagreb: Archive Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb.

———. 1985. Tradicija i društveni položaj žene. *Naše teme* XXIX (4-6): 412-415.

———. 1986. Natalie Zemon Davis: prema povijesti nade. *Gordogan* 8 (22): 85-91.

———. 1989. Emancipated Integration or Integrated Emancipation: The Case of Post-revolutionary Yugoslavia. In A. Angerman, G. Binnema, A. Keunen, V. Poels, and J. Zirkzee (eds.), *Current Issues in Women's History*, pp. 93-108. New York: Routledge.

———. 1996. *Konji, žene, ratovi*. (Selected and edited by D. Rihtman-Auguštin). Zagreb: Druga.

Sontag, S. 1966. *Against Interpretation: And Other Essays*. New York: Picador.

Supek, O. 1976. Od teorije do prakse i nazad. Mogućnost marksističkog shvaćanja u etnologiji. *Narodna umjetnost* 13: 57-76.

Supek-Zupan, O. 1979. Nacrt istraživanja jednog prigorskog sela. *Narodna umjetnost* 16: 57-80.

———. 1983. Osnovne značajke etnologije u Hrvatskoj od 1945. do danas. *Zbornik 1. Kongresa jugolsavenskih etnologov in folkloristov* 1: 51-65.

———. 1984. Utjecaj američke antropologije na rad Vere Stein Erlich. *Revija za sociologiju* XIV (3/ 4): 319-326.

Supek, O. 1988. Ethnology in Croatia. *Etnološki pregled* 23/ 24: 17-35.

——. 1988a. Etnos u etnologiji i kulturnoj antropologiji. *Zgodovinske vzporednice slovenske in hrvaške etnologije*. Dolenjske toplice, 3.-5.11.1987, pp. 29-60.

Supek, O., and J. Čapo. 1994. Effects of Migration on a Rural Society: Demography, Family Structure, and Gender Relations in Croatia. In D. Hoerder, H. Rossier, and I. Blank (eds.), *Roots of the Transplanted*, pp. 311-339. (Vol. 1). New York: East European Monographs.

Supek, R. 1966. *Sociologija i socijalizam*. Zagreb: Znanje.

Škokić, T. 2004. Feministička antropološka kritika: od univerzalizma do razlike. In R. Jambrešić Kirin, and T. Škokić (eds.), *Između roda i naroda. Etnološke i folklorističke studije*, pp. 17-32. Zagreb: CŽS, IEF.

——. 2011. *Ljubavni kod. Ljubav i seksualnost između tranzicije i znanosti*. Zagreb: IEF.

Chapter 12
Croatian Biological Anthropology in the Socialist Period

Irena Martinović Klarić

The study of human biology from evolutionary and comparative perspectives, with an emphasis on the interaction between biology and culture, has been referred to alternately as physical anthropology and biological anthropology. The term physical anthropology reflects the original interest that anthropologists had in describing human physical variation; it has been retained in numerous publications, university courses, societies, and journals. Following the rapid advancement in the fields of genetics and molecular biology since the late 1950s that was ignited by the development of the structural and functional model of DNA by James Watson, Francis Crick, Maurice Wilkins, and Rosalind Franklin, the term *biological anthropology* has been used to reflect a shift in emphasis within the discipline to more biologically oriented topics such as genetics, evolutionary biology, nutrition, human ecology, and auxology. Several branches of biological anthropology incorporate bio-cultural and evolutionary perspectives – paleoanthropology, population biology, anthropological genetics (molecular anthropology), forensic anthropology, skeletal biology and primatology. Therefore, as I will be discussing this discipline in Croatia's socialist period, particularly during the 1970s and 1980s, I will use the term biological anthropology to reflect the aforementioned disciplinary shift[1], and to reflect the terminology used by Croatian biological anthropologists. During the 1970s and 1980s, biological anthropology was portrayed as a natural science with the 'primary aim … to study complex biological events in man's past from the point of view of the present in order to extrapolate them into the future', and as an 'all-inclusive study of man in his own (man-made) environment', devoted to the 'study of

[1] However, when I refer to the period between 1945 and 1990 in Croatia, I use the terms anthropology and biological anthropology interchangeably. In Croatia, both terms referred to investigations of the nature of human biological variation within and among populations as a consequence of their genetic, ecologic, historic, linguistic, cultural, geographical, and other characteristics.

origin of biological (morphological, physiological and psychological) variations of human populations' (Rudan, Maver and Vlahović 1977: 26-27).

It should be emphasised that Croatian biological anthropology in the socialist period was built on the previous rich tradition of an evolutionary (or Darwinian) paradigm, traceable in the oeuvre of natural scientists as early as the 1860s (Balabanić 2009). The introduction of Darwinism was connected to the public engagement of several individuals who had studied the natural sciences in western European universities (such as Spiridion Brusina, who studied zoology in Vienna, and Gjuro Pilar who studied geology in Bruxelles) or medicine (e.g. Josip Kalasancije Schlosser). Until the 1900s, the idea of common descent and phylogenetic connections between diverse human groups with a common ancestor was present as the working hypothesis among many Croatian natural scientists, among whom paleoanthropologist Dragutin Gorjanović-Kramberger (1856-1936) was perhaps the best known internationally, due to his classification of hominids and the discovery of the Neanderthals in Krapina. Another very influential Darwinist was Boris Zarnik (1833-1944), who founded both the Department of Biology in the Medical School at the University of Zagreb and the first anthropological society in Croatia – the Anthropological Section of the Sociological Society (established in 1924). Zarnik initiated the first anthropological (anthropometric) field investigations based on craniometric measurements of elementary school children, but caused great controversy with his article on the foundations and aims of eugenics (Zarnik 1931). Zarnik's successor at the Department of Biology at the Medical School was Zdravko Lorković (1900-98), a geneticist, evolutionist, and ecologist, who became appreciated for his work in systematics and phylogeny.

Institutionalisation of Anthropology within Natural Sciences and Medicine

In its modern form, biological anthropology emerged in Croatia in the 1970s. This period was characterised by early attempts of anthropological institutionalisation, first nested within the framework of natural sciences and medicine. Croatian anthropological pioneers working at the Department of Anatomy and the Department of Biology at the Medical School of the University of Zagreb promoted the holistic nature of anthropological research on human biological and cultural diversity. Two prominent figures marked the institutionalisation of biological anthropology in Croatia: Hubert Maver and Pavao Rudan. Hubert Maver (1920-2009) studied medicine in Zagreb and joined partisans during the Second World War as a young physician. After specialisation in epidemiology, Maver worked as medical corps colonel and

head of the Institute for Hygiene and Epidemiology of the Yugoslav Army in Croatia. During the 1950s, together with Božo Škerlj, Patar Vlahović, Živojin Gavrilović, Tvrtko Švob, Ljubomir Berberović, and Božin Ivanović, Hubert Maver co-founded the Yugoslav Anthropological Society.[2] Pavao Rudan (b. 1942), currently holds a position in the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences. He earned a degree in medicine and began his professional career as an anatomist in Zagreb. He later obtained anthropological education during doctoral training at the Laboratoire d'Anthropologie Biologique at the Université Paris VII in France (1970-72), with further specialisation as a Fulbright Fellow at the Smithsonian's Department of Anthropology (1983-84), and at the University of Fukui (Kyoto) and Fukuoka University (Tokyo) (1988).

In 1974, Maver and Rudan founded the Section for Biological Anthropology of the Croatian Medical Association. They were also active in establishing the European Anthropological Association (EAA) and the Croatian Anthropological Society. The professionalisation of anthropology, both in Europe and Croatia, converged in Zagreb in 1977. The first thoughts towards developing the EAA were verbalised during the ninth congress of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) in Chicago in 1973; followed by similar initiatives during various meetings in 1975 in Paris and in Zagreb (during the 14th Yugoslav Congress of Anthropologists), and in 1976 in Brussels. The first congress and the first general assembly of the European Anthropological Association took place in Zagreb in 1977. Georges Olivier was elected as president and Johan Huizinga, Hubert Maver, Derek F. Roberts and Napoleon Wolanski were elected as the vice-presidents. The first issue of the international anthropological journal, *Collegium Anthropologicum*, the official journal of the newly formed Croatian Anthropological Society, was published on the occasion of the first EAA congress.

Connections between Croatian anthropology and the EAA have continued to be strong since the 1970s. In 1975, the School of Biological Anthropology was initiated as an annual international event under the patronage

[2] In Yugoslavia, the discipline of anthropology was viewed as a bourgeois construct or as a part of the Nazi racial project, because of the field's earlier preoccupations with genetics. It was made clear by the relevant institutions (e.g. the Yugoslav State Secretariat for Interior Affairs which issued the license for registration of the new society) that Yugoslav anthropologists were expected to collect data for establishing referent values and anthropometric norms for the needs of the army, health, schools, and sports (Mikić 2011). Yugoslav anthropology continued to be equated with anthropometry for years (Mikić 2011). In fact, the society's first president, Professor Božo Škerlj (1904-61), a famous Slovenian anthropologist who specialised in human morphology and anthropometry, became synonymous with Yugoslav anthropology.

of the EAA; it was designed to advance communication and the integration of Croatian anthropologists with the international anthropological community. From 1984, the international workshop *Anthropology and Health* has also been held annually.

Rudan and Maver also continued their efforts to professionalise anthropology within Croatia and to integrate it with European and international anthropological communities throughout the last two decades of socialism. In 1978, Rudan started teaching the elective course in Biological Anthropology at the Faculty of Natural Sciences of the University of Zagreb. In 1980, the first master's degree program in Biological Anthropology was organised at the same institution, and anthropology was taught as part of the natural, biomedical and social sciences and in the humanities. In 1981 the Laboratory for Anthropology was formed at the Institute for Medical Research and Occupational Health. The Laboratory turned into the Sector for Anthropology in 1986, which was then transformed into the Institute for Anthropological Research in 1992. Between 1983 and 1988 Hubert Maver served as president of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES). He succeeded in bringing the 12th International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences to Zagreb in 1988. During the congress Pavao Rudan became the IUAES vice-president for the period 1988-89.

Traditions of the Croatian Anthropological School

A full maturation of biological anthropology as the new discipline in socialist Croatia is linked to the work of Pavao Rudan and his colleagues. Unlike the anthropological traditions in many neighbouring countries, the Croatian anthropological school was not isolated within national bounds. It may be differentiated from traditions that have otherwise similar similar historic, political, and economic backgrounds in at least two ways. Croatian anthropologists were influenced by the Anglo-American and French intellectual impulses, and they prioritised active networking with the international anthropological scene. Apart from publishing in the Croatian language in various Croatian and Yugoslav professional and scientific journals, Pavao Rudan and his colleagues have a rich publishing record in the English language, both in the Croatian journal *Collegium Anthropologicum* and in the major western European and North American scholarly journals, such as the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *Human Biology*, *Annals of Human Biology*, *Homo*, and *Human Heredity*. Dynamic and continuous networking with foreign anthropologists took place through various channels of communication, including conferences and workshops organised in Croatia and abroad, as well as through the hosting of foreign scholars. For exam-

ple, during the 16 Schools of Biological Anthropology held in Croatia between 1975 and 1990, 110 anthropologists from metropolitan and non-metropolitan traditions delivered their papers: 14 per cent from Croatia, 19 per cent from the United States and Canada, 20 per cent from eastern European countries (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the USSR), 43 per cent from western European countries (France, Austria, Italy, Britain, Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Sweden), and 4 per cent from India, Mexico, China, and Japan. Foreign scholars who conducted fieldwork in Croatia and were hosted for a year or longer by Croatian anthropologists included several from the United States: Linda A. Bennett (Memphis State University), Margaret Lethbridge-Cejku (National Center for Health Statistics), and Stephan Zegura (University of Arizona).

Rudan and his colleagues established themselves scientifically through the study of the population structure of Eastern Adriatic rural communities by using a holistic anthropological approach. Rudan's colleagues formed an interdisciplinary group of scientists with various specialties and interests; Branka Janićijević oversaw human genetics, Veljko Jovanović and Lajosz Szirovicza were in charge of mathematical modelling and biostatics; Jasna Miličić directed human ecology; Nina Smolej-Narančić led growth and development; Anita Sujoldžić headed linguistic and socio-cultural investigations; and Sanja Špoljar-Vržina introduced medical anthropology.

The influence of early western European and North American bio-anthropological and multivariate studies – such as those undertaken by Jean Hiernaux (1956) in areas of present day Rwanda, Burundi, and the Kivu regions of the Democratic Republic of Congo; Frank B. Livingstone (1963) in the New Guinea highlands; William W. Howells (1966) in Bougainville, Papa New Guinea; and Richard S. Spielman, Ernesto Migliazza, and James V. Neel (1974) among the Yanomami of the Amazon – is evident in the group's reliance on holistic anthropological research as the main methodological framework. Palpable is the call for the integral approach needed to tackle biological variation in a given ecosystem or for the multidisciplinary or transdisciplinary approach to study 'not only individuals and populations, but also for what may be called the superstructure, and thus to enter the multidimensional space of culture, civilisation, economy, linguistics, history, archaeology, ethnology, all of which are relevant to and must be included in anthropological research' (Rudan et al. 1982b: 39).

In line with the contemporary state-of-the-art in western European and North American biological anthropology, determinants of genotypic and phenotypic variation as proxies for microevolution and population structure of rural Dalmatian populations were assessed based on various measures of genetic, biological, bio-cultural, and socio-cultural distances. Genetic dis-

tances were based on characteristics such as erythrocyte antigens (blood groups) and enzymes and serum proteins (classical genetic polymorphisms largely used prior to the development of various classes of DNA markers). Biological distances were often based on head and body anthropometry, physiological (cardio-respiratory) traits, dermatoglyphics (finger and palm prints), and radiogrammetric measurements of metacarpal bones (the intermediate part of the hand skeleton). Bio-cultural distances were estimated based on migration kinship data reconstructed from recent family histories, two to three generation pedigrees reported by informants, and from local parish records. Finally, socio-cultural distances were estimated based on the basic and cultural vocabulary. All these characteristics were brought into dialogue with history, historic migration patterns, and demographic trends.

In the history of Eastern Adriatic and Middle Dalmatia the following main episodes in population structuring were considered. The population substratum was considered as being formed by 800 CE from the admixture of proto-Illyrians, Illyrians, Greeks, Romans, and Slavs (Croats), who settled in the Eastern Adriatic islands between the sixth and eighth centuries CE. The *čakavian* speaking immigrants gradually assimilated previous population elements on the islands from the ninth century onward.[3] The population's superstratum was considered to have formed during the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries CE, during the Ottoman expansion, when population groups from continental parts of the Balkan Peninsula settled. In the case of the Middle Dalmatian islands, the new settlements were predominantly in the eastern regions. The majority of these immigrants spoke the *štokavian* dialect of the Croatian language, although other population groups settled during this time period as well, for example Romanian speaking populations in the western region of the island of Krk and in parts of Istria. Reproductive isolation and inbreeding on the islands was attributed to geographical barriers, but also to political and cultural reasons. For example, the Paštrović Privileges exempted new settlers from various taxes and public service and work, resulting in the formation of new, separate rural settlements of newcomers.[4] Finally, the population adstratum was formed during the nineteenth

[3] *Čakavaian*, *štokavian*, and *kajkavian* are the major dialects of the Croatian language. Dialects are named after the word 'what' in each dialect: *ča*, *što*, and *kaj*. The literary and standard Croatian language is based on the *štokavian* dialect spoken by the majority of the population in Croatia. *Čakavian* is spoken sporadically along the Eastern Adriatic coast and on islands and *kajkavian* is spoken in the northern part of the country.

[4] The Republic of Venice gave newcomers land and awarded the so-called Paštrović Privileges, according to which they were exempt from serving on the Venetian galleys in times of war and were freed from many taxes and public works. This resulted in animosity between newcomers and prior settlers, and created many socio-cultural barriers between the immigrant and indigenous population. As the newcomers could lose their privileges if they married prior

and twentieth centuries by infrequent immigration from and non-random emigration to the mainland and overseas, as for example during the economic crisis caused by the Wine Act in 1892 and the vineyard devastation due to phylloxera epidemics.

As an illustration of the scientific rationale and the significance of the obtained results in terms of understanding microevolutionary processes responsible for population structuring of isolates, I will briefly discuss the results of approximately two decades of holistic anthropological research on the Middle Dalmatian island of Hvar (e.g. Rudan 1980; Rudan et al. 1979, 1982a, 1982b, 1986, 1987; Bennett et al. 1983; Sujoldžić et al. 1983, 1985; Jovanović et al. 1984; Janićijević 1985a, 1985b; Smolej 1987; Šimić and Rudan 1990). The island has a longitudinal shape with an almost straight alignment of the studied villages. As long-range migrations on the island are less possible than short-range ones, the application of the model-bound approach was aimed at assessing the *isolation by distance model* (Malécot 1948). The model describes the tendency of individuals to find mates from neighbouring populations rather than distant ones which results in a smooth increase in population differentiation with increasing geographic distance between populations (i.e. cline). Population structuring in accordance with the model was variable specific. The majority of sampled traits (e.g. anthropometric body measurements, migration kinship [distance between parent and offspring birthplaces], dermatoglyphic traits, linguistic characteristics of the basic and cultural vocabulary) conformed with the model's predictions, but not all: classical genetic, mitochondrial and Y chromosome polymorphisms, cardio-respiratory characteristics, and radiogrammetric dimensions of metacarpal bones, distribution of surnames, did not conform to the model. Variable-specific differences were understood in terms of the monogenic or polygenic structure of the analysed traits; rates of adaptation to environmental change vary for different traits as a result of the complexity of their structures. A model-free approach based on factor analysis of the correlation matrix of all distance matrices was also used, in order to assess the pattern of observed variation. The test of matrix correspondence revealed clusters of correlation between geographic distances and migration kinship estimates; between anthropometric and geographic and genetic distances; and between demographic and genetic distances. Factor analysis revealed separation of

---

inhabitants, there was a strong barrier to gene flow between the old population substratum and the immigrant superstratum throughout the whole period of Venetian rule on the islands of Hvar and Korčula (from 1420 to 1797). Thus, migration (gene flow) between the immigrant and indigenous population on the islands was prevented by socio-economic privileges awarded to newcomers and by marriage restrictions. See http://www.anthroinsula.org/background.php.

monogenic and polygenic biological traits and socio-cultural characteristics into two main groups defined by two factors accounting for most of the observed variance. The first factor contained geographic distances; migration kinship for the period 1961-80; anthropometric measurements; and physiologic traits. The second factor contained geographic distances; migration kinship for the periods 1892-1913, 1914-40, 1941-60; genetic distances determined from classical antigens; and linguistic distances based on the characteristics of basic and cultural vocabulary. Geographic distances loaded on both factors, indicating that both monogenic and polygenic biological as well as socio-cultural variables were influenced with geographic distances. Observed variability in different analysed traits was connected with differences in plasticity, with one group of variables responding to selective pressures through natural selection, others echoing selective inertia, and the third group of traits whose variation could not be reasonably interpreted.

The critical evaluation of these briefly explained microevolutionary studies of Dalmatian isolates should be made in reference to the state of contemporaneous bio-cultural research elsewhere. Holistic approaches to gain a better understanding of a studied population in terms of its total being, cultural and biological, have characterised bio-cultural research since the late 1950s. Many anthropologists consider Livingstone's work on sickle cell anaemia and malaria (1958) as one of the seminal examples of bio-cultural synthesis. The terms biosocial and bio-cultural were used synonymously and with increasing frequency in biological and cultural adaptation research by authors such as Yehudi A. Cohen, Elizabeth S. Watts, Francis E. Johnston, Gabriel Ward Lasker, and Paul Baker between 1960s and 1970s. However, the state-of-the-art of bio-cultural adaptation research of that time was such that cultural variables were often measured and ethnographic work consulted mainly to test associations of health-related variables. In this approach, it was only possible to study how culture related to biological measurements. Therefore, the operationalisation of cultural data for distance statistics based on the analyses of linguistic and migration data in consultation of the available ethnographic and historic sources, that dominated the studies undertaken by Rudan and his colleagues in the 1970s and 1980s, reflected the most advanced approaches within holistic bio-cultural syntheses of the time.

Rejection of the Race Concept

The significance of microevolution and the history of rural Dalmatian insular communities to the understanding of human variability as a complex bio-cultural phenomenon that is variable-specific and greatly influenced by geography, has resonated within and beyond Croatia. Evolutionary theory, human population genetics, and associated mathematical models have fea-

tured strongly in shaping the anti-racist attitudes taken by Croatian biological anthropologists, especially Tvrtko Švob and Pavao Rudan, in their scientific and public engagements.

Tvrtko Švob (1914-2008) was a well-known scholar and humanist. After obtaining a diploma and doctoral degree in veterinary medicine, Švob worked as professor of biology at medical faculties in Sarajevo, Zagreb, Ljubljana, Tuzla, and Banja Luka. Most of his studies were in morphology, physiology, genetics, anthropology, and the history of biological sciences. Among many of his duties and accomplishments, Švob served as a president of the Yugoslav Anthropological Society. In his numerous scientific publications and popular monographs (including *Millennial Myths of Hatred – Biological Criticism of Racism* [1995]; *Sources of Identity - Anthropological Essays* [2001]; and *Ideology and Biology* [2002]), Švob deconstructed racist theories as not having any foundation in biological science. Švob criticised any attempts to biologise social issues and insisted on the relative and transient nature of the race construct, which he argued is more appropriate in zoology than in anthropology. Švob argued that human evolution is changing its direction from divergence to convergence due to cultural evolution and the development of social norms and laws.

Rudan's engagement in preventing the abuse of arguments from the field of biological anthropology for the purpose of classifying human populations into discrete races can be traced to as early as 1975, when he wrote the foreword 'Problems of Contemporary Biological Anthropology', to the Croatian translation of Hiernaux's 1969 monograph, *Equality or Inequality of Races* (1975). The idea that the recent knowledge about human variation makes the concept of race entirely obsolete has been one of the key concepts in Rudan's lectures and course materials; as author of the entry on race in the latest edition of the *Croatian Encyclopaedia* (Rudan 1999-2009) he also propagated his position to a wider public. Rudan's engagement with delegitimating the concept of race has also been internationally recognised. Together with Luca Luigi Cavalli-Sforza, Bruno Chiarelli, Ottó Eiben, Hans Wilhelm Jürgens, Horst Seidler and others, Rudan was one of the invited participants of the scientific workshop of the international UNESCO conference *Against Racism, Violence, and Discrimination* and one of the signatories of the *Statement on 'Race'* included as a part of the *Declaration of Schlaining* (Mader 1995). The *Declaration of Schlaining* is a document that uses scientific understanding from population genetics and molecular biology to 'replace the outdated concept of "race" with ideas and conclusions based upon current understanding of genetic variation as it applies to human populations'. It also describes causes and forms of racism, violence, dis-

crimination, and tolerance in contemporary societies and proposes new strategies and actions against racism, violence, and discrimination.

The influence of various cultural and political traditions in shaping the relationship between race and biological anthropology has been widely recognised and discussed (e.g. Caspari 2003; Lieberman et al. 2004). The impact of the idea of race on the scientific and political development of physical anthropology in central and south-eastern European anthropology has been explored as well (e.g. Kaszycka et al. 2009, Turda 2010). The above described position of Croatian anthropologists on the race concept was recognised in the surveys of European anthropologists' opinions towards the biological race concept conducted in 2002-03 (Kaszycka et al. 2009). The study was conducted on members of the European Anthropological Association. The majority of members are physical anthropologists, but about 20 per cent are scientists from other disciplines. Three major significant factors (country of academic training, discipline, and age) were found to be significant in differentiating the replies. Physical anthropologists, respondents educated in western Europe, and middle-aged respondents were found to reject the race concept more frequently than respondents from disciplines other than physical anthropology, respondents educated in eastern Europe, or scientists from younger and older age groups. These general tendencies did not present in the case of the Croatian anthropological school, where wide rejection of the race concept spanned the generations. The study explained the 'Croatian exception' as resulting from the prominence of 'the small circle of anthropologists within a single, although prominent, research center ... all of whom had previous research experience at Western institutions, [and who] repudiated the notion of "race"'. Such a rejection of race, continued the authors, 'could easily have latterly been adopted by other representatives of the research unit. In practice, given the already mentioned small size of the anthropological community in Croatia, this probably resulted in its adoption by most of the professional anthropologists in that country' (Kaszycka et al. 2009: 52)

In fact, generations of students of medicine, biology, and anthropology, as well as professional anthropologists and non-anthropological professionals who were in contact with the Croatian anthropological tradition were exposed to the ideas that human genetic variation is a gradual and continuous phenomenon; that the majority of human genotypic and phenotypic traits shows non-concordant distribution; and that larger genetic variation may be measured within a group than between groups.

Conclusion

After a proliferation of theoretical studies in anthropology in the 1970s and 1980s (and the set-back during the early 1990s due to war-related destruction and the drastic decrease of the state funding for all scientific activities), the revolution in molecular genetics during the 1980s spurred another period of growth and expansion in Croatian biological anthropology from the late 1990s onwards. The earlier emphasis on examining the role of microevolutionary forces in structuring allele frequency variation within and between populations was continued and deepened through a new focus on reconstructing genetic history and past migratory routes by using highly informative molecular markers. A higher level of resolution both in terms of the variety of studied populations (inclusion of populations from Croatian mainland and south-eastern European countries), and the utilisation of analytical methods superior to those based on classical markers came at the expense of the holistic anthropological account. It remains to be seen if the future development of the Croatian anthropological tradition will balance specialisations in various sub-disciplines with the renewal (or perhaps stronger momentum) of sub-disciplinary collaboration.

References

Balabanić, J. 2009. Darwinism in Croatia between science and ideology. *Nova prisutnost* 7: 373-406.

Bennett, L. A., J. Lawrence Angel, D. F. Roberts, and P. Rudan. 1983. Joint study of biological and cultural variation in Dalmatian village populations: Project description. *Collegium Antropologicum* 7: 195-198.

Caspari, R. 2003. From Types to Populations: A Century of Race, Physical Anthropology, and the American Anthropological Association. *American Anthropologist* 105: 65-76.

Lieberman, L., K. A. Kaszycka, A. J. Martinez, F. L. Yablonsky, R. C. Kirk, G. Štrkalj, Q. Wang, and L. Sun. 2004. The Race Concept in Six Regions: Variation Without Consensus. *Collegium Antropologicum* 28: 907-921.

Livingstone, F. B. 1958. Anthropological implications of sickle cell gene distribution in West Africa. *American Anthropologist* 60: 533-562.

——. 1963. Blood groups and ancestry: A test case from the New Guinea Highlands. *Current Anthropology* 4: 541-542.

Hiernaux, J. 1956. Analyse de la variation des caracteres physiques humains en une région de l'Afrique centrale: Ruanda - Urundi et Kivu. *An-*

nales du Musée Royal du Congo Belge. Serie en 8e. Sciences de l'Homme. Anthropologie 3: 1-131.

Howells, W. W. 1966. Population distances: Biological, linguistic, geographical, and environmental. *Current Anthropology* 7: 531-540.

Janićijević, B. 1985a. *Antropologijska istraživanja populacije otoka Hvara analizom eritrocitnih antigena.* PhD Thesis. Faculty of Natural Sciences, University of Zagreb.

———. 1985b. *Genetic structure of the island's population: Analysis of erythrocyte system*. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Meeting, Washington, DC.

Jovanović, V., B. Macarol, D. F. Roberts, and P. Rudan. 1984. Migration on the island of Hvar. In A. J. Boyce (ed.), *Migration and Mobility*, pp. 143-160. London: Taylor and Francis.

Kaszycka, K. A., G. Štrkalj, and J. Strzalko. 2009. Current views of European Anthropologists on Race: Influence of Educational and Ideological Background. *American Anthropologist* 111: 43-56.

Mader, G. (ed.). 1995. *Declaration of Schlaining against Racism, Violence and Discrimination*. Stadt Schlaining: Austrian Commission for UNESCO and European University Center for Peace Studies.

Malécot, G. 1948. *Les mathematiques de l'heredite*. Paris: Masson.

Mikić, Ž. 2011. *O interdisciplinarnosti u srpskoj arheologiji sa posebnim osvrtom na fizičku antropologiju*. http://www.rastko.rs/arheologija/zmikic-inter.html.

Rudan, P. 1975. Problemi suvremene biološke antropologije. In J. Hiernaux, *Jednakost ili nejednakost rasa?*, pp. 5-16. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

——. (1999-2009). Rasa (in Croatian). *Croatian Encyclopaedia. 1999-2009*, pp. 198-199. Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod.

Rudan, P., H. Maver, and P. Vlahović. 1977. Anthropology as a Natural Science: Problems, Investigations and Prospects. *Collegium Anthropologicum* 1: 26-35.

Rudan, P. 1980. Microevolution studies in present populations in Yugoslavia. *Collegium Antropologicum* 4: 35-39.

Rudan, P., M. Gomzi, E. Žuškin, and M. Šarić. 1979. Anthropometric and physiological properties in the determination of biological distances. *Human Heredity* 29: 77-81.

Rudan, P., D. F. Roberts, A. Sujoldžić, B. Macarol, N. Smolej, and A. Kaštelan. 1982a. Geography, ethnohistory and demography of the Island of Hvar. *Collegium Antropologicum* 6: 47-67.

Rudan, P., D. F. Roberts, A. Sujoldžić, B. Macarol, N. Smolej, and A. Kaštelan. 1982b. Strategy of anthropological research on the Island of Hvar. *Collegium Antropologicum* 6: 39-46.

Rudan, P., D. F. Roberts, B. Janićijević, N. Smolej, and A. Kaštelan. 1986. Anthropometry and the biological structure of the Hvar population. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 70: 231-240.

Rudan, P., D. Šimić, N. Smolej-Narančić, L. A. Bennett, B. Janićijević, V. Jovanović, M. F. Lethbridge, J. Miličić, D. F. Roberts, A. Sujoldžić et al. 1987. Isolation by distance in Middle Dalmatia - Yugoslavia. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 74: 417-426.

Smolej, N. 1987. Indices of physiological traits, ventilatory measurements, maximal oxygen uptake and blood pressure, derived from age, statute and weight. *Homo* 38: 177-190.

Spielman, R. S., E. C. Migliazza, and J. V. Neel. 1974. Regional linguistic and genetic differences among Yanomama Indians. *Science* 184: 637-644.

Sujlodžić, A., L. Szirovicza, P. Šimunović, D. F. Roberts, and P Rudan. 1983. Lingvističke udaljenosti na otoku Hvaru. *Rasprave Zavoda za jezik* 8-9: 197-214.

Sujlodžić, A., L. Szirovicza, P. Šimunović, D. F. Roberts, and P Rudan. 1985. Analiza kulturnog vokabulara otoka Hvara kao pokazatelja lingvističke mikroevolucije. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku* 27-28: 767-780.

Šimić, D, and P. Rudan. 1990. Isolation by distance and correlation analysis of distance measures in the study of population structure: Example from the Island of Hvar. *Human Biology* 62: 113-130.

Švob, T. 1995. *Milenijski mitovi mržnje*. Zagreb: Durieux.

———. 2001. *Izvori individualnosti - Antropološki eseji*. Zagreb: Izvori.

———. 2002. *Ideologija i biologija*. Zagreb: Izvori.

Turda, M. 2010. Introduction: Whiter race? Physical anthropolgy in post-1945 Central and Southeastern Europe. *Focaal – Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 58: 3-15.

Zarnik, B. 1931. Temelji i ciljevi eugenike. *Priroda* 21: 35-48.

Chapter 13
Between Folklore, Geography, and Ethno-Nationalism: Ethnology in Macedonia During and After Socialism

Ljupčo S. Risteski and Rozita Dimova

This chapter is a contribution to tracing the history of the discipline(s) of ethnography (*etnografiya*), ethnology (*etnologiya*) and anthropology (*antropologiya*) in Macedonia during socialism and the first years following Macedonia's independence in 1991.[1] There is a gap in documenting the history of the discipline in the period between the two world wars and under socialism. Despite the course entitled 'History of Ethnology in Macedonia' that has been taught at the Saints Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje since 2005, the authors of this chapter faced limited sources addressing the topic. The published texts we encountered pay little attention to social and political

[1] Through the establishment in 1946 of the study program in ethnology at the Seminary of Ethnography and Ethnology (*Seminar po etnoografiya i etnologiya*) at the Philosophical Faculty in Skopje, and in the republic's newly founded museums, it became evident that all three terms - ethnography, ethnology, and anthropology - were equally used and circulated in Macedonia, and questions concerning the name and boundary of the discipline(s) were an object of lively academic discussions throughout the period under question. For example, Bronislaw Rusiḱ held the perspective that: 'After all the discussions, both terms, ethnography and ethnology, are only two terms for one and the same science, namely science for the people (*nauka za narodite).* The first term is older, its structure reveals its past, primordial and descriptive phase of the science on people, whereas the second terms is more recent and refers to the new, real science of the peoples of the world' (Rusiḱ 1954b: 58). Rusiḱ rejected other arguments which distinguished ethnography and ethnology as two different phases of research: 'Some scientists consider the usage of these terms confusing and use the term ethnography to talk about descriptions, empirical materials of people. In this way they divide the discipline in two levels, the first lower (ethnography) and the second higher (ethnology). According to this division, the ethnographers are only describers while the ethnologists are scientists, which is not true' (Rusiḱ 1954b: 58). Among the three terms, Rusiḱ preferred to describe the discipline as 'ethnology'. The term had the advantages of denoting the field's scientific aims, and reflecting local interests. That is, he pointed out that ethnology does not examine the human in a general sense (*anthropos*) but rather focuses on human communities (*ethnos*). Moreover, in socialist Macedonia and Yugoslavia anthropology generally referred only to 'science examining somatic characteristic of people and with discovery of new theories around emergence of new races and racial types' (Rusiḱ 1954b: 58).

contexts, whether in Macedonia itself or in the surrounding region (Rusiḱ 1957: 456-59; Konstantinov 1983; 1985; 1988; Palikruševa 1997; Risteski 1997, 2004; Svetieva 2001, 2005, 2009). And yet, we can confidently claim that in its initial phase, ethnology (*etnologiya*) in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia was oriented toward the 'nation', and indeed participated in its creation, as it happened elsewhere in the region (cf. Mihailescu, Iliev and Naumović 2008: 2). Hence, our aim is twofold: first, to explore the pioneers of the discipline of ethnology by focusing on the concrete persons who engaged in its establishment. We insist that much can be learned about the discipline if we examine the key figures involved in its establishment, particularly if we focus on the intersection of the social relationships between ethnologists and wider politics of knowledge production. Secondly, our task is to map out the major shift occurring in the discipline towards the end of the 1980s, when the focus on the nation acquired an ethno-national dimension mirroring wider social processes in south-eastern Europe and former Yugoslavia that were in tune with the rising political ethno – nationalism and the pending dissolution of the Yugoslav Socialist Federation.

By combining written sources addressing the socialist period, and personal involvement in the educational system at the end of the 1980s and 1990s, the central argument of our chapter is that the discipline of ethnology has always been deeply political, despite its apparent de-politicisation and relegation to the field of natural sciences. The political identity of ethnology has in fact made it be perceived as ideologically 'unstable' and seemingly 'inferior' in comparison with cultural studies and gender studies which were the new theoretical trends emerging since the 1990s. In its attempt to rebrand itself as a discipline hard-wired with natural sciences at the Institute of Geography, and, at the same time, to incorporate novel epistemological and theoretical premises, ethnology has struggled with its institutional affiliation and with asserting its validity as a discipline equal to other social sciences such as sociology, archaeology, and political science. Ethnology's globalisation and exposure to Western theories have allowed researchers from Macedonia to participate in a wider network of scholars, but at the same time the standing of the discipline at home has been undermined by these same processes, allowing for competition and factionalism between sociologists, gender specialists, and other experts on identity studies. In this sense, ethnology in Macedonia has inadvertently been affected by similar turbulences to those that have created an often irreconcilable tension within the four-field approach to anthropology in the United States that relies on a unity between physical anthropology, linguistics, social anthropology, and archaeology (for more see Stocking 1982; Segal and Yanagisako 2005).

A Promising Start and a Premature Demise

The history of the social and humanistic disciplines in Macedonia began long before the country became part of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Ethnology was taught in Skopje in the 1920s, when, according to the political arrangement, Vardar Macedonia belonged to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. During this time, Macedonia was often referred to as Southern Serbia and its inhabitants were considered Southern Serbs. The famous Serbian anthropogeographer Jovan Cvijić (1865-1927) was the first to launch explorations between humans and their environment within an analytical framework that emphasised questions of ethnic unity and difference existing in the Balkans. His scholarship is embedded in the larger Serbian discourse of that time that claimed Macedonia to be part of Serbia both ethnically and as a geographic territory, and triggered reactions from the Bulgarian side on the common ethnic heritage between Macedonians and Bulgarians (for more see Vodovozov 1917: 90; Cvijić 1922; Filipović 1957).

Following the Second World War, communist elites attacked both national and religious sentiments throughout the newly formed Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. They promoted the industrialisation of the country, which was of crucial importance in ideological as well as economic terms. A new working class was supposed to replace the peasantry as the dominant social stratum. The first years of socialist Yugoslavia were characterised by harsh control under the strong influence of Stalin and the scientific thought of the USSR (Naumović 2008: 220-21). These influences affected ethnology, which was renamed from *etnologiya* into *etnografiya* according to the Marxist-Leninist model.[2] After Tito's break with Moscow in 1948, further changes were introduced, which have continued to shape the discipline and its institutions down to the present day.

In the 1940s Macedonia had a mere handful of scholars who specialised in ethnology, but these were also affected by political developments at the national level. A Seminar in Ethnography and Ethnology at the Faculty of Philosophy was closed in 1952-53 after just a few years of operation, so

[2] In his text 'Ethnography or ethnology' (1954b), Branislav Rusiḱ points out that intellectual influences during the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (1921-38) arrived from western and central Europe, and ethnology was the more dominant term. After the foundation of socialist Yugoslavia (1943), Soviet science gained stronger influence and ethnography became the preferred term. As a result the previously used terms of 'ethnologist' and 'ethnology' (*etnolog, etnologiya*) were replaced with 'ethnographer' and 'ethnography' (*etnograf, etnografiya*). For example, the title of the journal published by the Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana changed from *Etnolog* into *Etnograf*. As indicated in note 1, such changes were not undisputed, and Rusiḱ offered the position that: 'bourgeois, regressive, unscientific are the approaches and theories that are represented without paying attention to the use of the terms' (Rusiḱ 1954b: 57).

that there were no further graduates in ethnology after this date. It is nonetheless worth looking closely at this Seminar or 'Ethnological Group' (*Seminar po etnografiya i etnologiya*) led by Professor Branislav Rusiќ, who was appointed by Krste Crvenkovski, a senior political official of the young Macedonian Republic.

Branislav Rusiќ had roots in Macedonia, and most of his relatives lived their entire lives there. The Rusiќ family was one of many which had experienced the ordeals of forced migration and devastation during the Balkan Wars, when they were resettled from Aegean Macedonia to the western part of Vardar Macedonia. Rusiќ was born in 1912 in the village of Tomino. Later the family moved to Prilep, where Branislav's father became a famous teacher. His sons were among the few young intellectuals from Macedonia to study at the University of Belgrade and then elsewhere in Europe.

When Rusiќ began his career in the Ethnological Seminar at the newly formed Faculty of Philosophy, he was the only teacher of ethnology and the new socialist realities were causing great turmoil. His curriculum had a strong historical orientation: besides the two core courses in *etnografiya*, which were compulsory over almost the entire four-year period of study, all other prescribed courses were in history and archaeology. Between 1946-51 about 75 students enrolled and took these courses.

In 1952-53, under strange political circumstances, the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of Macedonia decided to abolish the study of *etnologiya*, on the grounds that its contents were adequately covered in the studies of Art History that were also offered by the Faculty of Philosophy. The scant archival data for this crucial period suggest that the real reasons were political and mundane. Skopje officials judged that the discipline did not produce graduates capable of engaging in 'operative' tasks.[3] Yet there was an interesting discussion as to whether the Faculty of Philosophy should devote its efforts exclusively to raising literacy levels, or whether it should pursue scientific research as well. As a result some individuals, among them distinguished professors such as Kataliniќ Marin, Kiro Miljovski, Todor Mirovski, and Athanasie Uroseviќ, were allowed to continue with their scientific work. Athanasie Uroseviќ, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, argued for maintaining both the Ethnology Seminar and the Art History programs at a crucial meeting of the Board for High Schools and Science (BHSS). He emphasised that if these two subjects were eliminated,

[3] The word used was *operativci*; it referred to work undertaken in primary education and to raising levels of literacy among adults. Source: Report of the Board for High Schools and Science (BHSS) of the Council of Education, Science, and Culture of the People's Republic of Macedonia (CESC of PRM), 4 June 1952, Macedonia State Archives, 04.07.1012 / 96).

Macedonia's rich ethnological materials would be investigated 'by people from abroad'. A majority voted not to abolish them, though the number of enrolments was cut back.[4]

At the first of these BHSS meetings it was agreed to set up a commission to report more fully to the Council of Education, a body of the Ministry of Education, on these controversial matters. The ensuing commission failed to provide a full report, but the views of its distinguished members are preserved in the archives. Dimče Levkov and colleagues in the Faculty of Philosophy argued that the loss of ethnology would be a serious scientific blow. Others emphasised that ethnology was distinguished as a discipline that devoted itself to the nation, and that for this reason it would be historically misguided and unprecedented to abolish it (together with History of Art).[5] Some members of the commission spoke assertively against the Communist Party officials who sought to eliminate the two departments and in sympathy with the newly initiated work of Professor Branislav Rusiќ. Professor Levkov alluded to the creation of a new national Institute of Folk Culture (*Folkloren Institut*) and proposed his own solution to the chronic shortage of staff: Macedonian experts should receive appropriate training in Belgrade and Zagreb.[6]

Gojko Sekulovski, a member of the BHSS, at the time an influential educational activist in Macedonia who later became Yugoslavia's ambassador to Australia, was against continuing support for ethnology. He accused Rusiќ of having a negative attitude on the national question, and in particular for extending support to 'foreign experts'. While Penčo Ikonomov argued that, for reasons of academic quality, 'both groups should be abolished', Kataliniќ Marin argued for continuation with an adjustment of student numbers. For him, as for Dimče Koco, abolition would mean that 'the national moment is being impaired'. Marin also invoked the need for ethnological specialists in museums. However, Levkov responded that the need for ethnologists was minimal (he estimated 19 over the next 10 years) and that the Seminar was unsustainable for this reason.

It was also pointed out that many recent graduates had proceeded to work in completely different fields. Sekulovski Gojko emphasised the need to bolster the behaviour of proletarian youth and referred disparagingly to the reactionary and pro-Western orientation of the Skopje students he called

[4] Minutes of the meeting of the BHSS, CESC of PRM, 11 June 1952, 07.04.1012 / 120: 1012/ 119.
[5] Ibid.: 1012/ 120.
[6] Ibid.

mamini mazi (spoilt mothers' sons). He too took the view that those who really wanted to study should go to Belgrade and Zagreb.[7]

Another influential voice at the BHSS meeting was that of Dimče Mire, who, also in the spirit of socialist progress and socialist future-oriented values, argued that the Ethnological Seminar was diminishing the reputation of the Faculty of Philosophy. 'We really have a need for ethnologists, but that does not mean we cannot train good ethnologists at Faculties in Belgrade or Zagreb'. He argued in favour of fully integrating art history into the Department of History, and ethnology into the Department of Geography, located in the Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics; neither would retain any corporate identity in its new setting. At this point Comrade Slavko Pop Antovski summarised the deliberations of the meeting: 'The majority recommends that these two groups – ethnology and history of art - should be abolished'. No new students were to be accepted, second year students were to switch to other programs, while those in years three and four were allowed to complete their courses.[8] Branislav Rusiḱ was completely marginalised.

Ethnology and Folklore – An Unproductive Rivalry

As argued above, Branislav Rusiḱ had little success, for political reasons, in consolidating ethnology as a university discipline in Skopje. In the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s when the academic study program in ethnology at the university was closed, there was a rise in the interest in folklore studies, which led to the opening of the Folklore Institute in Skopje. Even at the time of losing the university program in ethnology, Rusiḱ aspired to encourage the formation of a national research institution that would examine the folk culture of Macedonians. According to Rusiḱ's personal thoughts, such an institute should have had a more complex and comprehensive approach to the investigation of traditional culture than that which was eventually adopted by the 'Marko Cepenkov' Institute of Folklore.[9]

Rusiḱ envisioned a new research institution that would be oriented towards the study of folk (*narodna*) traditional culture (*tradicionalna kultura*) as a basis for understanding the presence of modern, socialist Macedo-

---

[7] Ibid.: 1012/ 122-23.

[8] Ibid.: 1012/ 124.

[9] Initially founded in 1950, the institute was renamed in 1979 after Marko Cepenkov. Cepenkov (1829-1920) was one of the most prominent collectors of folklore and ethnographic materials from Macedonia. A significant part of his collected materials were published in contemporary Bulgarian journals, and most of his other manuscripts are kept in archives in Bulgaria. In Macedonia, part of his manuscripts were edited and published in 1954 by Blaže Koneski, and in 1972 the rest of the manuscripts were published in ten volumes.

nian society (Rusiḱ n.d. [manuscripts]; 1954a, b; 1955). He initiated the creation of such a national research institution, which he referred to at various times as the Institute for the Study of Folk Culture (*Institut za proučuvanje na narodnata kultura*); Institute of Folk Culture (*Institut za narodna kultura*); Institute of Macedonian Folk Culture (*Institut za makedonska narodna kultura*); Institute of Folk Culture of the PRM (*Institut za narodna kultura na NRM*)[10]; or the Ethnological Institute (*Etnološki Institut*). Although 'Macedonian' figured in the original designated title, this was then dropped and the research emphasis placed on folk culture (*narodna kultura*) rather than on ethnic or national identity. In one variant of the Drafts of Regulations (*Pravilnik*) for the organisation and operation of the institute, it was explicitly envisaged in Article 1 that research would be undertaken 'in the territory of the People's Republic of Macedonia and other republics'. This clause could also be interpreted as allowing the institute's members to work in neighbouring countries in areas of Macedonian settlement.[11] Article 2 of this document sets out the main tasks of the institution as follows:

1. To organise the work of collecting, systematising, and preserving the folk heritage (*kulturno nasledstvo*) of the Macedonian people;
2. To scientifically analyse, purify, and process the material collected in the field of folk culture;
3. To provide advice and expert opinions regarding the application of our folk art in local handicrafts, music, industry, construction, etc.
4. To cooperate with organisations, companies, and institutions that work on the propagation of our folk art from the territory of FPRY[12] and abroad and to care for the purity and excellence of our folk art;
5. To care for preserving and further developing our national artistic creation;
6. To publish scientific and popular-scientific works.[13]

It is clear that the emphasis was to be in the field of folk heritage and folk culture, especially folk art. In later versions the phrase 'Macedonian people' was removed most likely to avert criticism at the federal level, and also inside Macedonia. The solution was to maintain focus on scientific research within the domain of 'domestic' and 'Yugoslav' but not as 'national' or

[10] From 1945-63, Macedonia's official name was the People's Republic of Macedonia (Narodna Republika Makedonija).
[11] *Pravilnik*. Dame, 1370 Fund, Ministry of Education, Science, and Culture 1950-51; 1.1370.1.28/123.
[12] From 1946-63, Yugoslavia's official name was *Federativna narodna republika Jugoslavija*, the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia.
[13] Ibid.

'Macedonian' which would contribute towards creating a modern, socialist Macedonian nation.

When the institute was established in 1950, a high priority was given to devising acceptable modern, industrial applications of traditional folk art motifs. The institute was scheduled to have six departments, which were eventually organised as sections (*oddeli*):

1. Department of Vernacular Architecture;
2. Department of Folk Customs;
3. Department of Folk Literature;
4. Department of Folk Games and Dances;
5. Department of Folk Music;
6. Department of Folk Art, Ornaments, Woodcarving, Painting, Embroidery, and Other Crafts.[14]

Branislav Rusiḱ was not personally supportive of the agenda adopted by the Folklore Institute; he considered to publicly critique its research field as (Rusiḱ 1954a; 1955; 1959). In subsequent decades, research on folk forms (folklore) in socialist Yugoslavia and Macedonia became more emphasised while ethnology as a discipline examining ethnos and ethnic topics became marginalised and treated as unsuitable in the socialist reality. Folklore was viewed as less dangerous because of the emphasis placed on artistic aspects of a general cultural heritage, a resource that was valuable and had to be preserved and protected for its own sake (Risteski 1997: 49-50). In the Folklore Institute, ethnology was effectively excluded, except from the departments for research into folk customs, games, and dances. The priority for Macedonian officials in the early years of socialism was to avoid ethnonational issues, especially any that touched upon minority communities in Macedonia. Rusiḱ struggled for a more holistic approach to what in this volume is termed the encompassing anthropological field, but it seems that he lost this battle as well.

Until the mid-1980s, full training in ethnology was not possible at the university level. Ethnology returned to the university curriculum because Macedonia was producing a surplus of geographers, and it was decided that some should be converted into ethnologists by introducing an ethnological specialisation from the third year of studies in geography.[15] A separate

[14] Ibid.: p. 126.

[15] The decision was the result of an initiative by the Employment Office and Office for Education of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (Zaednica za vrabotuvanje I Zaednica za obrazovanie na SRM) that was supported by the Institute of Geography (Institut za geografiya). The republic's many unemployed geographers were to be retrained as ethnologists to enable them to find jobs in museums and similar institutions. The state program for decreasing unemployment in certain professions had retraining funds at its disposal. In 1985-

Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology was established only in 2005. Its programs are largely compatible with those of other European universities. However, as a result of the hiatus of more than four decades, the shortage of highly trained staff still remains.

Ethnology and the Final Gasps of Socialist Yugoslavia

Ethnology in 1988 was part of the Institute of Geography in the Faculty of Natural Sciences. Consisting of approximately 15 students, the first year cohort attended common seminars for the first two years. After this general period, five students would specialise in ethnology and continue the rest of their education to receive a BA (Diploma) degree in ethnology.

While the first two years were common for undergraduate students in geography and ethnology[16], the last two years of the undergraduate education for the students in the Ethnology section consisted of the following subjects: Social Geography; Ethnology of Balkan non-Slavic Peoples; Ethnology of South Slavic People; Museology and Conservation; Anthropology; Ethnology of Macedonians; Geography of Republic of Macedonia; Scientific Research Methodology in Ethnology.

With the limited access to books and translations, the lectures consisted of dictations and students wrote the main definitions, summaries, and most of all, long graphs of enumerated groups and sub-groups of humankind. For instance, in General Ethnology the main accent was placed on accounting for the main regions of the world, then the main families, sub-families, and kin (rod), along with the percentage with which these groups participate in the overall population of a particular continent. The families were then geographically divided with reference to the main ethno-linguistic groups. This approach was based on an evolutionary-Victorian anthropological method that incorporated clear-cut divisions of the world according to ethnic/racial divisions and was strikingly similar to how pioneers of British anthropology, such as James G. Frazer, divided the world into neat zones (Stocking 1982). The influence of Victorian British anthropology was even more evident in the course on Physical Anthropology, which took place at

---

86, the Institute of Geography opened the new program to eight geographers with full BA degrees and eight geographers with two-year degrees. (Svetieva 2001: 3

[16] The subjects studied were Cartography; General Ethnology; Climatology; General Geology with Petrography; Basics of Geography; Mathematical Geography; People's Defence and Self-protection 1; Introduction to Informatics; Hydrology; Protection and Advancement of Living Environment; Historical Geology; History of Peoples and Nationalities of Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY); English; Biogeography with Pedology (soil science); Basics of Marxism; People's Defence and Self-protection 2; Folk Literature; Basics of Tourism; General History; Geography of SFRY.

the Medical School of the University. In this course, the material focused on the different physical features of the peoples of the world based on indexes, and measures of heads, skin colour, nose, skull, or form of eyes. At this time (the end of the 1980s), there was still no sign of departing from the Victorian model, and not even a hint of dismantling the colonial legacy embedded in the 'objective science' that aimed at explaining the human varieties and diversity, which were also part of the Marxist perception of human variations.

The focus of Ethnology of South Slavic or non-Slavic peoples of the Balkans was carried out in a similar Marxist-Victorian tradition in which the listings were the main approach of study. Here, however, there was a stress on the material and spiritual culture, as well as descriptions devoted to rituals and customs. Detached from history, politics, and power division, ethnology aimed at providing an objective and scientific description of human variations.

This orientation culminated in the BA thesis, which was the final project after completing the required course work. It was supposed to be based on fieldwork research consisting of several subsequent visits to a village and interviews with villagers on a topic previously agreed with the supervisor. In 1988 the Institute of Geography had one adjunct professor in Ethnology, Miloš Konstantinov, and a lecturer (docent), Aneta Svetieva. In addition, there were two teaching assistants who were working towards their PhDs. Prof. Miloš Konstantinov was in the first generation of ethnologists supervised by Rusiḱ. His PhD was defended in 1960 with the title *Crafts and Guilds in Bitola and its Vicinity* at the Faculty of Natural Sciences because the Seminar in Ethnography and Ethnology had already closed. His entire professional life was devoted to archivistics, and only after his retirement in 1984 he committed himself to teaching ethnology of Macedonians, European, and non-European Peoples at the Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje.[17]

With the deteriorating health of Prof. Konstantinov at the beginning of the 1990s, advanced BA students in ethnology were supervised by Dr. Aneta Svetieva. It was her influence, vision, and determination to change the course of ethnology; to detach it from geography and natural sciences; and to open it up to trends prevalent elsewhere in the Balkans, that introduced major changes in the institute. She joined the institute in 1985, and her influence was felt across all cohorts but especially by the first-year students. Svetieva belonged to a vanguard of creative people in Macedonia committed to using art as a powerful vehicle of expression despite, as Prof. Svetieva

[17] The university's name was changed to 'Saints Cyril and Methodius' in the early 1990s.

explained in personal communication, the wider family and social beliefs in Macedonia that art is for 'spoiled' people and carries no significant social influence. She graduated from the Art Academy of Belgrade University and successfully defended her MA thesis with distinction before returning to Skopje in the early 1970s. Having spent several years unemployed due to her refusal to make political commitments and to join the Communist Party (she has never joined any political parties during socialist and the post-1991 periods), her two-year job hunt ended with a job at the Institute of Folklore in the Section for Folk Ornaments. The political climate in the country at that time discouraged any discussion on the topic of ethnicity while encouraging less politically heated topics such as ornaments, arts, and decoration. Being focused on this domain for several years, Svetieva began to be more engaged with the discipline of ethnology and its theoretical concepts as they were practised in the wider Balkan region. This enabled her to start her PhD in Belgrade at the Department of Ethnology at the University of Belgrade, graduating in 1988. Given her training in arts and her position at the Institute for Folklore, her PhD is devoted to woodcarving in Macedonia and embraces not only this technique but also a large-scale analysis of wider social, political, and cultural dynamics in the country. She refused to treat only the artistic dimension of folk art or wood carving and introduced, for the first time, a complex cultural analysis of social change through these themes. In 1990 she moved to the Faculty of Natural Sciences at the Saints Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje where the BA ethnology program had already commenced.

The tension between the naturalists and Svetieva was openly exhibited, especially during BA thesis defences. The interference of the geographers and their emphasis on the role of the rivers, the forests, or the mountains on rituals and on the life of villagers, was vigorously debated in the attempt to evaluate to which extent the natural environment determined people's lives. Svetieva also insisted that students should be allowed to choose unconventional topics such as the post-punk movement in Skopje and street graffiti; the emergence of new theses on these topics also revealed that the discipline was beginning to change and incorporate novel approaches beyond the study of villages and 'disappearing worlds'.

The two central teaching figures in 1988, Miloš Konstantinov and Aneta Svetieva, represented opposed visions of what ethnology should be. Konstantinov was a representative of the old school focused on regions, villages, and detailed descriptive knowledge of Macedonia with its natural and folk traditions, while Svetieva already envisioned the discipline apart from natural, environmental, and rural themes. She also insisted on paying close attention to gender and its role in everyday life either in urban or rural

environment. At this time, there was a major shift already affecting and shifting the main research foci of the discipline, namely that of ethno-nationalism.

Ethnology and Creeping Ethno-nationalism

The course General Ethnology taught in the first year by Prof. Konstantinov began with an explanation of the main analytical categories analysed by ethnology. The following is a selection of the notes taken in this seminar from dictated material that Rozita Dimova recorded in her 1988 notebooks:

> First it is 'the people' (*narod*) defined as a community formed in a longer process from a large number of smaller (and, at times, diverse, groups), as a higher organised way of life. Theoretically, people have their own name, territory, language, and culture which are attributes that distinguish them from similar groups. In addition to these elements, it is necessary for the member of the *narod* to have the feeling that due to these or some other characteristics, they belong to this group. Often, there is a mythical ancestor from which the *narod* originates (e.g. from Brut – British people, from Frankus – French people and from Turk – Turkish people). Sometimes, the distinction of *narod* is made (although this is not a correct way of distinguishing) according to anthropological (physical) features. All these elements are general and often flexible. The notion of territory for instance, can be precisely determined, but it does not have to be. If we consider the case of the Roma people (*Ciganite*), who do not have a common territory, but nonetheless managed to survive throughout history as a unitary mass. Jews, who although in recent times have their own territory, have experienced long wanderings and displacements around the world. And yet, they maintained strong ethnic community. It is known that different ethnicities and groups live on foreign territories. Language can often also become an unstable or indecisive characteristic for belonging to a *narod*. It is known that the Spanish language is used by many people in South America, although they are not Spaniards. English is similarly spoken in the US, Canada, and other countries. For instance, in Ireland, Irish and English; in Brittany (France), Breton and French; in the Basque country, Basque and Spanish language, etc. It can also happen that some ethnic groups do not know their own language, but have acquired another. For instance, large number of Jews in the world do not speak Hebrew; also many of the Roma people do not speak their own language.

> National culture is also not a very certain criteria for defining one *narod*. We encounter many *narodi* with Islamic culture in Indonesia, Pakistan, some Arabic people, and also our Muslim population. In Vojvodina, for instance, material culture (living, economy, food) is almost the same among the Serbs, Romanians, Hungarians, Slavonci (people living in Slavonia, Croatia), and Rusinite. When we talk about *narod* and its components that make it a unitary group, we need to mention the importance of religion. In the past, *narodnost* (minority) and religion overlapped. For instance, part of our people or the Albanians, who during the Turkish rule converted to Islam, started to feel, not only socially but also nationally, as Turks. This means that the ethnic and the national feeling moved towards the confessional (national) belonging. As the consciousness of people changes, in the past some *narodi* and groups disappear or emerge. *Narod* is very similar to a living organism which under particular circumstances emerges, grows, disappears from the compact mass, and yet, under different circumstances assimilates, vegetates simultaneously, and then gradually, disappears. In sum, with the contacts among people in the past, present, and in the future, it is difficult, even impossible to find 'pure *narodi*, pure languages or pure races'.

This excerpt from the content of the course Introduction to Ethnology taught in 1988 reveals interesting tensions that lay at the core of the discipline of ethnology at that time. On the one hand, the categories and definitions of the primary analytical tools of ethnology are based on 'scientific' grounds, rooted in Marxist, evolutionary, and natural-science components. On the other hand, there is a significant emergence of stress on ethno-national elements, Islam, and Islamised Macedonians as an illustration of how religion can affect a separation among people who otherwise share ethnic traits, producing distinct *narodi* according to confession.

It is important to highlight that in 1988, when this material was taught, and was also probably compiled by the lecturers in the Ethnology Section, several important events took place that stamped the politics of knowledge production in Macedonia in general, and in social sciences in particular. The focus on Albanians, ethnicity, and nationalism in social sciences in Macedonia and in Yugoslavia was evidently noticeable and rising after 1981, the year after Tito's death, due to the protests of Albanian students in Kosovo who demanded that Kosovo become a republic. During this incident the Yugoslav Army intervened with tanks and heavy weapons, killing at least a dozen people.

In response, the forceful campaign staged by the Serbian intellectual elite assigned itself a task to scientifically clarify the inseparability of Kos-

ovo and Serbia thus generating a new so-called field of study, the 'Mythology of Kosovo' (Qosja 1990: 11). Led by the Serbian Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Battle of Kosovo in 1389 soon became the cornerstone of Serbian political ideology. The academy sponsored numerous academic seminars, publications, and workshops on this theme, culminating with the 1986 Memorandum that pushed forward constitutional changes in Yugoslavia and decentralisation that would prevent the alleged discrimination of Serbs. Serbian newspapers and magazines staged a long and persistent campaign to show a 'forced' expulsion of the Serbian people from Kosovo by ethnic Albanians. Serbian daily and weekly newspapers and magazines, such as *Nin, Borba*, and *Politika,* led this campaign with daily reporting, describing the Serbian people's suffering in Kosovo. The term 'ethnic cleansing' was actually introduced in this period, referring to what Albanians were doing to Serbs. Most high-school students, the age of the authors at that time, were heavily influenced and aware of these events and the alleged danger presented by Albanians as something similar could happen with Albanians in Macedonia.

In 1988, Slobodan Milošević became president of Serbia. He committed himself to fully resolving Kosovo's troubles and relieving what he called the 'suffering of the Serbs'.

In the same year (1988), Jovan Trifunoski, a leading Macedonian anthropo-geographer known for his elaborate analyses of ethnogeneses of peoples living in Macedonia and former Yugoslavia, argued that only 20 per cent of the Albanian population in Macedonia are autochthonous (which he defined as living in the area before the seventeenth century). He argued that 80 per cent of ethnic Albanians in Macedonia were newcomers, who arrived in Kumanovo, Skopje, Struga, Debar, and other towns in western and central Macedonia in the period between 1804-40. The main support for his argument comes from material remains such as deserted villages (*selišta*), cemeteries, remnants of destroyed churches (*crkvišta*), and names of villages. These, according to Trifunoski, are scientific proofs that corroborate his argument that it was Orthodox Christian population populated the areas and most of the Albanians in Macedonia are newcomers (ibid.: 107–13).

As the legitimacy of claims to territory and political recognition by Muslim Albanians throughout Yugoslavia were contested through various intellectual avenues, there were also efforts to establish the legitimate existence of other ethnicities with Muslim affiliation. For example, other Macedonian scholars initiated a political endeavour to make a clear distinction of the difference between Albanians and Macedonians who converted into Islam. In addition to the obvious political agenda of this endeavour, there was a strong scientific production to evidence and support the existence of

Macedonian Muslims as separate from the other Muslim ethnic groups. The main role in this was played by the Association for Cultural-Scientific Manifestations of the Macedonian Muslims which was founded on 10 November 1979 with an aim to provide a platform for 'this part of the Macedonian nation to build its historical future, national consciousness, self-discovery, and realisation of the cultural and national revival for cultural and educational emancipation of Islamised Macedonians' (Limanoski and Dojčinovski 1989: 4). The date of the association's foundation and its activities in the early 1980s make clear that the intellectual debates about Islam and Albanian-Macedonian relations were not just a reaction to the events of Kosovo. The association sponsored scientific symposiums such as *For Macedonian Muslims* (*Za Makedoncite muslimani*) on 3-4 October 1981 in Kičevo; and *Folklore and Ethnology of the Macedonian Muslims* (*Folklorot i etnologijata kaj Makedoncite muslimani*) on 16-17 October 1986 in Debar. The tenth anniversary of the foundation of this association was marked with the publication of the report *Ten Years of Cultural-Scientific Manifestations of Macedonian Muslims* (*Deset godini na kulturno naučnite manifestacii na makedoncite muslimani*) co-authored by Nijazi Limanoski and Stevce Dojčinovski (1989). The ten-year period abounded with numerous activities, meetings, and publications that highlighted the difference between Macedonian Muslims and Albanians or Turks despite the common Muslim religion.

For example, the Torbeš ethnic group became critical in this effort. This group had captured the attention of ethnologists for a long time. The Folklore Institute's library has a copy of the book written by Milivoj Pavlović, *Skopski Torbeši, najstarije srpsko pleme na Balkanskom poluostrvu* published in 1923. Galaba Palikruševa completed a PhD in 1965 on the theme of conversion into Islam in western Macedonia and the formation of the Torbeš sub-group. But, it was the publication of Nijazi Limanoski's (1993) analysis based on his PhD thesis (completed at the Institute of Ethnology at the University of Belgrade in 1988), *Islamisation and Ethnic Changes in Macedonia* (*Islamizacijata i etničkite promeni vo Makedonija*), that made a major impact on both the political and scientific agenda of the Macedonian Muslims. As a native member of this group, Limanoski became president of the Association for Cultural-Scientific Manifestations of the Macedonian Muslims, an association heavily subsidised by the state with a permanently employed researcher responsible for the archive and materials of the association. The book was considered as the most comprehensive study of the historical process of conversions between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries on the territory of Macedonia. The book also addresses the contemporary political and scientific activities of the Macedonian Mus-

lims, their treatment by the state, and their integration in the larger public sphere.

At the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s therefore the topic of the Torbeš and Islamisation was popular and fully supported among the students. One of the authors of this chapter prepared a BA thesis, *Customs during Pregnancy, Child Bearing and Early Childhood among the Torbeš in the Markova River Basin* (*Običai pri bremenost, raganje i rano detstvo kaj Torbešite od porečjeto na Markova Reka*) (Dimova 1992). By visiting the villages of Batinci, Pagaruša, and Dolno Količani in the Skopje area, she interviewed women of different ages to describe the cycle of these customs and rituals. The fieldwork also revealed the presence of rising politicisation of the group and an awareness among the people that they were caught in a larger and alien political process that involved distinguishing Albanians from Islamised Macedonians. These three villages are populated with people of different ethnic backgrounds and intermarriages are common, and during the interviews Dimova often encountered a reaction against the overtly-stressed distinction and obvious anti-Albanian views expressed by politicians.

This process of consolidating ethno-national politics within the discipline of ethnology culminated in 1993 with the appointment of Dr. Nijazi Limanoski as an associate professor of ethnology at the Institute of Geography. The stories circulating around his appointment and role in ethno-national politics were widespread, and he was suspected of shifting his ethnic belonging – from Turk to Torbeš to Islamised Macedonian – according to daily politics and pragmatic reasons. After his untimely death in 1997, Dr. Aneta Svetieva became full professor with a clear agenda to build a team around her that would allow the introduction of theories and methodologies from social and cultural anthropology and to separate ethnology from geography.

Conclusion

The separation of ethnology from geography finally took place in 2005, after years of struggle and resistance from the natural scientists. Since the establishment of the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, the interest in ethno-national matters and identity politics continues to be one of the primary analytical lenses of researchers, as it has been elsewhere. With the ethnic wars and conflicts raging on the territory of former Yugoslavia, Macedonia became interesting for foreign and domestic anthropologists who studied abroad, and were interested in doing fieldwork on precisely the topic of ethno-national politics. The independence of Macedonia; the tensions with Greece and its disputed history; and especially the ethno-national dynamics between Macedonians and Albanians became the most popular

topics among anthropologists in the 1990s and throughout the early twenty-first century.

This brief genealogy of the discipline of ethnology reveals that despite the shifts of the research focus, politicisation has remained a constant feature making the discipline one of the most radically political among social sciences, although this politicisation was often masked as 'scientific' or 'innocent' in its intended study of 'disappearing worlds'. The attempt to distinguish between folklore, and between ethnology, as a more scientific methodology in the 1950s, exemplifies a similar politicisation of knowledge production critical in the initial years of nation-building during socialist times. The disputed nationhood of Macedonia bestowed both folklore studies and ethnology with a special role, similar to the role that these disciplines played in Greece at the dawn of its nationhood (Herzfeld 1982). The rise of ethno-national politics embedded in the epistemology and theory taught at the end of the 1980s made forceful politicisation of the Torbeš identity or reacted to the circumstances surrounding the violent dissolution of socialist Yugoslavia. Evidently, the history of the discipline is saturated with significant roles played by individual scientists and other figures in implementing the intellectual potentials and political agendas of ethnology. The examples of Rusiḱ in the 1950s, and Limanoski and Svetieva at the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s reveal an entanglement of science and politics in which the work undertaken by scientists is shaped by political context and in which the scientists are also agents in the reproduction or change of that context. The knowledge that emerges from this entanglement, encased in publications, museum artefacts, informant interviews, audio recordings, and archival documents, continues to be an endless source for analysing specific moments of how knowledge is produced and enmeshed with larger political configurations.

References

Cvijić, J. 1922. *Balkansko poluostrovo i južnoslovenske Zemlje, I.* Beograd: Izdavčaka Knižarnica.

Dimova, R. 1992. *Običai pri bremenost, raganje i rano detstvo kaj torbešite od porečjeto na Markova Reka.* B.A. Thesis. Skopje: Institute for Geography, Section for Ethnology, University Cyril and Methodius.

Filipović, M. 1957. Cvijićeva antropogeografska škola. *Geografski Pregled* 1: 1-18.

Herzfeld, M. 1982. *Ours Once More: Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Konstantinov, M. 1960. *Zanaeti i Esnafi vo Bitola i Okolijata*. PhD dissertation. Univerzitet „Kiril i Metodij", Skopje.

———. 1983. *Etnologija u Makedoniji*. Zbornik 1. Kongresa jugoslovenskih etnologov in folkloristov, Br.1, Savez uzdruženja folklorista Jugoslavije, pp. 88-94. Ljubljana.

———. 1985. Etnologijata na Makedonija vo sovremeniot mig. *Godišen zbornik: Geografija* 29, pp. 201-209. Prirodno-matematički fakultet na Univerzitetot „Kiril i Metodij", Institut za geografija.

———. 1988. *Postiganja na makedonskata etnologija*. Predavanja na XX seminar za makedonski jazik i kultura na Univerzitetot "Kiril i Metodij" (Skopje-Ohrid 7-27 juli 1987), pp. 271-286. Skopje: Univerzitet "Kiril i Metodij".

Limanoski, N., and S. Dojčinovski. 1989. *Deset godini na kulturno naučnite manifestacii na Makedoncite muslimani (1979-1989)*. Tetovo: Napredok.

Limanoski, N. 1993. *Islamizacijata i etničkite promeni vo Makedonija*. Skopje: Makedonska Kniga.

Mihailescu, V., I. Iliev, and S. Naumović. 2008. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Naumović, S. 2008.Brief Encounter, Dangerous Liaisons and Never-ending Stories: The Politics of Serbian Ethnology and Anthropology in the Interesting Times of Yugoslav Socialism. In V. Mihailescu, I. Iliev, and S. Naumović (eds.), *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*, pp. 211-260. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Palikruševa, G. 1965. *Islamizacija na Torbešite i sozdavanje na torbeškata subgrupa.* PhD Dissertation. Skopje, University "Kiril i Metodij".

———. 1997. The Development of Macedonian Ethnology and Folklore. *Ethnologia Balkanica* 1: 214-217.

Pavlović, M. 1923. *Skopeski Torbeši, najstarije srpsko pleme na Balkanskom poluostrvu*. Beograd.

Qosja, R. 1990. *Nezaštičena Sudbina*. Zagreb: HSLS.

Risteski, Lj. S. 1997. *Rakopisnata zaostavština na Branislav Rusiќ. Prilog kon istorijata na etnološkata misla vo Makedonija.* Bitola: "Misirkov".

———. 2004. *The Achievements of Ethnology in Investigating Folk Religion and Mythology in Macedonia. Ethnology of Religion*, pp. 175-190. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

Rusiќ, B. *n.d. Etnologijata i nejzinata dolžnost vo Makedonija*. Arhiv na MANU, K-1, AE 61-1-6. (manuscript).

——. *n.d. Antropologija Makedonije.* Arhiv na MANU, K-1, AE 60,1-5. (manuscript).
——. *n.d. Etnologija*. Arhiv na MANU, K-1, (manuscript).
——. 1954a. Diskusija okolu Folklorniot institut. *Nova Makedonija* XI: 11.
——. 1954b. Etnografija ili etnologija. *Zbornik Matice Srpske* VIII: 55-66. Novi Sad.
——. 1955. Edno pojasnuvanje (vo vrska so diskusijata za Folklorniot institut). *Nova Makedonija* II: 8.
——. 1959. *Odredba pojma folklora*. (Rad Kongresa Folklorista Jugoslavije u Varaždinu 1957). Savez Folklorista Jugoslavije, pp. 271-273. Zagreb.
——. 1957, Bericht über die ethnologische Arbeit in der VR Mazedonien (1945-1955). *Südost Forschungen* XVI: 156-159.
Segal D., and S. Yanagisako (eds.). 2005. *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle: Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Stocking, G. 1982. *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Svetieva A. 2001. *Statusot na etnologijata na Univerzitetot "Sv. Kiril i Metodij" vo Skopje*, Paper presented at Bulgarian-Macedonian Conference „History and Education", Sofia 8-9- June 2001, manuscript.
——. 2005. *Konečno Institut za etnologija i antropologija na Univerzitetot „Sv.Kiril i Metodij", Skopje*. Prirodno-matematički fakultet, Etnolog, XII-11, pp. 225-232. Makedonsko etnološko društvo, Skopje.
——. 2009. *On Macedonian Ethnology and the work of Prof. Gjorgji Zdravev*, pp. 13-17. PhD Thesis. Social and Spiritual Aspects of Material Culture, "Ss.Cyril and Methodius" University in Skopje. Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology.
Trifunoski, J. F. 1988. *Albansko stanovništvo u Socijalistickoj Republici Makedoniji: Antropogeografska i etnografska istraživanja*. Belgrade: NIRO 'Književne novine'.
Vodovozov, V. 1917. *Na Balkanah*. Petrograd: Ogni.

Chapter 14
'Croquis' of Ethnology in Montenegro

Lidija Vujačić

Introduction

Montenegro is a new country and, as in other parts of former Yugoslavia, the institutionalisation of the anthropological field in higher education, museums, and public life has been a confusing process. A precise overview of the history and development of ethnology in Montenegro has not been realised, and few attempts have been made to evaluate how the field developed during the socialist years (Vujačić 2005). This chapter aims to fill that gap by presenting a 'croquis' or sketch of the most important institutions, projects, and activities undertaken in that era, without which it will not be possible to assess the prospects for further development in the present century.[1]

As elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia, ethnology (*etnologija*) had relatively long-standing roots in Montenegro. It involved the more or less systematic collection and classification of data concerning 'traditional customs'. When practised in a purely descriptive way, often by amateur enthusiasts, the term *etnografija* was used synonymously. After 1991, the terms 'cultural' and 'social anthropology' also came to be used as synonyms for ethnology. The connotations of these new terms are very different (there is much overlap with fields elsewhere labelled cultural or media studies) but that is not the theme of this chapter.

During the 1945-91 period, *etnologija* was practised in Montenegro as an empirically-oriented discipline focused on the material and spiritual culture of the preindustrial countryside. It paid little attention to social change, and did not seek to identify the causes or potential consequences of changes as pursued in Anglo-American anthropology and some other European ethnologies. In Montenegro such interests barely existed before 1991, although some ethnologists did begin to theorise how socio-cultural identity developed between the poles of patriarchal structures and 'modern' values.

[1] In completing this chapter I am deeply indebted to Jennifer Cash for her guidance and editing.

In Montenegro, the social realities of everyday life have long been shaped by the changing nature of statehood, which has been influenced by global shifts in conceptualisations of the 'nation' and appropriate forms of national political autonomy. From the fifteenth century Montenegro was under Ottoman rule, but it gained a unique autonomous status within the empire during the sixteenth century. In 1878, it gained status as an independent principality, and in 1910 became a kingdom. From 1918, Montenegro was merged with Serbia, before obtaining *oblast* status within the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1922. Between 1929 and 1941 all of present-day Montenegro as well as adjacent parts of central Serbia, Kosovo, Croatia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, were organised within Yugoslavia as the Zetska Banovina (Zeta province).[2] After the Second World War, Montenegro was merged into socialist Yugoslavia (initially as a less-autonomous 'people's republic' until 1963 when it became a 'socialist republic' on par with the five other constituent republics). After the breakups of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and of the subsequent state union of Serbia and Montenegro, Montenegro became an independent state in 2006. Repeated restructuring of the polity has affected both economic and ethnic relations.

Close political, historical, linguistic, and cultural relations between all of the former Yugoslav republics, but especially with neighbouring Serbia, have shaped the development of Montenegrin ethnology. As elsewhere in the former Yugoslavia, promising young ethnologists from Montenegro received their training in Belgrade (or sometimes Zagreb) and after that they continued working at home in existing institutions of culture and education.

The Ethnographic Tradition in Montenegro's Museums

After the Second World War, Montenegro established and expanded cultural institutions in the framework of the new socialist state. The first ethnological institution in Montenegro – Etnografski muzej Crne Gore (the Ethnographic Museum of Montenegro) – was formed in 1951 in Cetinje. Over subsequent decades, the museum's capacity to develop a local school of ethnology proved limited. Yet the collections also provide insight into the motivations behind local practices of ethnographic collecting.

The selection of Cetinje for the museum's home was not accidental. The town has a rich historical heritage and was the seat of Montenegro's Petrović dynasty from the end of the seventeenth century until 1918. In 1946, Montenegro's political and administrative capital was relocated to Podgorica (Titograd), but many cultural institutions continued to function in

[2] The name of the province comes from the Zeta River; the medieval state of Zeta also roughly corresponded to modern Montenegro.

Cetinje. In 1993, Cetinje officially resumed its role as the historical, cultural, and spiritual capital of Montenegro, although Podgorica remains the administrative centre, largest city, and official capital.

In 1964, the museum was incorporated into Montenegro's National Museum Complex. In 1979, the complex was renamed the Narodni muzej Crne Gore (National Museum of Montenegro), and in its current form, the National Museum incorporates the Ethnographic Museum, the Istorijski muzej (Museum of History)[3], Umjetnički muzej (the Art Museum), and the newly-founded Arheološki muzej (Archaeological Museum). The National Museum existed before the socialist period, but underwent successive reorganisations in the years following the Second World War.[4] In 1979, the Ethnographic Museum also lost the building that housed it (the Biljarda Palace of Petar Petrović II Njegoš) in a devastating earthquake. The collections were relocated to the Vladin Dom (the government building during the Petrović dynasty), but from 1979 until 2002, the museum did not have a display area of its own. During this period, the collections were organised to enable the display of occasional thematic exhibitions such as *Škrinje Crne Gore* (*Chests of Montenegro*) and *Od niti do tkanine* (*From Fibre to Fabric*).

The ethnographic museum holds valuable items with strong symbolic and national significance. The collection of materials now exhibited by the museum can be traced back to the late fifteenth century. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, collecting was associated chiefly with the activities of the Crnogorska mitropolija (Montenegrin Metropolitan) and the nature of the collected items relates primarily to church history. Since the end of the eighteenth century (especially since the great Montenegrin victories over the Ottomans at Martinici and Krusi in 1796), war relics (flags, arms, and decorations) were also collected. Over the nineteenth century, collecting activities expanded to include artefacts bearing on economic activities, nutrition, housing, textile crafts, clothing, arms, music instruments, and monies. The collections now held by the ethnographic museum come from the entirety of Montenegro and bear witness to the influence of

[3] The Museum of History is further composed of the Muzej Kralja Nikole (the King Nikola Museum), Muzej Petra II Petrovića Njegoša (Museum of Petar II Petrović Njegoš), Njegoševa rodna kuća (Njegoš`s birthhouse), Njegošev Mauzolej na Lovćenu (Njegos`s Mausoleum on Lovcen), Dvorska crkva na Ćipuru (the court church), Muzej Vladike Danila (the Mausoleum of Bishop Danilo), and Reljef Crne Gore (the Relief of Montenegro).

[4] The initiative to formally establish a national museum began in the late 1870s. In 1896, a law was passed to establish the Royal Montenegrin Library and Museum which became the foundation of the later National Museum. In its current form, the National Museum of Montenegro also has a large number of professional services (conservation, documentation, information centre), as well as archival and library departments with approximately 50,000 bibliographical and 100,000 archival units (see http://www.mnmuseum.org).

various cultures and styles on the territory including those of the Illyrians, Greeks, Romans, Venetians, and Ottomans (Kapičić and Vujačić 2007).

The museum's collections evoke a multicultural, multi-ethnic, and multi-confessional history of Montenegro. In this respect, the museums are in accord with the current state's official cultural policy that stresses multiculturalism. However, the historiographic and archivistic materials in the museums also stand at the symbolic centre of recent political turmoil over the ethno-national identity of Montenegrins. Museum collections can also be read to comment on the development and projection of Montenegro's independence; the present role of the Petrović dynasty and its role in the political history of Montenegro; the current political and cultural situation; and the qualities represented by national symbols. Although all identities are in a constant state of becoming, Montenegro's national identity is marked by the particularity of dualisms and tensions between 'Serbian' and 'Montenegrin' interpretations of the constitution of national and cultural identity, such as ethnic origin, language, and national and state symbols.[5]

Initiatives in Ethnology: Publications, Associations, and Research

After the establishment of the Ethnographic Museum, the infrastructure of ethnology in Montenegro developed in a chronological sense, with the appearance of publications, professional associations, and some research institutions, but the intellectual output was not robust. For example, the Ethnographic Museum undertook the publication of a journal, *Glasnik Etnografskog Muzeja (Bulletin of the Ethnographic Museum)*, at the instigation of ethnologist Jovan Vukmanović.[6] The journal was published from

[5] For example, there are two Academies of Arts and Sciences: Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts (*Crnonogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti – CANU*) and Doclean Academy of Arts and Sciences (*Dukljanska akademija nauka i umjetnosti - DANU* founded in 1999). Both academies are funded by the Government of Montenegro through project and academic supplements for regular members. In principle, CANU should focus more on issues related to Serbian and Montenegrin national and cultural identity, while DANU focuses on the multicultural identity of Montenegro and its Montengrin base. But there are political and ideological tensions between them. The Government of Montenegro during 2012 passed a new law which presupposes judging based on competition between the academies. This has caused new tensions, delays in work, and termination of funding until the court resolves the dispute. Also there are two departments for mother language (Serbian and Montenegrin) in the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Montenegro and other 'duplicated' scientific and educational institutions.

[6] Jovan Vukmanović (1906-94) was a Montenegrin ethnologist and musicologist educated in Belgrade. In addition to establishing the museum's journal and the Association of Ethnologists, Vukmanović also founded the Society of Museums and the Society of Folklorists in Montenegro. Later in life Vukmanović published the results of his ethnographic research in Montenegro in several books including *Geografski pregled Crmnice* (*Geographical Overview*

1961-64, but discontinued when the museum was incorporated into the national museum complex of Cetinje. In 1968, the publication was re-launched under the name *Glasnik Cetinjskog muzeja* (*The Bulletin of the Cetinje Museums*), but was also discontinued after a few years, impeding the work and professional collaboration of local ethnologists. At the least, the journal could have opened up space for vocational and technical debates in the museological aspects of the discipline.

In 1978, Jovan Vukmanović continued his efforts and founded the *Društvo etnologa Crne Gore (the Association of Ethnologists of Montenegro*) in Cetinje. In 1978, the *Odbor za etnologiju* (the Board of Ethnology)[7] was also established in the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts (MASA).[8] The establishment of MASA was connected to larger processes of administrative de-centralisation within Yugoslavia. These processes brought political and administrative support for the institutionalisation of ethnology in some forms, but Montenegro's ethnologists themselves seemed to have little lasting enthusiasm for supporting their own professional development as a community. The Association of Ethnologists ceased to function in 1985 as a result of several factors. First, the association did not have its own space for gathering and the exchange of ideas (meetings were held occasionally in Titograd or Cetinje). With time, the association's activities were also largely duplicated by the Board of Ethnology, which had workspace and modest finance for planned activities under its budget from the Academy (and thus the government), or by the museums which had better infrastructure. In short, the association lacked professional and official efforts to resolve the technical and infrastructural problems required to sustain its activities; over time, the association's work to bring ethnologists together did not contribute very much in terms of developing the discipline or initiating new research projects. The cessation of the association's activities also foreclosed opportunities to stimulate a wider social recognition for the profession of ethnology (see Ilić 1998: 153). The records of the association's activities are now dispersed among archives of several other affiliated organisations and institutions in the field of culture.

---

of Crmnica); *Konavli-antropogeografska i etnoloska ispitivanja* (*Konavli: Anthropogeographical and Ethnographical Studies*); and *Studije o Paštrovićma* (*Studies about Pastrovici*).

[7] The president at the time of publication is ethnologist Petar Vlahović, full member of the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts and retired full profesor of the University of Belgrade.

[8] The Parliament of the Republic of Montenegro passed the Law on the Society of Sciences and Arts of Montenegro on 12 October 1971. In April 1976, the Society was transformed by law into the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts. At the time of publication, the Board was operational in CANU, but not in DANU.

From 1978, the Board of Ethnology has been the most important institution in the field of ethnology in Montenegro. The Board is comprised of ethnologists and scholars from other fields that (in)directly use or pursue ethnological topics. It currently counts some forty members whose research is funded through freelance contracts for annual and multi-year research projects. The majority of projects supported by the Board during its history have been based on an interdisciplinary approach to ethnological themes. During the late 1980s and early 1990s, for example, most of the studies conducted were focused on anthropogeographical units, anthropomorphologic features of the population, traditional culture (material culture, especially in terms of commerce, traditional architecture, national costumes), the transformation of the family unit, and Montenegrins living in the republic's border regions and in diaspora. Most of the resulting research has been published in the form of regional or thematic monographs in which classic techniques for collecting and interpreting data have prevailed. Over the past decades, the Board has also initiated and organised several seminars, forums, roundtables, and national and international conferences in the field of ethnology and related disciplines.[9]

During the socialist period, almost no training in ethnology was available in Montenegro's universities. The first attempt to introduce ethnological themes into university teaching came in 1981with the foundation of the *Kulturološki fakultet* (Cultural Studies) in the University of Montenegro (Cetinje) with departments of Museology, History of Arts, Librarianship, and the Organisation of Cultural Activities (Đurašević-Miljić 2010). Some of the courses in Cultural Studies covered ethnological themes from the perspective of cultural heritage, preservation, and tourism (Mijović 1997: 173). In 1988, Cultural Studies was transformed into the Faculty of Fine Arts, with little further development of ethnological training. In the 1990s ethnology was finally incorporated as a course of study in the Department of

[9] Some of the topics covered were: *Ethnological Characteristics of Montenegro - Scientific Problems and Processing Methods* (1995); *The Scientific Work of Jovan Vukmanović and Its Significance for the Ethnology and Museology of Montenegro* (1996); *On the Relationship between Ethnology and Other Sciences* (1997); *Ethnology of the Museums of Montenegro* (1997); *Ethnology of Montenegro - Position, Problems, and Prospects* (1997); *Traditional Folk Culture in Montenegro* (1998); *Museology in Montenegro* (2000); *The Village in Montenegro* (2002); *National Costume - Identity of Time and Space* (2004); and the *Ethnological Characteristics of Montenegro* (2010). The data were taken from the minutes of Board meetings and official correspondence between Board members. In addition, interpretation of Board activities has been facilitated by information regarding proposals and initiatives on the launch of scientific debates and conferences. The documentation of the Board for the period 1986-2011 is held in the archive of the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts in Podgorica.

Sociology in the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Montenegro (Nikšić campus).[10]

Currents in Ethnological Thought until the 1990s

Although Montenegro lagged behind Serbia and Croatia in building an institutional network, local ethnology shared some similarities in terms of the broader social and ideological context within which it evolved. The identity of the ethnological sciences was shaped primarily by the socialist environment in which ethnology was perceived as a historical (and often auxiliary) discipline; the method of work was largely cultural-historical in nature; and research topics were largely inspired by rural areas, 'inexhaustible' folklore, and by the eagerness to preserve it from oblivion. This was the type of work pursued by ethnologists as well as all others who were spurred by some other professional or amateur incentives to be 'interested in' ethnology. Researchers paid special attention to the so-called customary law and patriarchal communities (Vujošević 1981; Stojanović 1987) and many other social institutions and customs that were considered to be in the process of extinction or to have already been abolished in their original form. These phenomena, which were 'caught' in the transformation process, were not merely described (as was the case with much of the folkloric material), but were interpreted from the point of their socio-economic function through the socialist ideological milieu and, in particular, through the tenants of dialectical materialism. At the time, in the 'theoretical innocence ethnology' (Kovacević 2005: 13) characterised by insufficient theoretical and methodological savvy of researchers, dialectical materialism offered a quick and simple explanation.

Without an academic and institute-based position, ethnology in Montenegro was practically a science of secondary importance during the 1940s-60s. The rare local ethnologists acquired their education elsewhere and did not have a core around which to accumulate their respective energies and ethnological knowledge in a more stable manner, or around which they could draw up a broader theoretical and epistemological direction. The lack

[10] The first lecturer from the program's establishment until 1998 was ethnologist Dragana Radojičić. Radojicić was born in Herceg Novi, Montenegro. From 1984-94, she worked in the Historical Institute of Montenegro. From 1994 until 2001 she worked at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić and at the Faculty for Navigation in Kotor (where she had a course on Professional Communication). Since 2001, she has been employed in the Ethnographic Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SASA), but from 2001-05 she was visiting professor at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nikšić and at the Faculty for Navigation in Kotor. At the time of this publication, Radojičić was principal research fellow and head of the Ethnographic Institute of SASA.

of an institutional base other than the Board of Ethnology was also responsible for the slower and less forceful absorption of new theoretical approaches, such as those of structural anthropology, than occurred in other parts of Yugoslavia.

In the early 1970s Montenegro slowly started to witness, to a certain extent, reflections of the redefinition of the science on a larger scale. Changes in ethnology came from a greater circulation of ideas between Yugoslav republics. For example, the dogma according to which traditional culture and folklore would disappear in contact with urban civilisation began to be questioned, especially under the influence coming of some colleagues from other Yugoslav republics who started a self-critical review of existing ethnographic work and the broader social context, cultural policy, and official ideology in which it took place (e.g. Rihtman-Auguštin and Muraj 1998, Kovacević 2005). The trend of perceiving social volatility as a research challenge in itself did not, however, have a significant impact in Montenegro. Theoretical development was certainly hindered by the lack of a faculty department or institute which supported staff with fresher ideas and perceptions of the discipline to meet frequently and review theoretical and methodological postulates.

Špiro Kulišić's book *O etnogenezi Crnogoraca* (*On the Etnogenesis of the Montenegrins*) (1980) could probably be considered a step forward from the 'cushioned' ethnological reality in Montenegro.[11] His book encouraged scientific and political discourses about ethnogenesis, ethnic processes, and nation-building in Montenegro, and sparked a huge controversy in the domestic and Yugoslav public. Since the 1970s there had been a developing theory about the autochthonous nature of the Montenegrins' ethnic origin. The dominant narrative held that Montenegrins were of Serbian ethnic background, but the new theory, which Kulišić's work helped to develop, argued that ethnic Montenegrins were distinct from ethnic Serbs. Kulišić's work focused on demonstrating the ethnic distinctiveness of the *Dukljani* (Docleans), residents of the ancient Slavic *Duklja* (Lat. *Doclea*) that existed partially on the territory of Montenegro. Kulišić considered that the Docleans were the ancestors of ethnic Montenegrins; he claimed that they were distinct from both Serbs and Croats because they were a mixture-nation of Slavic migrants and the Romanised ancient and autochthonous population of Duklja's territory (Kulišić 1980).[12] The book garnered immediate discussion

[11] Špiro Kulišić (1908-89), was an ethnologist from the Bay of Kotor in Montenegro who held professional posts throughout the former Yugoslavia (see Kurtović this volume).

[12] Kulišić also concluded that Serbs had not lived in Montenegro until recently; in the early Medieval Ages, he claimed that there was only a small number of Croatians living next to the Docleans (Kulišić 1980).

and debate among the Montenegrin elite and intelligentsia in the *Titogradski marksisticki centar* (Titograd's Marxist Centre). Kulisic's opponents came mainly from the ruling elite, especially from Serbia, while his supporters generally were Montenegrin intellectuals and the lower ranks of politicians from Montenegro. These debates show how ethnology and neighbouring sciences were turned to political ends in 1970s and 1980s without a corresponding intellectual development within the fields.

Ethnology after 1990

Although the scope of this volume ends with the end of the socialist period, ethnology in Montenegro has flourished, relatively speaking, since the 1990s. At the University of Montenegro (Nikšić), the undergraduate program in the Department of Sociology opened a course on Ethnology in 1994, followed by several additional courses in the 2000s: Social Anthropology, the Anthropology of Modernity, and (at the postgraduate level) the Anthropology of Popular Culture. The introduction of these three courses, however, also mark the beginning of the 'anthropologisation' of ethnology in Montenegro in terminology and problematics. Nevertheless, they are designed, not to further the development of the field itself, but to familiarise future sociologists with basic anthropological categories and theoretical approaches.[13] A few other initiatives to introduce courses in anthropology have been building since the mid-2000s: in 2006, a course on Political Anthropology was introduced by the Faculty of Political Science, and since 2008, anthropology has been considered in attempts to introduce interdisciplinary courses in humanistic studies in the University of Donja Gorica (Podgorica) one of Montenegro's two private universities. But for the time being, the Department for Sociology at Faculty of Philosophy of University of Montenegro remains the most 'open' space for ethnology and anthropology on the academic level.

In recent years, the Board of Ethnology has also significantly shifted its focus to contemporary ethnological themes through its chief project *Etnološke odlike Crne Gore* (*Ethnological Features of Montenegro*). The project has assembled several local ethnologists and anthropologists to work

[13] The curricula was developed to avoid an overlap with material that was already included in other sociological courses and to benefit from potential overlapping with material in wider social theory, particularly cultural studies. Furthermore, course development was undertaken with concern for the practical application of knowledge gained from anthropological disciplines, and attempted to focus on specific social, cultural, political, and economic challenges that are of interest in Montenegro but also elsewhere. Issues such as the meaning and significance of (supra) national and multinational identities, Europeanisation, and globalisation were all included in the new curricula (Vujačić 2005).

on a variety of research plans, some formulated by the Board and others proposed by researchers. Many of the projects proposed by researchers interrupt the otherwise ongoing descriptive engagement with folk culture as a vanishing cultural phenomenon (Prošić-Dvornić 2003), and insist on an indispensable connection between a '*new methodology (explanation) and a new space*' (Kovačević 2005: 17). These new projects have slowly opened the door (but not yet wide enough) for urban ethnology and anthropological diversity in Montenegro, thus eliminating all spatial and cultural boundaries in determining the subject of research (ibid.: 18). Yet despite the language and possibility of 'newness', most research projects supported by the Board after the 1990s do not address the complex network of relationships between the contemporary (consumerist) culture, global market, and local communities; the fluidity of identity, or new approaches to understanding national identity and processes of national branding (e.g. Anholt 2003; Dinnie 2008; Aronczyk 2009; Vujačić 2010).[14]

Conclusion

Although it is difficult to measure the importance that a scientific discipline has in a particular environment, there are some still tangible parameters. The most prominent and illustrative ones are determined by the relationship of the state towards the institutional infrastructure of a discipline. The others are related to the specific activities and effects that professional ethnologists accomplish.

Since the 1990s, some ethnologists in Montenegro, like their more prominent counterparts in Serbia, have argued that the mutual relationship between the formal and creative circumstances is, in fact, 'a process that expresses social conditions which a global system provides for the development of a science but which, once started and relatively established, goes on to largely determine the breadth and scope of its development, and thus the development of the science itself' (Bogdanović 1990: 17). In this respect, the development of any science requires a high-quality dialogue, not only on

[14] The capital project *Montenegro in the 21st Century – In the Era of Competitiveness*, carried out under the auspices of the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts, resulted in the 2009-10 subproject *Aspects of Montenegro's Population* in which a number of ethnologists dealt with contemporary ethnological and anthropological issues (see Vujačić 2010). The latest work plan for the Board of Ethnology also carries an extremely complex project, *Ethnological Lexicon of Montenegro*, the realisation of which is expected over the next few years. Altrough the project is still in draft form, it was conceived as a very ambitious example of teamwork with an interdisciplinary approach to the most important topics in ethnological researches in Montenegro including theoretical and metholodological considerations, social and material culture, and history.

regional but also on a global level. Except for individual efforts this global dialogue has never been a well-established practice in Montenegro. But perhaps it will become so in the twenty-first century if the introduction and problematisation of new topics of research in accord with current socio-cultural and (global) economic trends is accompanied by a (self-) critical review of the field's current conceptualisation. New anthropological researches on tourism, branding, and the culture industry in Montenegro embody this possibility. All of these topics may appear 'novelties' to ethnologists because they require the abandonment of the concepts of territorially limited communities, stable cultures, and identities. These 'new' topics require the acceptance of a networked world and a constant exchange of people, goods, and ideas, but this only means that they are nothing more 'real' than life in Montenegro viewed in global perspective (see Appadurai 1991).

References

Anholt, S. 2003. *Brand new justice: The upside of global branding*. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Appadurai, A. 1991. Global Ethnoscapes: Notes and Queries for a Transnational Anthropology. In R. G. Fox (ed.), *Interventions: Anthropologies of the Present*, pp. 191-210. Santa Fe: School of American Research.

Aronczyk, M. 2009. Research in Brief / How to do Things with brands: Use of National Identity. *Canadian Journal of Communication* 34: 291-296.

Bogdanović, M. 1990. Institucionalni razvoj sociologije u Jugoslaviji. In M. Bogdanović (ed.), *Sociologija u Jugoslaviji-Institucionalni* razvoj, pp. 13-45. Beograd: Institut za sociološka istraživanja Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu.

Dinnie, K. 2008. Nation Branding and Russia: Prospects and pitfalls. *Russian Journal of Communication* 1 (2): 199-201.

Đurašević-Miljić, D. 2010. *Nastavno naučni I pedagoški rad Pavla Mijovića.* Podgorica: Matica, pp. 519-524.

Ilić, V. 1998. *Jugoslovensko udruženje za sociologiju i Sociološko društvo Srbije*. In Bogdanović, M. (ed.) *Sociologija u Jugoslaviji – institucionalni razvoj*, Beograd: ISFF, pp. 153-168.

Kapičić, A., and V. Vujačić (eds.). 2007. *Vodič kroz muzeje Crne Gore*. Katalog.

Kovačević, I. 2005. Iz etnologije u antropologiju. In D. Radojičić, *Etnologija i antropologija: Stanje i perspektive*, Zbornik Etnografskog instituta Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, pp. 11-19. Vol. 21. Beograd: SANU.

Kulišić, Š. 1980. *O etnogenezi Crnogoraca*. Titograd: Pobjeda.

Mijović, P. 1997.*Otvaranje Kulturološkog fakulteta*. Cetinje: Cetinje kao Feniks.

Prošić-Dvornić, M. 2003. Pogovor. In Đ. Petrović, *Od pusta do zlatoveza*, pp. 386-388. Beograd: srpski genealoški centar.

Rihtman-Auguštin, D., and A. Muraj. 1998. Prvih pedeset godina etnološke misli u Institutu. *Narodna umjetnost* 35 (2): 103-124.

Stojanović, P. 1987. Metodološki problemi u istorijskopravnoj nauci. In V. Strugar (ed.), *Prošlost Crne Gore kao predmet naučnog istraživanja i obrade*, pp. 345-367. Vol.15/7. Titograd: CANU.

Vujačić, L. 2005. Etnologija i antropologija u Crnoj Gori. In D. Radojičić, *Etnologija i antropologija: Stanje i perspektive*, Zbornik Etnografskog instituta Srpske akademije nauka i umetnosti, pp. 45-53. Vol. 21. Beograd: SANU.

———. 2010. Identifikacija i projekcija stanovništva na kulturološkom i antropološkom planu (odnos lokalnog, regionalnog i globalnog). In P. Vlahović (ed.) *Populacioni aspekti - Crna Gora u XXI stoljeću - u eri komepitivnosti*, pp. 479-504. Vol. 73/6. Podgorica: Crnogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti.

Vujošević, N. 1981. Sociološki pristup proučavanju patrijarhalnih zajednica. In Đ. Pejović (ed.), *Predmet i metod izučavanja patrijarhalnih zajednica u Jugoslaviji*, pp. 91-109. Vol. 7/3. Podgorica: CANU.

Chapter 15
Cataloguing Tradition in a Socialist Republic: Ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1945-1990

Larisa Kurtović[1]

Among the former Yugoslav republics, Bosnia-Herzegovina[2], as an object of study and as a site of production of ethnological knowledge, remains perhaps the least known and the most enigmatic. Unlike its western and eastern neighbours, Bosnia-Herzegovina did not possess a distinct national ethnological tradition in the vein of those that developed elsewhere in central and eastern Europe as a Romantic counter-response to Enlightenment and in concert with flowering nationalist aspirations. The late nineteenth century proved more fickle and less welcoming to ethnology in Bosnia than in the other future Yugoslav republics, whose scholars occasionally exercised influence in Bosnia. As a consequence, ethnology never quite became a nation-building science in Bosnia, nor did it achieve the institutional status and recognition it sometimes enjoyed in Serbia and Croatia.

In the Balkans, interest in ethnological study emerged in parallel with cultural and political transformation. Serbian ethnology gleaned its inspiration from the efforts of the great philologist-reformer Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, but came into its own as a scholarly discipline under the auspices of the anthropogeographic school of Jovan Cvijić (Naumović 2008). In

[1] Writing this text proved to be a challenge in many respects and certainly could not have been completed without the help and support of colleagues from many corners of the globe. I wish to especially thank Svetlana Bajić and Marica Filipović of the National Museum in Sarajevo, who shared with me their recollections and personal materials, despite the fact that the museum had already been closed to the public at the time of my visit. I discuss the museum's protracted financing crisis and abandonment by the state government at the end of this chapter. I am also in debt to Sabrina Perić, who advised me on translation of some of the original titles of the works I have cited. My deepest gratitude goes to the editors for their support and their patience.

[2] For ease of reading, I use Bosnia-Herzegovina and Bosnia interchangeably throughout this text to refer to the former socialist republic and current independent state. When referring only the northern and north-eastern parts of the country (Bosnia proper), the distinction from Herzegovina (in the south and south-west), is specifically noted.

Croatia, Antun Radić's investigations of peasant culture set the stage for the work of the diffusionist ethnologist Milovan Gavazzi whose influence on the discipline remained dominant until the 1970s (Čapo-Žmegač 2004: ix). In spite of their differences and occasional confrontations (see Bošković 2008: 9), both Serbian and Croatian ethnology advanced the study of their own national group, always at a small scale and in rural settings, and often with the explicit purpose of discovering the authentic national spirit (*Volkgeist*). Since *national* heritage could be brought to bear in the context of evolving political aspirations, in the early decades of the twentieth century, ethnology managed to achieve in these parts of the Balkans a significant amount of prestige and relevance. Under the tutelage of a few recognised and politically savvy scholars, it also carved out its place as the expert science on national issues. A part of the delegation of the newly founded Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 consisted of ethnologists, whose role was to provide advice "on the ethnic distribution of populations with respect to the drawing of frontiers for the new state" (Halpern and Hammel 1969: 20). Political affirmation went hand-in-hand with the institutionalisation of the discipline at the university level. In Belgrade, a department of ethnology was established in 1906 while the University of Zagreb began to offer courses in ethnology as early as 1924.

Despite the founding of the *Zemaljski muzej*[3] in Sarajevo in 1888 during the heyday of Austro-Hungarian imperial administration, and the subsequent organisation of the museum's *etnološka sekcija* (officially translated as the Ethnology Department) in 1913, no comparable founding figures or systematic scholarly programs of ethnology existed in Bosnia-Herzegovina in these transitional periods. Nor did ethnology ever become a fully institutionalised department at the University of Sarajevo as it did at other major university centres throughout Yugoslavia. In fact, in spite of the growth in the number of universities and the promised advancement in all forms of

[3] From its founding in 1888, Zemaljski muzej represented a unique, complex, and multidisciplinary institution, which housed collections in natural history (including botany and geology), as well as archaeology and ethnology. Throughout its history, the museum has also been a centre of scientific research and academic publishing. Its main purpose was to study and exibit the natural and historical heritage of Bosnia-Herzegovina This type of a multidisciplinary museum dedicated to a specific region is sometimes refered to in German as *Landesmuseum.* While the name of Zemaljski muzej in the local language remained unchanged since its foundation, translating the name into English presents a bit of a challenge. The literal translation is the 'museum of the land' except that in Bosnia (as well as in Germany), what one means by 'land' has changed over time. At its foundation, the name of the museum would be best translated as the Provincial Museum. During the socialist period, the name of the museum was sometimes translated into English as the Museum of the Socialist Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina. After 1992 and Bosnian independence, it has been rendered in English as the National Museum of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

scientific inquiry during socialism, the Ethnology Department of the Zemaljski muzej remained up until recently the central, and more or less the only, home for ethnological research and study in Bosnia.[4]

The peculiar fate of ethnology in Bosnia begs the question: how did this discipline remain such a marginal field of inquiry in precisely the area of former Yugoslavia that is often described as one of its most ethnically and culturally diverse? If the socialist period offered the most hope for ethnology in Bosnia (even while constantly deferring the founding of a university department or research institute), then what kinds of scholarly pursuits did it yield? Is it possible to speak at all about something called 'Bosnian ethnology' or is this a misleading pursuit, reflecting less the actual division of labour among socialist ethnologists, and more the disciplinary presumptions about the link between ethnology and ethnos?

This chapter pursues these questions while offering an exploratory history of a marginal discipline in a centrally located yet still peripheral Yugoslav socialist republic. In constructing this pockmarked narrative, I have drawn in the first place on interviews with employees of the Ethnology Department of the Zemaljski muzej who were on staff at the time of the museum's closure in 2011, as well as on an archive of descriptive ethnographies and a few existing state-of-the-field reflections published during the socialist era by authoritative experts in and outside of Bosnia.[5] In addition, I have consulted the more recent writings of scholars from Serbia and Croatia, who have over the last twenty years been engaged in historicising Yugoslav ethnologies.[6] With the exception of the prolific ethnographer Milenko Filipović and the renowned ethnomusicologist Cvjetko Rihtman, the contributions of ethnologists based in Bosnia-Herzegovina remained modest in the regional context. Nevertheless, the fate of ethnology in this socialist republic provides an important occasion for reflection on the very presuppositions of this disciplinary inquiry and the organising tenants of its recent historiography.

In the first place, this essay investigates the ways in which the absence of a titular nation in the socialist republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina provided ethnologists based there with specific kinds of challenges and opportunities.

---

[4] As I explain in the conclusion, at the time of writing, the Ethnology Department, as well as the National Museum as a whole had been closed due to the lack of funding and the protracted abandonment of cultural and scientific institutions by the Bosnian government.

[5] For systematic treatments of ethnological literature, see Lopac 1951; Škerlj 1955; Matičetov 1966; Supek-Zupan 1976; see also Halpern and Kideckel 1983 among others cited directly in the text. See also Lockwood 1975 for an example of an early anthropological ethnography of socialist Bosnia produced by an American scholar.

[6] Among these are Čapo-Žmegač 1993, 1997; Bonifačić 1996; Kürti 1996; Hann et al. 2007; Mihăilescu and Naumović 2008.

The inherent diversity and slippery nature of *narod* (people, nation) in Bosnia could at times problematise and destabilise the dominant model for the production of ethnologic and folkloric knowledge. I suggest instead that collective ethnographic surveying in Bosnia helped give traction both to the ideology of socialist multinationalism (Bratstvo i jedinstvo), and a distinct model of ethnographic inquiry that undermined the position of individual researchers as national 'insiders'. It is not simply that such scholarship helped constitute as its object the presumed synthetic and harmonious nature of interethnic life. Collective surveying, I argue, also highlighted the importance of space—at times conceived along political, but more often along regional lines—in helping to organise both research and the production of ethnological knowledge in Bosnia. To conceive of regions as an object of ethnological research introduces certain dissonances into the conceptualisation of ethnology as *Volkskunde*.

In the second place, the activities of ethnologists in Bosnia throughout this period showcase the full extent to which ethnologic study in socialist Yugoslavia had been a federal rather than republic-centred endeavour. These forms of inter-republic circulation of ideas and people were particularly strongly felt in Bosnia, where the lack of a degree granting institution created a dependence on the universities in Zagreb and Belgrade for the production of new cadre. Such inter-republic circulation of experts may have facilitated regional integration but did not reflect or create equal relations between ethnologists in all of the republics, and it did not necessarily help advance ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina. As Bosnian scholars have argued (Beljkašić-Hadžidedić 2007), a number of professional ethnologists appeared to perceive Sarajevo as a temporary stop on their way to more important assignments elsewhere. This fluidity of cadre, however, helps to illuminate the fact that Belgrade and Zagreb never were opposing regional poles, but rather nodal points in a much larger system. Paradoxically, the apparent absence of a strong Bosnian ethnologic tradition during socialism reveals a certain level of integration across republican lines, which makes conceivable an incorporated Yugoslav model of ethnology.

The sections that follow offer a brief summary of the history of ethnological studies in Bosnia, as well as focused analyses of a few central controversies and methodological debates that helped shape the work of cataloguing tradition. The first section tells of the beginnings of ethnological study in Bosnia by looking at the early proto-ethnological writings of foreign travellers and local amateurs which preceded the founding of the Ethnology Department of the National Museum on the eve of the First World War. I then turn to the efforts of renowned Yugoslav ethnologist, Milenko Filipović, to reimagine a modernised and socially relevant ethnology. The

backlash that followed his 1955 state-of-the-field assessment is the subject of the following subsection, which also takes up the failed efforts at revolutionising and modernising ethnological inquiry. Finally, in the last two sections, I turn to the ethnographic surveys conducted during the socialist era by the ethnologists of the National Museum to consider what such a methodological model suggests about ethnology in Bosnia as a distinct field of research and inquiry. I end with a few speculative arguments and a reflection on the state of the field today.

Jagged Chronologies: The Beginnings of Ethnological Study in Bosnia-Herzegovina

Proto-ethnological activities began in Bosnia long before the possibility of Yugoslavia became imaginable. As throughout much of the Balkans, the people and places of Bosnia emerged as an object of ethnographic interest in the writings of foreign visitors, like the Ottoman traveller Evliya Çelebi (1611-ca.1685), French diplomat Amédée Chaumette des Fossés (1782-1841), and Austrian geologist Ami Boué (1794-1881). Each of these visitors trekked through Bosnian and Herzegovinian valleys and mountains, producing some of the earliest accounts of local life and custom (Beljkašić-Hadžidedić 1984: 867). But this early 'ethnographic' archive had its problems. Çelebi embellished and at times fully invented his accounts of life in Ottoman-controlled Bosnia (see Palavestra 2003: 8). Meanwhile, nineteenth-century travelogues painted a portrait of a land at once wild, primitive, and exotic, sitting at the cusp of two irreconcilable worlds – a model of representation closely related to Orientalist discourse that we today term Balkanism (Bakić-Hayden 1995; Todorova 1997; Allcock and Young 2001; Hadžiselimović 2001; cf Wolff 1996).

Since the Ottoman Empire did not have a vigorous interest in supporting ethnological surveys, the early efforts of activists like Ivan Franjo Jukić, a Franciscan priest, and Konstantin (Kosta) Hadži-Ristić, a Sarajevo merchant, to create an ethnological society in the mid-1800s did not reap a rich harvest (Filipović 1955: 211; see also Bajić 2013). However, when Bosnia fell into the hands of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1878, new imperial administrators took an interest in the traditions of the local populations, partly out of curiosity but also out of the desire instrumentalise or at least control the political potentials of that heritage. Ethnological investigations intensified with the arrival of imperial scientists, and the founding of the Zemaljski muzej in Sarajevo in 1888. Self-styled experts at the new museum began to collect cultural artefacts and to survey certain regions with the goal of recording the cultural heritage of the local population. Kosta Hörmann,

the museum's first director, also founded in 1889 the journal *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* (*Herald of the Provincial/National Museum of Bosnia-Herzegovina*), which grew into one of the key ethnological publications in Bosnia during the socialist era. In addition to these imperial officials, the museum drew in a number of amateur ethnologists, some of whom arrived in Bosnia from neighbouring Croatia, Slovenia, and Serbia.

Monographs written by such non-professional enthusiasts began appearing in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as documents of everyday traditions among Bosnia's key ethnic groups. These amateurs' observations and reflections, prepared with the help of cultural organisations and new publishing houses, took the form of compilations of anecdotes and 'pearls of folk wisdom'. Among the most well-known of these works are *From the People, and About the People* (1898) by Luka Grđić-Bjelokosić; *Life and Custom of Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina* (1907) by Antun Hangi; and *Life and Custom of Catholic Croats in Bosnia-Herzegovina* (1908) by Nikola Buconjić. Such publications rarely met the standards of a new generation of professional ethnologists, and had a tendency to focus on the exotic, archaic, and strange. Socialist-era ethnology would subsequently view work completed during the early twentieth century as a slanted representation of life in Bosnia. For example, both Milenko Filipović (1955) and Ljiljana Beljkašić-Hadžidedić (1984) contended that the Austro-Hungarian administration, due to its fear of awakening nationalist aspirations, sought to produce an ethnically and nationally bland image of Bosnia. Filipović and Beljkašić-Hadžidedić both suggest that the ethnology of this era worked to reduce national heritage to material artefacts that could excite the imperial imagination but not lend support to the rising nationalist (particularly irredentist Serb and Croat) movements that wished to challenge Austro-Hungarian hegemony in the region.[7] Despite these caveats, the Austro-

[7] The politics of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in regard to national questions in Bosnia were complex, and their detailed discussion extends beyond the scope of this short chapter. It is worth knowing, however, that Benjamin von Kállay (1839-1903), the minister of finance and chief colonial administrator of Bosnia, during his reign favoured and actively promoted the idea of interconfessional Bosnianism (*Bošnjaštvo*). Whether this policy had a legitimate historical or political basis is a question that I cannot answer here, but it is important to recognise that this Austro-Hungarian narrative of Bosnianism served the political purpose of counteracting movements for national self-determination among local populations which would have posed a serious treat to the empire (and ultimately did help to end it). For more discussion on this period and these policies, see for example Donia 1981; Kraljačić 1987; Okey 2007. It is crucial to note that these policies also provided the context in which Zemaljski muzej was founded and may have coloured the logic according to which ethnographic knowledge about Bosnia-Herzegovina was gathered. Socialist-era ethnologists about whom I write in this chapter were unanimously critical of the lack of professional standards and the 'slanted approach' of proto-ethnologists, but were rather vague concerning their precise

Hungarian rule of Bosnia set the stage for the intensification of ethnographic work. For example, the founding of the Balkan Institute in 1908 helped the ethnological knowledge about Arbanasi quickly accumulate.[8] Researchers from neighbouring Croatia and Serbia also proceeded to collect ethnological data in Bosnia and in Herzegovina. In the edited volume *Habitation and the Origin of Population* (orig. *Naselja i poreklo stanovništva*), Jovan Cvijić and his collaborators gave special attention to certain areas of Bosnia and also Herzegovina. Around the same period, Matica Hrvatska successfully assembled and published compilations of folksongs from Bosnia (Filipović 1955: 212).

The end of the First World War led to the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. But national affirmation of the Yugoslav peoples did not help advance ethnology at the Zemaljski muzej in Bosnia. Rather, the study of ethnology stagnated during this era; the Balkan Institute was disbanded and the museum's Ethnology Department no longer had among its employees a single professional researcher or expert (Beljkašić-Hadžidedić 1984: 869). Scholars based in Zagreb and Belgrade continued to investigate areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina, but chose to publish their ideas elsewhere. During this period *Glasnik* did not publish regular editions nor did it offer much in the vein of ethnographic reports. The only positive development was the founding of the Ethnographic Museum in the second largest Bosnian town of Banja Luka[9], which unfortunately could not secure a trained ethnologist to work at its helm (Filipović 1955: 212). These staffing difficulties were a reflection of the limited intellectual and scientific resources in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, and specifically of the isolation of Bosnia as one of its poorest and least industrialised parts.

Given the forlorn state of ethnology in Bosnia during the Kingdom, the end of the Second World War and the founding of a new federal state offered reasons for hope. As a part of its great overhaul, the Yugoslav state apparatus began to systematically build and expand scientific and educational institutions. The Zemaljski muzej in Sarajevo was included in this general process. In 1947, Špiro Kulišić – a future key figure in the school of

---

objections as to how their predecessors had handled the question of ethnic origins and belonging.

[8] Arbanasi are an ethnic group of Albanian origin that resides in Croatia, mainly around the town of Zadar.

[9] The original name of the museum, established in 1930, was Museum of Vrbas Banovina. However, the museum changed its name several times during the Kingdom and socialist Yugoslavia. In his 1955 text Filipović refers to this museum simply as the Ethnographic Museum (*Etnografski muzej u Banjoj Luci*). Today, it is known as the Museum of Republika Srpska.

Marxist ethnology - was named the director of the Ethnology Department at the museum (Buturović and Kajmaković 1989: 156).[10] Prior to his appointment, Montenegro-born Kulišić had earned an undergraduate degree in ethnology at the University of Belgrade under the mentorship of leading Serbian ethnologists Jovan Erdeljanović and Tihomir Đorđević. Before the outbreak of the Second World War, he worked as a professor in the gymnasium in the town of Prijedor in north-western Bosnia, a school known for its vibrant intellectual atmosphere. As a participant of the Partisan resistance and a politically savvy communist, he quickly climbed the ladder in the republic's cultural administration, receiving the appointment as the museum's director after a few years of work in the Ministry of Education of SR Bosnia-Herzegovina (see Gorunović 2007: 19).

Because Kulišić's appointment was mainly administrative, Zorislava Marković-Čulić and Nada Korica-Pasariček were hired as assistants and became the first professional and university-trained ethnologists at the museum. Furthermore, since the Ethnology Department had suffered so long without professional guidance, shortly after his appointment, Kulišić invited renowned ethnologist Milenko Filipović from Belgrade for a short visit to help assess the post-war state and future perspective of the Ethnology Department of the National Museum. Kulišić chose Filipović for several reasons. At that time, Filipović held the post as the chief curator of the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade, where he developed relevant professional and managerial expertise. Moreover, Filipović was not only born in, but also spent a significant part of his career conducting ethnographic research in Bosnia-Herzegovina.[11]

After the 1947 reorganisation, the Ethnology Department continued to hire trained experts and established ethnologists. Rade Uhlik, a well-respected authority on the Roma, also came to work at the museum in 1948. The following year, the museum hired Cvetko Popović[12], who spent the

[10] Later in his career, which included not only his directorship in Bosnia, but appointments in the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade, and other administrative and curatorial posts, Špiro Kulišić become infamous for his controversial work *Ethnogenesis of Montenegrins* (published in 1980), which appeared in the context of the rise of the so-called Montenegrin autochthonist school. The work went against the prevailing ethnological canon and the political mainstream of the time to insist on the historical and ethnological distinctness of Montenegrins.

[11] As I discuss in subsequent sections, Filipović's vast familiarity with the history of ethnological study in Bosnia, as well as his postwar work as a conslutant in the Ethnology Department of the Museum, led to the 1955 publication of a state-of-the-field assesment of the ethnographic resarch in the republic, published in Sarajevo-based journal *Pregled*. This document, as I show soon, created a rift between him and Kulišić.

[12] Before Popović became an ethnologist, he was a member of the nationalist movement Young Bosnia, and a participant in the plot to assassinate Archduke Franz Ferdinand, whose

entirety of his career in the Ethnology Department, investigating folk economy and artisanal crafts and trades (*zanati*). More new cadre was on the way: Ljiljana Beljkašić (later Beljkašić-Hadžidedić) received during this period the first, though unfortunately also the last full scholarship in Bosnia for the study of ethnology at the University of Belgrade (Beljkašić-Hadžidedić 2007: 8). Ethnology seemed to be amidst great expansion and professionalisation. Thanks to the work and enthusiasm of the new professional cadre, the museum soon laid down the foundation for its first five year plan (1947-51).

The optimistic mood among Sarajevo ethnologists in the early 1950s was marked by the zeal of post-war reconstruction. Cultural institutions, including a slew of regional and city museums (*zavičajni muzeji*) appeared in smaller towns like Tuzla, Doboj, Travnik, Jajce, Bihać, Mostar, Zenica, and Bijeljina. Many of these museums were established to commemorate the people's liberation and the socialist revolution, but they also collected and displayed the cultural and material heritage of local communities. The year 1950 saw the establishment of the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Sarajevo. Two years later, Filipović began teaching ethnology there, first as an elective, and then as a second track specialisation in the Department of Geography. But such advances at the university were short-lasting. Filipović's appointment did not lead to the foundation of a separate ethnology department; to the contrary, these curricular offerings were discontinued by 1962 when Filipović, already in failing health, retired to Belgrade. In 1978, ethnology returned once again to the University of Sarajevo when the Faculty of Political Science and Sociology adopted a two-semester-long ethnology curriculum. Around the same time, and under the influence of Cvjetko Rihtman, the Music Academy also started offering courses in ethnomusicology (Beljkašić-Hadžidedić 1988: 871). Wishing to ensure the continuation and growth of their field, ethnologists at the National Museum petitioned the state several times over the course of the next decades (1960s-70s) with the request that a separate department be founded at the Faculty of Philosophy. But they always received the same response: that the departments in Zagreb and Belgrade were perfectly sufficient to serve the needs of the field.[13]

---

murder provoked the start of the First World War. Popović was sentenced in 1914 to thirteen years of imprisonment, but he was released in 1918 (Prosenica 1981: 199).

[13] During our conversation in the summer of 2013, Svetlana Bajić suggested that the failure to establish ethnology at the university as a separate department was also in part the responsibility of Bosnian ethnologists. Many of the experts at the museum never completed their doctoral degrees which would have allowed them to teach at the university level. According to Bajić, the state hesitated to further institutionalise ethnology at the University of Sarajevo because it feared that the professional and academic cadre in Bosnia was insufficient.

The Yugoslav state ministries, as Beljlkašić-Hadžidedić suggested, never conceived of Bosnia as a site for the production of new professional ethnologists, but only as a place where experts trained in Belgrade and Zagreb could find employment (Beljlkašić-Hadžidedić 2007: 9). Despite such disappointing outcomes, ethnologists of Bosnia did leave a record of their efforts, debates, and contributions to the work of cataloguing traditions. It is to the details of this socialist-era history that I now turn.

Yearning for a Great Transformation: Milenko Filipović's Quest for a Modern Ethnology

In his 1955 assessment of the state of the science in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Milenko Filipović, one of the key figures charged with resurrecting the Ethnology Department of Zemaljski muzej and one of the most respected among early Yugoslav ethnologists, proclaimed the republic to be possibly 'the least ethnologically and geographically known area of socialist Yugoslavia' (Filipović 1955: 212). In making such an appraisal, Filipović was not simply claiming that ethnological materials were non-existent, which was sometimes indeed the case. He was also bemoaning the condition of the existing ethnological archive which had been collected in an unsystematic and unscientific way. Subject to the whims of amateurs, enthusiasts, and colonial administrators, Bosnian ethnological records contained many gaping holes that could only be rectified through the institution of rigorous professional standards.

In Filipović's eyes, socialist ethnology in Bosnia faced a multiplicity of problems, which needed to be addressed if the discipline was to develop into a modern, professional science. To start customs, ways of life, and traditions of entire micro-regions, particularly western Herzegovina, and north-eastern and eastern Bosnia, had never been studied ethnographically (1955: 212). Such concerns with geographic representation and thorough documentation of folk life in vast areas, represented one of the paradigmatic methodological presuppositions of descriptive ethnology whose key generational representative was Filipović himself. Born in 1902 in Bosanski Brod as a son of a railroad employee, Filipović had received his elementary and high school education in the Bosnian towns of Visoko and Tuzla, after which he moved to Belgrade to pursue his university and doctoral studies (Halpern and Hammel 1970: 558). Although he was trained by Jovan Cvijić, Jovan Erdeljanović, and Tihomir Đorđević, the key figures of the Serbian anthropogeographic school, Filipović's own thesis focused on the origins of the ethnically heterogeneous populations near Visoko in central Bosnia. Most of his subsequent research remained in Bosnia and Macedonia, and to a lesser

extent Serbia and Slovenia, reflecting the trajectories of his employment history and temporary placements. Though often described as one of the key Serbian ethnologists, Filipović's ethnological interests never rested exclusively with ethnic Serbs. His ethnographic writings often took on complex practices that appeared across different ethnic groups, and sometimes even contained explicit comparisons. His most well-known monograph, *Visočka nahija* (*Visoko Subdistrict*) (1928), is a chronicle of the life and customs of all the ethnic groups in Visoko.[14] Even though his own voluminous ethnographic oeuvre was anchored in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Filipović felt that ethnologists had hardly done enough to cover the whole of the geographic terrain. What was needed in order to marshal a response to these problems, was a proper institution whose chief (as opposed to secondary) regional focus would be within the republic's borders. While ethnologists based in Belgrade and Zagreb sometimes ventured into Bosnia-Herzegovina, they were primarily concerned with phenomena within Serbia and Croatia. Bosnia too, in the eyes of Filipović, needed a proper academic institution separate from this multidisciplinary museum, which could solely focus on filling the gaps in the existing ethnographic archive

Such an institution, according to Filipović, would not simply monopolise the ethnological study of Bosnia, but serve as an organising nexus around which ethnology in Bosnia could become a veritable professional science. It is worth observing that Filipović tempered his plea by continually acknowledging the debt owed to Serbian and Croatian ethnologists who had investigated certain ethnological phenomena and regions inside the republic. In the context of the 'iron years' of Yugoslav socialism when intellectuals could easily be discredited, imprisoned, or exiled for being perceived as either Stalinists or nationalists, it is clear that Filipović did not wish to antagonise anyone nor be accused of sowing discord among the various federal centres. Yet at the same time, he insisted on a regional or geographic division of labour.

Filipović's emphasis on *space* — rather than ethnicity or custom — as an organising axis of ethnological research, is quite significant and instructive. On one level, it reflects perhaps an apprehension about the sensitive nature of the national question in Bosnia, where during the Second World War significant clashes and violence often broke out along ethno-national lines. Similar kinds of ambivalence are present when Filipović discusses the legacy of early ethnology during the Austro-Hungarian occupation in Bosnia, whose representation of interethnic relations had undoubtedly been

[14] Some of this research was compiled in a well-known ethnographic monograph entitled *Visočka Nahija*, which was resurrected and reprinted in Visoko in 2002, despite the difficult state of publishing in post-war Bosnia (Filipović 2002 [1928]).

constructed on the basis of imperial interests. On the other hand, one detects in Filipović's assessment a direct commitment to the republic as a unique ethnological and geographic space, and a distinct object of ethnographic investigation. As I discuss in latter parts of this text, such a commitment to space also existed in the ethnological surveys organised by the Ethnology Department of the museum and their various collaborators, which were almost always conceptualised as ethnographic investigations of regional terrains (*oblast*). Filipović, in an effort to break out of the constraints of the national question, suggested that the institutionalisation of ethnology in Bosnia might follow the model presented by the ethnically diverse Socialist Autonomous Province of Vojvodina. In Vojvodina, ethnological study had been in a similarly disarrayed state, but in the early years of socialism had opened a series of new museums and scientific institutions (Filipović 1955: 212).

The institutionalisation and further education of new experts posed in Filipović's mind the greatest priority for the future of ethnology in Bosnia. The absence of an archive of foundational descriptions for many parts of the republic presented another significant obstacle because ethnology required systematic, synchronistic observations to allow for meaningful comparison and the study of cultural change. But an even greater danger lay in the complete lack of attention to what Filipović called 'complex phenomena' or 'problems of greater and wider importance'. Frustrated by the antiquarian ethnologists who obsess over old, esoteric, and arcane objects, while relishing in 'primitivism, patriarchy, and exoticism', Filipović insisted that ethnological study be thoroughly revamped. In order to locate alternative models, he urged that Yugoslav ethnologists stay in tune with transformations of ethnology on the international level:

> Contemporary ethnology does not separate out or look for only such patriarchal groups and exotic elements, but it is more and more a science about the 'life of a nation' (*narodnom životu*) of all of its peoples ... it views phenomena in a 'life of a people' (*život naroda*) in their dynamism, studies and observes processes, their conditions and consequences, to which all data collection is dedicated – rather than collecting objects for their own sake (Filipović 1955: 213-14).

Fluent in English, French, and German, and familiar with a handful of other languages, Filipović was more informed than most about the developments in central European ethnology and British and American anthropology. Just a few years prior to publishing the above-cited article in the Sarajevan journal *Pregled*, he had spent the year 1952 at Harvard University supported with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation (Halpern 1970: 559). Additionally, as a foreign member of the American Anthropological Association,

fellow of Current Anthropology, and member of the American Geographical Society, he was also well connected with the American scholarly community.

No doubt, Filipović's international experiences left a mark on his intellectual work and thinking. However, his criticism of stagnation in ethnological work had also been inspired by the challenges posed by socialist modernisation in Yugoslavia. Consequently, in parallel to his desire to reconfigure ethnological study as that which is concerned with everyday lives and complex phenomena alike, Filipović also sought to reimagine ethnology as a socially and politically relevant discipline that was able to support social transformation and economic development. To that end, the perceived archaic nature of rural life in Bosnia was for Filipović not only an object of scientific interest, but also a useful prism for tracing the effects of rapid post-war modernisation — a modernisation whose transformative effects made even more important the work of 'salvage ethnology', that is, of cataloguing and recording dying practices (Filipović 1955: 213). In fact, Filipović went as far as claiming that the ethnographer who records 'primitive' practices should also offer help to the socialist state and its new experts in eradicating such archaic forms of thought and action as quickly as possible (214). He even questioned to extent to which the work of cataloguing differences, practices, material culture, costumes, language, and traditions could also produce value among tourists, young artists, and for 'national propaganda' (213) by which he presumably meant patriotism.

Filipović's pragmatism and insistence on the modernisation of ethnologic study did not earn him any favours or new friends. By contrast, his 1955 intervention brought about one of the most interesting controversies in Yugoslav socialist-era ethnology, which has been analysed at length by the Serbian ethnologist Gordana Gorunović (2006; 2007). In response to Filipović's assessment, Špiro Kulišić, former director of the Ethnology Department of Zemaljski muzej and at that moment an employee of the Institute for Folklore Studies in Sarajevo[15], published within several months a harsh critical response, accusing his esteemed colleague (and former friend) of advocating a bourgeois functionalist overhaul of socialist ethnology (Kulišić 1955). This controversy, as I suggest in the following section, offers important insights into ethnology in Bosnia and socialist Yugoslavia.

[15] The Institute of Folklore in Sarajevo was founded in 1946 as a separate department of the Zemaljski muzej. In 1947, the Institute became a separate research institution with its own publication, *Bilten* (*Bulletin of the Institute of Folklore*). The institute continued to exist as an independent research center until 1958 when it was re-absorbed by the Ethnology Department of Zemaljski muzej. See below for further details about the complexities of Kulišić's career.

Ethnology Fit for a Revolution: The 'Theoretical' Disjuncture of Socialist-Era Ethnology

The debate that took place on the pages of the journal *Pregled* in 1955-56 foreshadowed some of the tensions that would grip Yugoslav ethnologies and ethnologists through the dissolution of the socialist federation and beyond. Ethnology in Yugoslavia remained for a long time an insular, traditional, 'atheoretical', and largely conservative discipline of little interest to the state. Nowhere in Yugoslavia did this remain more true and for longer than in Bosnia-Herzegovina, where the model of an artefact-gathering museum ethnologist, remained the norm until the late 1970s. Undoubtedly, the absence of a major research institution in Bosnia that was not tied to the museum (whose chief purpose was in fact cataloguing and the acquisition of articles for exhibits), compounded the inertia of local ethnological research. Thirty years after Filipović's assessment of ethnological study in Bosnia, Ljiljana Beljkašić-Hadžidedić (1984) echoed his concerns, as well as theoretical assumptions, by criticising the fact that entire regions and topical domains had been left unexplored in both Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Filipović-Kulišić debate offers some answers to the question of why ethnology in Bosnia remained so closed to change, even amidst great upheavals among the new generation of ethnological scholars in other parts of Yugoslavia. Starting in the 1970s and 1980s, particularly in Slovenia, Croatia, and Serbia, students and future professional ethnographers began to question the status quo and to introduce theoretical innovations and methodological reinterpretations (see e.g. Supek 1987). More open to theoretical thinking and external influences from Anglo-American anthropology and French structuralism, scholars like Zagorka Golubović, Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, Ivan Čolović, and others began producing some of the earliest studies of everyday life in modern, urban settings. No similar transformations ever became possible in the ethnology of Bosnia-Herzegovina, where even the study of quintessential elements of folklore, such as traditional dress, were considered lacking (Gorunović 2006: 194).

When Filipović raised the issue of modernising ethnology in Bosnia he was attempting to sketch out a plan for a newly transformed discipline suitable for revolutionary times. But his program of moving ethnological inquiry away from the collection of beautiful objects and a fascination with the arcane and exotic never took hold. He was instead denounced and attacked as a bourgeois functionalist. The fact that this attack was launched by Špiro Kulišić, former director of the Ethnology Department of Zemaljski muzej, who also became in his mid-career a chief representative of the 'historical materialist' school of Yugoslav ethnology, was noteworthy. Their

confrontation brought to the surface an array of tensions within Yugoslav socialist-era ethnology including its relationship to social anthropology and Marxist philosophy.

The conflict also had other personal and political dimensions, and might have been – at least according to some sources (Kajmaković in Gorunović 2006) – generated by competition and professional jealousy. After Kulišić stepped down from his position as the director of the museum's Ethnology Deparment, he began doctoral studies at the newly founded Faculty of Philosophy at University of Sarajevo, where as a doctoral candidate, he also taught ethnology in the Department of Ethnology. In order to keep this job, Kulišić was urged to finish his doctorate, but due to a falling-out with his mentor, he withdrew his completed thesis and left to teach at a teacher's college (*viša pedagoška škola*) in the Croatian port town of Split. His animosity towards Filipović also began during this period. As a friend and mentor, Filipović failed to warn Kulišić about an obscure text written by Dušan Nedeljković (Kulišić's thesis advisor in Sarajevo), whose omitted citation in the thesis's bibliography led to the fight between the advisor and advisee (Gorunović 2007: 21). By the time Kulišić was ready to return to Sarajevo in 1955, Filipović had already begun to teach ethnology and geography in Sarajevo, which meant that the department no longer had any place for Kulišić. Instead, in 1956, Kulišić began to work at the Institute for Folklore, becoming the director in 1957.[16]

These perceived betrayals undoubtedly played a big role in Kulišić's decision to attack Filipović so publicly. Still, during the 'iron' years of early socialism, when allegations such as these could have ruined someone's career (see Naumović 2008), this was a bold and damaging move. Unlike politically skilled (yet occasionally explosive) Kulišić, Filipović was never one to pander to the dominant political currents, in spite of what the above-discussed appeal to the modernising socialist state might suggest. But he was certainly caught off guard by the reaction that his article provoked in Kulišić, and the 'most unusual manner' (Filipović 1956: 143) in which that reaction was expressed.

Gordana Gorunović's extensive research on the debate suggests that Kulišić also reacted so forcefully because he felt singled out by Filipović's critique of old-fashioned folklorists who went about collecting archaic objects and studying 'survivals', in place of pursuing more vibrant, *more modern* objects of study (Gorunović 2006: 188). Throughout his career, Kulišić remained committed to the traditional life as the object of ethnological investigation; he considered 'modern life' to be the domain of sociolo-

[16] After the Institute of Folklore was re-absorbed by the Ethnology Department of the Zemaljski muzej, Kulišić once again became the department's director in 1958.

gists. By contrast, Filipović recognised that rural and traditional life was changing, and that ethnology also needed to change alongside it, as 'living reality was creating new problem spaces for ethnology' (Gorunović 2006: 189).

These were not the only ways in which Filipović and Kulišić differed. Filipović was an avid fieldworker and a prolific ethnographer; Kulišić was an armchair ethnologist who disliked and was not very good at ethnographic fieldwork.[17] Filipović was also better versed in anthropological debates and theoretical discussions with which Kulišić only had marginal familiarity through secondary literature. Nevertheless, Kulišić's accusations cleverly mobilised Soviet critiques of Western anthropology in order to denounce Filipović's 1955 intervention as a sign of his allegiance to 'bourgeois' ethnology. Filipović's functionalism, Kulišić argued, was not only complacent with an imperial ideology existing in service of Western expansion, but also anti-historical (and anti-historicist), politically conservative, and therefore counterrevolutionary.

Gorunović cautions in her analysis that Kulišić did not fully appreciate, and possibly did not understand the technical debates between functionalism and structural-functionalism, leading him to collapse the differences between them. He was especially enraged by Radcliffe-Brown's dismissal of Engels' theory of marriage and family as 'pseudo history' and by Malinowski's rejection of the significance of 'cultural fossils' (i.e. survivals) to which Kulišić had dedicated his own career. According to Gorunović, Kulišić most likely adopted his lines of criticism from Soviet ethnologists who were also committed to an evolutionary view of history. As a consequence, she characterises the Filipović-Kulišić debate as an encounter between Filipović's admittedly 'proto-functionalist' model and Kulišić's 'pseudo-Marxism' or rather vulgar Marxist evolutionism. However, she also warned her readers that both of these positions were highly situated and only partly connected to the debates abroad. Kulišić never quite developed any of his theoretical formulations, but relied rather on a few phrases from the Marxist-Leninist cannon. Filipović recognised this, and fired back the contention that Kulišić writes with 'great pretensions' but 'insufficient information' about the questions that he takes on 'very authoritatively' (Filipović 1956: 144). In parallel, Filipović also sought to minimise his own familiarity with the theoretical debates in British and American anthropology. He insisted in-

[17] When Gorunović interviewed the ethnologist and retired employee of the Ethnology Department Radmila Kajmaković, Kajmaković recounted how Kulišić blundered terribly in an attempt to conduct research in the villages outside of Sarajevo. He took along a uniformed soldier, whose presence caused quite a commotion and frightened the locals who did not know what was going on (Gorunović 2006).

stead on the primacy of ethnographic research, claiming that 'no phenomenon can be explained away by using some schema ... but only through fieldwork and in relation to other practices and phenomena' (Gorunović 2006: 197).

It is important to note that Filipović had never been opposed to the study of traditional life and custom—in fact, most the ethnographic archive he left behind was also dedicated to such topics. But he did believe that modernisation posed a significant challenge to ethnology, and that transformations of rural life needed to be studied in concert with folklore. A huge point of contention between Filipović and Kulišić became the status of 'survivals' which Kulišić believed held proof for evolutionary view of historical development. By contrast, Filipović believed that when people incorporated so-called survivals in their daily lives, such elements were not dead, fossilised, or archaic, but alive and living (Filipović in Gorunović 2006: 198).

Špiro Kulišić's attack on Milenko Filipović had indisputably been ideological and dogmatic, and possibly, as I explained earlier, originated with the conflict between the two of them over the teaching job in the Department of Geography in Sarajevo. Despite losing out on this academic post, Kulišić continued – after a brief stint at the Institute for Folklore (1956-58) – to work in the Ethnology Department at the Zemaljski muzej until 1960, when he received a transfer to Belgrade where he became the director of the Ethnographic Museum. Nevertheless, during his fickle career in Sarajevo, he left an important impact on socialist ethnology in Bosnia. As I demonstrate in the following section, in the first decades after the Second World War, he helped bring the Ethnology Department in Sarajevo back from the ashes. However, by refusing Filipović's call to action, and by not allowing his conservative theoretical views to effectively respond to the transformations of ethnology already under way, he also helped hold back the modernisation of socialist-era ethnology in Bosnia.

In the rest of Yugoslavia, the Marxist ethnology to which Kulišić paid allegiance soon became marginalised because it was too dogmatic, too conservative, and too rigid (Gorunović 2006: 203). Instead, a new generation of ethnologists actually pursued socio-cultural anthropology, informed by theoretical insights of humanistic Marxism, praxis philosophy, and psychological configurationism. It is not surprising therefore that second line of attacks on Kulišić originated within this new, up and coming generation, and specifically, with Manojlo Glušević, a student and advisee of Milenko Filipović. In his 1963 article 'Ethnography, Ethnology, and Anthropology', Glušević offered one of the earliest challenges to the conception of ethnology as a science about peoples (*narodi*), ethnic characteristics, and eth-

nogenesis that had been put forth by Jovan Erdeljanović (who had been mentor to both Filipović and Kulišić) (see Gorunović 2006: 203n). He also chastised the older generation for its reluctance to read foreign literature, think theoretically, and engage with debates taking place in other kindred disciplines like anthropology (see Gluščević 1963; 1966).

Filipović did not publish any more polemics after his failed 1955-56 intervention, but he diligently continued to pursue ethnosociology and ethnohistory in his own work, combining elements of functionalist and historical materialist approaches. As Mirjana Prošić-Dvornić (cited in Gorunović 2006: 202) suggests, although Filipović never really abandoned the eastern European paradigm, his work was more modernist than most other ethnologists of his generation. He was also very popular among and a great colleague to American anthropologists who came to Yugoslavia in the 1960s. After his death in 1962, he became remembered as the paradigm ethnographer, who very professionally and carefully documented folk practices and customs.

Filipović's doomed modernisation plan and backlash that followed it constitute a lost opportunity for ethnology in Yugoslavia, and particularly Bosnia. Kulišić himself never came to fully appreciate how harmful his performance had been, not in the least because it discouraged others from taking part in scholarly debates for the fear of ideological denunciation. Though he himself also recognised that ethnology in Yugoslavia had been marginalised, he understood this as a technical problem, resulting out of the lack of a 'clear and consistent theoretical framework and methodology' (Kulišić cited in Gorunović, 204) and the discrimination of the discipline in light of other sciences acting as 'tutors' of the state. Nevertheless, Kulišić's intransigence and rejection of new critiques of ethnological traditionalism contributed to the overall unfavourable status of ethnology. In Bosnia, this combination of ideological dogmatism and the lack of academic space within which further development of ethnological thought and practice could take place proved quite disadvantageous. The production of ethnological knowledge remained thoroughly wedded to the museum as an institution, and up until the 1980s over-determined by the focus on traditional rural life. Unfortunately, those very orientations kept ethnology's repute among other social sciences undeservingly low (Halpern and Hammel 1969: 22).

More than a Museum Ethnology: Ethnographic Research at *Zemaljski muzej* from 1945-1989

Despite the traditionalism that marked much of ethnological research in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the work conducted by the experts at Zemaljski muzej

during the socialist period in many ways managed to break out of the classic mould of museum ethnology focused on curatorial work and exhibitions. For more than 45 years, the Ethnology Department of Zemaljski muzej was also a major research institution and a home to one of the most important research publications in socialist Yugoslavia. The introduction of scientific research into the routine activities of the Ethnology Department had been enabled by the unique character of this museum. *Landsmuseum* represented a complex, multi-field institution, which at one time or another pursued research in history, geography, archaeology, and various natural sciences such as biology and geology. Within this nineteenth century holistic model, the Ethnology Department—alongside two other semi-autonomous research divisions dedicated to archaeology and natural sciences—managed to transform itself into one of the premier scientific centres in socialist Bosnia-Herzegovina. Consequently, the museum's ethnographers became the most important advocates and authorities on ethnology within the borders of the republic, helping establish new regional museums and reorganise many ethnological archives that existed as part of other cultural and religious institutions (Bajić 2013).

As I have discussed in the previous sections, the rise and transformation of the Ethnology Department after the Second World War began with the arrival of a new generation of university-educated ethnologists. In 1947, during Špiro Kulišić's first year of work as the director of the museum, the newly-hired Zorislava Marković (later Marković-Čulić) and Nada Korica (later Korica-Pasariček), a student of Milovan Gavazzi, commenced the enormous task of rearranging the museum's permanent ethnological exhibit and systematising the existing archive of material and spiritual culture (Gorunović 2007: 19-20). Ethnologists discovered that despite the large and relatively rich archive, the museum had very little material on Bosnian village life. In order to address this problem, ethnologists very quickly started travelling to the provinces to acquire additional materials. Though such fieldtrips were initially imagined as occasions for the purchase of new artefacts, young ethnologists also used these opportunities to conduct ethnographic research on practices and phenomena about which they could later produce publishable scholarly reports (Buturović and Kajmaković 1989: 156). This expansion into academic research seems to have begun almost by accident – according to the report occasioned by the 100th anniversary of Zemaljski muzej, in which the Buturović-Kajmaković text was published, the section's first five year plan (1947-51) made no explicit mention of a program of scientific research (*naučno-istraživački rad*). Over the next few decades, however, scientific research became a key aspect of the museum's regular activities. Researchers usually combined historical and archival data

with ethnographic findings gathered through interviews and onsite observation (Gorunović 2007: 25).

As the number of professional ethnologists at the museum grew, so did the scope of their research activities. Simultaneously, each ethnologist developed his or her own area of specialisation. Zorislava Marković-Čulić became an expert in material culture and folk dress (see Bugarski 1996-99: 317). Radmila Kajmaković, who came to the museum after the dissolution of the Institute for Folklore in 1958, worked on folk customs and everyday life (Softić 1996-99: 322). Radmila Filipović-Fabijanić, the oldest daughter of Milenko Filipović and a productive ethnologist in her own right, investigated and wrote about a range of themes, including oral traditions, folk nutrition, folk medicine, and beliefs (Hadžidedić 1996-99: 325). Astrida Bugarski specialised in traditional architecture (*ethnologija stanovanja*), while folklorist and occasional archaeologist Vlajko Palavestra primarily focused on oral traditions and folk narratives. Aforementioned Cvetko Popović, who became the director of the Ethnology Department after the departure of Špiro Kulišić in 1950, specialised in arts and crafts. Ljiljana Beljkašić-Hadžidedić, about whom I write at length in the following section, specialised in textiles and folk dress. During the socialist period, many other researchers including the famed ethno-musicologist Cvjetko Rihtman, aforementioned specialist on Roma, Rade Uhlik, and philologist Abdulah Škaljić held temporary appointments in the museum's Ethnology Department.[18]

University-trained ethnologists such as Marković-Čulić, Kajmaković, Filipović-Fabijanić, Bugarski and Beljkašić-Hadžidedić all earned their degrees in Belgrade. Yet a substantive portion of these researchers, such as Palavestra and Popović among the old generation, never obtained degrees in ethnology, but instead came to the museum with backgrounds in pedagogy, psychology, history, philosophy, or languages. This heterogeneity remained a fact of life even among the younger generations of employees. For example, Đenana Buturović and Aiša Softić (who came to the museum with degrees in literature in about 1965 and 1984 respectively) became specialists in lyric poetry and oral traditions.

Because the museum was a receiving site for many different kinds of researchers, the Ethnology Department needed to rethink the organisation of its research activities. In the late 1950s, the museum was among the first in Yugoslavia to begin experimenting with ethnographic surveys conducted by teams, as opposed to individual researchers (Gorunović 2007: 25). Filipović-Fabijanić claimed that such a collective effort became a necessity because of a pervasive lack of ethnological data on large areas of Bosnia-Herzegovina

[18] This is not an exhaustive list, but one that highlights ethnologists who stayed at the museum the longest and contributed the most to ethnographic research produced there.

and a great need to gather information as quickly and as efficiently as possible. Under such conditions, the individual was 'powerless' particularly since the new generation of expert ethnologists came from different universities and had no united approach to the science (Filipović-Fabijanić 1970: 157). Team fieldwork became a way to define a shared method of work—but also a new trademark of the model of ethnographic research that Svetlana Bajić today terms the Sarajevo School (*Sarajevska škola*).

The impetus for collective surveying originated, perhaps surprisingly, with Špiro Kulišić, whose two-part act as the director of the Ethnology Department (from 1947-50, and then again from 1958-60) left an indelible impact on the organisation of work at the museum. In an interview conducted by Gorunović (2007), another one of his close associates, Zorislava Marković-Čulić, recounted how the fieldwork-averse Kulišić had both a vested interest in and a habit of sending younger ethnologists to gather data in the field. After ethnologists made a collective decision on a particular geographic locality, Kulišić would assign a task to each of the assistants who would then focus on specific aspects of village life and custom. Field ethnologists spent months doing archival work and historical research in preparation for their fieldwork. They devised complex questionnaires to aid them in conducting interviews. When they finally departed on their reconnaissance missions, they could have faced a number of obstacles. Rural Bosnia, as evidenced by the ethnographic diaries of Ljiljana Beljkašić-Hadžidedić, could be an unpredictable place. They would return with notes, illustrations, at times even photographs. They would then be expected to produce publishable reports for collective publications or individual papers.

This method of work proved to be quite effective in generating new ethnological knowledge. Expanding the archive also worked for the benefit of armchair ethnologists like Kulišić, who routinely used the information gathered by younger fieldworkers in his own work. Interestingly, Marković-Čulić also claims that Kulišić had an unfortunate habit of editorialising raw data—he would only take that which suited his evolutionist perspective and discard everything that went against it. He also prevented other ethnologists from writing about those unfit details (Gorunović 2007: 26).

Context notwithstanding, such forms of ethnographic teamwork from the early 1960s until the 1980s engendered a steady output of publications that appeared in the *Herald* but also other academic journals throughout Yugoslavia. During this period, the Ethnology Department also published nine self-standing, research-based monographs (Bajić 2013: 11). Among the first areas researched in Bosnia through the use of this method were the outskirts of Travnik, Vareš, and in south-eastern and central Bosnia (Burutović and Kajmaković 1989: 157). These areas were chosen for the complex-

ity of their histories and population—often times, ethnological research targeted the most ethnically diverse areas of the republic. In parallel to these efforts, individual ethnologists continued to pursue their own specific areas of interest.[19]

A cursory look at the editions of the *Herald* from the period of mid-1950s all the way up to the 1970s reveals that most of the publications produced out of this research focused on rural life and custom, and frequently took a very technical, dry form. Studies could potentially include multiple ethnic groups or just focus on one major group. The primary aim was to document and catalogue ethnological phenomena encountered in the archives and in the field, but ethnologists made little to no effort to place these findings into the context of larger theoretical debates. Nominally, the goal of collective ethnological surveys, at least as it was defined under the influence of Špiro Kulišić, was to uncover the ethnic origin and history of the populations found in various areas of the republic. In practice, tackling questions of ethnogenesis presented only a small part of the content of the publications written on the basis of these research missions. Most frequently, authors would provide a historical overview and a discussion of the origins of certain practices, but the greater part of the scientific article focused on describing the given ethnological phenomenon.

These descriptive studies could be categorised roughly into two general rubrics: material and spiritual culture. This division corresponded to the two sections within the Ethnology Department at the museum. The Department of Spiritual Culture was briefly made an autonomous institution with the founding of the Institute of Folklore in 1946. When the Institute was disbanded in 1958, its employees and archive were again reincorporated into the Ethnology Department of the museum. Experts such as Palavestra and Filipović-Fabijanić came to the museum as a part of this restructuring, and continued to work within larger team projects on oral folk traditions. While ethnologists specialised in material culture focused on folk dress, textiles, crafts, and rural architecture, the newly reorganised Department of Spiritual Culture investigated a more fluid array of ethnological phenomena, including customs, oral traditions, and folk beliefs.

The institutional context within which ethnologists were doing their work dictated their continued focus on traditional rural life. But by the early 1970s, the mood in Bosnia slowly began to change. Upon the insistence of Milenko Filipović, who unfortunately did not live to see his plan realised (see Trajković 1970), the industrial town of Zenica in central Bosnia was chosen as the location of the 1969 National Conference of Yugoslav Eth-

[19] For a more detailed account of the research and publication activities at the museum, see Buturović and Kajmaković (1989) and Ljubičić (1980).

nologists. As is made evident by the edited volume that emerged out of this conference, many Yugoslav ethnologists from different parts of the country had heard and responded to Filipović's call to modernise the discipline. Renowned Croatian ethnologist of the new generation, Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin (1970) and Radomir Rakić (1970) from Zemaljski muzej openly discussed the relationship between ethnology and sociology, as well as British social anthropology. Rakić's colleague from Sarajevo, Nedžad Hadžidedić, prepared a historical-ethnographic study of the central market in Zenica which described at length the effects that rapid socialist modernisation and monetary economy had produced on a traditional institution. This fascinating work would have fit squarely within Filipović's proto-functionalist model, and even includes a reference to the work of American anthropologist Sidney Mintz (Hadžidedić 1970: 29). Dušan Drljača from Zemaljski muzej submitted another atypical essay on the history of the Jewish community in Bosnia that accented practices of urban Jews in Sarajevo. Amidst such brave professional choices, audiences were offered a window into a new social ethnology. To echo Filipović's point, it seemed that 'living reality was creating new problem spaces for ethnology' (Gorunović 2006: 189).

The movements in Yugoslav ethnology as a whole could not but affect the ethnologists based in Sarajevo. But changes were slow in coming. It was only in the 1980s that the ethnologists at the museum began to systematically investigate certain aspects of modernisation, including labour migrations and changing traditions in the village. Some ethnologists and folklorists were interested in these changes more than others. For example, Radmila Kajmaković had heeded Filipović's call much earlier and eagerly published on the transformations of rural life. In 1978, she wrote on the changing nature of village meetings and events in an article entitled 'The Traditional and the Contemporary in Village Gatherings in Semberija'. In 1987, she presented at the meeting of Yugoslav folklorists in Tuzla a report on the village of Bogutovo entitled 'An Ethnography of a Village that Is Withering Away'. This essay directly dealt with the effects of labour emigration on village life, and was a part of a new long-term plan which the Ethnology Department adopted in 1985. At that time, ethnologists officially decided to begin investigating certain elements of urban life, and to make urban and rural culture equally valued targets of ethnographic interest (Bajić 2013: 12). As a result, more examples of urban ethnology began to appear in the 1980s editions of the *Herald* (e.g. Buturović 1980; Softić 1984). However, before the Ethnology Department could seriously pursue the new stage of its transformation, the political situation in the country disintegrated, ethnological

research slowed, and the plan for a new social ethnology in Bosnia was left unrealised.

Ethnologists in the Field: Ethnographic Diaries of Ljliljana Beljkašić-Hadžidedić

At the beginning of this chapter, I suggested that ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina never achieved the status of a nation-building science. I argued instead that the unique conditions of ethnological work in this multinational republic could disturb the assumed connection between ethnography and ethnos. This section pursues such a line of reasoning by looking at the contemporary representations of the trials and tribulations of ethnographic research during the socialist period. As discussed in the previous section, in the years following the Second World War, the museum's Ethnology Department organised a number of 'reconnaissance missions' (*rekognisciranje*), aimed at mapping out previously unknown areas and producing encyclopaedic ethnographies, which were often the product of the collective effort of a team of museum experts. Such preliminary forms of research, to reiterate, took place in the context of acquisition trips, whose chief purpose was the purchase of new artefacts for the museum's collection. In the early 1950s, professionally trained painters and illustrators, whose job was to produce a visual record of the artefacts and cultural activities on site, often accompanied ethnographers on these missions. As photo cameras became more available, photographs replaced such hand-drawn illustrations. By the 1980s, the Ethnology Department had videographers on staff who produced video recordings of ceremonies and customs. The ultimate aim of these activities was to produce a catalogue of knowledge about the people living inside the socialist republic about whom little had previously been known in ethnological terms (Buturović and Kajmaković 1988: 156). These ethnological surveys most often produced collective reports and a series of individual publications, completed by several junior ethnologists supervised by a principal researcher (ibid.: 157-58).

Encounters with People (*Susreti s ljudima*), a short book of ethnographic reflections published in 2007 by Ljiljana Beljkašić-Hadžidedić, a retired curator of the National Museum in Sarajevo, offers a delightful snapshot into the mechanics of this research and its unintended consequences. Through her chronicle of fieldwork adventures, recorded between the early 1950s and mid-1980s in eastern, western, and central Bosnia, Beljkašić-Hadžidedić provides contemporary readers not only with an invaluable perspective on everyday life of Bosnian villages during socialism, but also offers a window into the rapidly changing conditions for ethnologi-

cal fieldwork. During the early reconnaissance missions, employees of the Ethnology Department faced the challenge of travelling to remote areas, which were completely isolated from any organised means of transportation. This meant that teams relied on a range of travel methods, including 'auto-stop' (hitchhiking), horse-driven carriages, horseback, and most often their feet. Beljkašić-Hadžidedić recalled that ethnographers were often confused for mountain hikers, as they wore climbing shoes and carried a range of equipment and supplies, such as sleeping bags, medical kits, and food. Members of local village communities, who generally had a favourable response to ethnologists (except one time, when the researchers were mistaken for forest inspectors!), also provided teams with lodging. Many of the homes where ethnologists set up camp were traditional households with open heaths, outhouses, and no running water or electricity. Over the course of the 1960s and 1970s, socialist modernisation brought the comforts of modern life to many of these remote villages, with occasionally unexpected results. Beljkašić-Hadžidedić recalled visiting households not yet reached by electrification, where family members had already purchased—in anticipation of changes to come—stoves and refrigerators that they were temporarily using for shoe storage.

The ethnographic reflections contained in Beljkašić-Hadžidedić's book are also a meta-commentary on the sociological aspects of fieldwork which often brought together groups of young, educated, and urban researchers of various ethnic backgrounds face-to-face with the 'exotic' populations of remote rural areas. The author recounted how on numerous occasions she was forced to acknowledge and negotiate her youth, gender, urban origin, and professional and educational background in contexts where such markers positioned her in an unwelcoming way. At one point, while visiting a particularly remote and impoverished village, she accidentally, and much to her own surprise and shock, took on the role of a medical professional, tending to the wounds of an accident victim and minor medical problems of local women and children. Though such moments underline the intimate rapport that ethnologists were often able to forge with the villagers they were visiting, they also reveal the multi-faceted forms of difference and distance between them.

The insights provided by this ethnographic diary therefore render problematic the presumed linear relationship between the ethnologist and ethnological subjects in eastern European folkloristics. Because most east European ethnologists have studied their 'own' native groups, local ethnologies often suffer from what has sometimes been referred to as the 'double-insider syndrome'. According to Slobodan Naumović, who coined this term in relation to eastern European and specifically Serbian ethnological tradi-

tions, ethnologists who conducted research 'at home' inevitably developed distinct affective, moral, and political attachments to the people who were the object of their research. In practice, this led the ethnologist to assume the role of advocate and spokesperson, especially in the situations where his or her native society was being threatened or victimised, or perceived to be so (Naumović 1999: 46). While Naumović produced a convincing argument in relation to the situation in Serbia, the account provided by Beljkašić-Hadžidedić suggests that social markers other than that of ethnicity, including class, gender, and socio-economic background, also modulated such attachments. *Encounters with People* showcases a range of different rapports developing between ethnologists and their ethnographic interlocutors, including sympathy and solidarity, but also ambivalence and estrangement. Beljkašić-Hadžidedić confesses to feeling sorry for residents of an isolated and impoverished village, and admits to being alarmed by an encounter with a Roma man during a solitary walk to a village near Vlasenica in eastern Bosnia. More often than not, her anecdotes chronicle her urban displacement and discomfort, or her resourcefulness and perseverance in a strange environment, rather than her sense of Romantic attachment and rootedness in idyllic traditional life.

The realities of socialist-era fieldwork in Bosnia also provide other important challenges to the assumptions that ethnography necessarily promotes the development of national consciousness. The methodological suppositions of reconnaissance missions (a term adapted from archaeology) once again highlight the centrality of space, rather than national group, as an organising unit of investigation. When ethnologists took such exploratory research trips, in search of information and new artefacts, they most commonly encountered a range of villages whose residents belonged to different confessional, ethnic, and national communities. As a result, museum ethnologists in Bosnia-Herzegovina almost without exception researched and wrote about a number of different ethnic communities and not solely their 'own'.[20] This was rarely the case in other parts of Yugoslavia, which were more ethnically homogenous, and where researchers tended to study their own (see Halpern and Hammel 1969: 22) or, as in the infamous case of Tihomir Đorđević's writing on Macedonia, studied 'others' only to prove they in fact belonged to the ethnologist's own national group.

[20] In my experience, ethnologists rarely used the term Yugoslav to connote some kind of a unifying nationality or identity, but always spoke instead of Serb, Croat, Muslim, or other populations in specific parts of the republic. Although most ethnologists do profess a certain affinity with 'the people', in other ways they also make apparent that they do not share in their traditions, values, or beliefs, but stand as scientists very much outside of their subjects' way of life and thinking. The label 'native researchers' is therefore misleading.

Because ethnology in Bosnia never had the status of a nation-building science, such political commitments rarely became manifest among ethnologists. For example, over the course of her 35-year career, Ljiljana Beljkašić-Hadžidedić published a number of descriptive and mostly technical monographs of traditional dress of villagers in Bosnia and in Herzegovina, sometimes focused on Croats, and at other times on Serbs or Muslims. Moreover, in her capacity as an officer of the Ethnological Society of Yugoslavia, Beljkašić-Hadžidedić had tried, just like Milenko Filipović before her, to advance the cause of ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina. She advocated not only for a separate department of ethnology, but for a greater number of scholarships for students from Bosnia-Herzegovina who were interested in conducting ethnological studies within the republic's borders. Neither of these initiatives led anywhere—in the context of state-controlled cadre politics, such demands were seen as inappropriate luxuries (Beljkašić-Hadžidedić 2007: 9). Nevertheless, efforts of Bosnia-based ethnologists, such as Filipović and Beljkašić-Hadžidedić, to advance the cause of this science in the republic, suggest that they understood ethnological inquiry as a primarily regional, rather than (ethno)national endeavour.

Concluding Remarks: Ethnology, National Question(s) and the Fate of Culture in the Post-Independence Period

Although my task in this essay consisted of mapping out the terrain of knowledge production previously inaccessible to those not versed in the Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian languages, on these pages I have taken up a number of historical and epistemological questions. First, in this chapter I explored whether it would ever be possible to speak of a specifically Bosnian (or Bosnian-Herzegovinian) ethnology, comparable to its 'cousins' in Croatia and Serbia, where the *Volkskunde* paradigm took its distinct but ultimately analogous forms. While such a question may seem polemical in the context of post-Dayton wrangling around the questions of the legitimacy of independent Bosnia, my interest rests not with the contemporary debates over the current state's viability or of a syncretic Bosnian identity, but rather with the ways in which its ethnically-mixed surroundings (which were quite pronounced during the socialist era) affected both the nature of the ethnological object and the conditions of ethnological work. In comparison to Croatia and Serbia, ethnology in Bosnia made very modest advances, leaving behind museum catalogues and a few technical archives, but little in the way of theoretical innovations. The domination of a dry folkloristic and museum-focused approach further side-lined ethnologists from Bosnia in the community of Yugoslav ethnologists. And without actual institutional sup-

port, such marginalisation could only become a self-fulfilling prophesy, leading to further mummification of the science as a whole.

This systematic neglect of ethnology in Bosnia has sometimes been explained by recourse to the contentious nature of the national question in this ethnically diverse Yugoslav republic (e.g. Bringa 1995). The attitudes of the socialist state towards both tradition and national identity played an important role in shaping the course of Yugoslav ethnology overall. However, in Bosnia lack of proper institutionalisation of the discipline reflected a more general tendency to side-line Sarajevo, and Bosnia at large, as a site for state investment and scientific research. Based on the research I have conducted, it was not fear of nationalism but disinterest that kept the Yugoslav state from establishing a university ethnology department in Sarajevo.

In addition, ethnology suffered in Bosnia as well as the rest of the Yugoslav Federation from an overall lack of popularity during the socialist era (see Naumović 2008). Ethnology experienced a fleeting moment of political recognition in the region at the end of nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, which in turn enabled the founding of university departments in other Yugoslav republics. At that time, Bosnia had been an annexed and politically contested territory, where ethnology could not find adequate institutional or political support. The lack of attention to the discipline continued during socialism, which placed its efforts on concrete, material, and technical sciences that were seen as better able to address the problems of economic and social "backwardness."

Unfortunately, the end of the socialist era, and the period that has followed the bloody and tragic 1992-95 war, has not been any kinder to ethnology in Bosnia. Prolonged disinvestment in cultural institutions and scientific research in the post-war period reached its apex in 2011, when several museums in Sarajevo had to be closed because of the withdrawal of the 'new' state from their financing. Among them was also Zemaljski muzej, and its forgotten Ethnology Department, whose few employees are now either retiring or looking for new jobs. Because no university in Bosnia today offers a bachelor's degree in ethnology (or anthropology or folklore), formally trained ethnologists are few and far between. Most self-described ethnologists have been trained as historians, political scientists, sociologists, sometimes archaeologists, or scholars of literary, Islamic, or cultural studies. Several university faculties in Sarajevo do offer new modules and seminars in ethnology, including the Faculty of Political Science and Sociology (FPN), Faculty of Natural and Mathematical Sciences (PMF), and Faculty of Philosophy, but there is little consensus on what constitutes the scope, methodology, or canon of contemporary ethnology. This institutional and scientific disarray is also proving to be a fertile ground for misappropriations of

ethnological traditions, principles and methods to be marshalled in the service of various ethno-nationalisms. In the absence of a community of experts who adhere to agreed-upon professional and epistemological standards, ethnology is in danger of becoming co-opted by ethno-national elites, neo-traditionalists, and various pseudoscientists. This is a direct result of the protracted marginalisation of ethnology as a field of scientific inquiry.

Finally, since the 1990s, Bosnia has become a receiving site for many Western anthropologists who have been drawn to the political and social complexity of its post-war situation. Most of them have had little or no contact with local ethnological practitioners; in the best scenario, they have sought out 'native' political scientists and sociologists based at local universities. As a Bosnian-born, US-educated anthropologist who is a complete outsider to the tradition of ethnology as it was practiced during the socialist era in Bosnia-Herzegovina, I have faced similar predicaments to my Western colleagues with fewer personal connections to the country. To my own embarrassment, during my long-term dissertation fieldwork in 2008-09, I did not attempt to develop any contacts with the Ethnology Department of Zemaljski muzej. Like many others in my own generation of researchers, I initially registered only a limited affinity with those who studied traditional life. At that time, and owning to my orientation as a political anthropologist, I chose as my institution of affiliation the Faculty of Political Science and Sociology at the University of Sarajevo. It was there that I seized the opportunity, born out of series of accidents, to teach an introductory course in socio-cultural anthropology to a small group of master's students from the departments of sociology, international relations, and political science. Ironically, though the goal of this module was quite explicitly the promotion of anthropology and ethnographic methodology, the task of teaching the course required me to fill the gaps in my own knowledge, and learn more about ethnology as it has been studied and practiced in the region.[21]

[21] The need to do this was further exacerbated when we decided to publish the results of the project. Short presentations of students' projects, as well as my own 'Manifesto for the Development of Anthropology in Post-War Bosnia' came out in 2010 in the *Godišnjak Fakulteta političkih nauka Univerziteta u Sarajevu,* the yearbook of the Faculty. The 'manifesto' provided a context for the students' contributions, while offering a short account of ethnology as a discipline from a regional (rather than national perspective) and an argument for establishing a greater presence for a modernised ethnology and anthropology in Bosnia overall. In addition to providing several concrete recommendations, I argued that future Bosnian researchers should learn from reflections provided by ethnologists in the region, and seek to develop a hybrid new science based on ethnographic fieldwork and the qualitative study of the social, economic, and political phenomena that had been ushered in by the war in Bosnia and post-war reconstruction and reform.

Despite having had access to some of the most comprehensive research libraries[22], with impressive archives of books and scholarly journals from socialist Yugoslavia, gathering information on ethnological work produced specifically in Bosnia, has been and remains a difficult task. Since 2009, I have made a systematic effort to locate, examine, and reflect on the work produced by ethnologists from the region both before and after the breakup of Yugoslavia. I still find that the technically focused and encyclopaedically oriented ethnological and folklore archives bear a limited relationship to my own work. However, my thinking and research have been distinctly shaped by recent ethno-anthropological studies (published mostly in Zagreb and Belgrade) that have been inspired by Rihtman-Auguštin's lead. The works that I find resonate with my own address the topics of everyday life, urban experience, and postsocialist transformation.[23] Nevertheless, in growing familiar with these Yugoslav and post-Yugoslav ethnological literatures, I have also begun to recognise ethnology, folklore, and anthropology as sister disciplines which each have their own, albeit related, history, tradition, and contexts of emergence; this new attitude has in turn shaped my approach to this exploratory text.

The pervasive marginalisation of ethnology, both from and about Bosnia-Herzegovina, has placed contemporary researchers at home and abroad in a position of disadvantage. It has also made ethnology quite vulnerable in the context of pervasive and highly politicised ethno-nationalisms in the post-Yugoslav period. It remains to be seen whether these weaknesses can be turned into strengths – for example, whether the absence of a strong, identifiable, and institutionalised traditional ethnology can actually open up space for a new kind of theoretically and methodologically innovative ethnology or anthropology that is able to grapple with the challenges of post-war reconstruction and postsocialist transformation. Perhaps in that sense, a margin can become a space of possibility and new beginnings.

---

[22] I am referring here to the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and University of California, Berkeley libraries which have large collections on socialist Yugoslavia. The National Library in Sarajevo also proved an invaluable resource, particularly when it came to some of the rarer monographs. Unfortunately, the library of the Ethnology Department is currently closed to the public.

[23] By contrast, in Bosnia proper, I have sought allies among sociologists, political scientists and political philosophers, rather than ethnologists. What's more, the nature of this alliance is not based on thematic or methodological orientations, but rather on shared theoretical and conceptual questions.

References

Allcock, J. B., and A. Young (eds.). 2001. *Black Lambs and Grey Falcons: Women Travelers in the Balkans*. Bradford: Berghahn Books.

Bajić, S. 2013. *Etnološko odjeljenje Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu (1888-2012)*. Unpublished paper.

Bakić-Hayden, M. 1995. Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia. *Slavic Review* 54 (4): 917-931.

Beljkašić-Hadžidedić, L. 1984. Razvojne tendencije etnologije u Bosni i Hercegovini. *Pregled* 74: 7-8, 867-875.

———. 2007. *Susreti Sa Ljudima: Iz Etnografskog Terenskog Dnevnika*. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej BiH.

Bonifačić, V. 1996. Ethnological research in Croatia: 1919 to 1940. *Narodna umjetnost* 33 (2): 239-263

Bošković, A. 2005. Distinguishing 'self' and 'other': Anthropology and national identity in former Yugoslavia. *Anthropology Today* 21 (2): 8-13.

———. 2008. Anthropology in Unlikely Places: Yugoslav Ethnology Between the Past and the Future. In A. Bošković (ed.) *Other people's anthropologies: ethnographic practice on the margins*, pp. 156-168. Oxford, UK: Berghahn Books.

Bringa, T. 1995. *Being Muslim the Bosnian Way*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Buconjić, N. 1908. *Život i običaji Hrvata katoličke vjere u Bosni i Hercegovini.* Sarajevo: Tisak i naklada Daniela A. Kajona.

Buturović, Đ. 1980. Prilog genealogiji sarajevskih Morića. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja (Etnologija)*, Nova Serija 35/36: 115-132.

Buturović, Đ., and R. Kajmaković. 1988. Naučna djelatnost u oblasti etnologije 1945-1988 godine. In *Spomenica stogodišnjice rada Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine: 1888-1988*, pp. 156-78. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej BiH.

Bugarski, A., and S. Bajić. 1996-1999. In Memoriam: Zorislava Čulić-Marković, viši kustos. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja BiH (Etnologija)*, Nova Serija 48/49: 317-321.

Čapo-Žmegač, J. 1993. Etnologija i/ili (socio)kulturna antropologija. *Studia ethnologica Croatica* 5: 11-25.

———. 1997. Hrvatska etnologija - stanje, s osvrtom na svjetsku znanost ili: O kukcima, vinu i bapskim čarolijama. In D. Tadić (ed.) *Zbornik radova Simpozija o fundamentalnim istraživanjima održanog 14. i 15. prosinca 1995*, pp. 191-198. Zagreb: HAZU.

———. 2004. Editor's Preface: From 'the Science of People' to Contemporary Ethno-Anthropology. In D. Rihtman-Auguštin and J. Čapo-Žmegač

(eds.), *Ethnology, myth and politics: anthropologizing Croatian ethnology*, pp. vii-xvii. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Cvijić, J. 1928. *Naselja i poreklo stanovništva*. Knjiga 25. Beograd: Štamparija Sv. Sava M. Sladekovića.

Donia, R. 1981. *Islam under the Double Eagle: The Muslims of Bosnia and Hercegovina, 1878-1914*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Drljača, D. 1970. Neka zapažanja o životu i običajima Sarajevskih jevreja. In F. Ibrahimpašić (ed.), *Radovi 11 savjetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, pp. 285-298. Zenica: Izdanja Muzeja grada Zenice.

Filipović, M. 2002 [1928]. *Visočka nahija*. (Drugo izdanje). Visoko: Mak.

———. 1955. Etnološki (etnografski) rad u Bosni i Hercegovini. *Pregled* 10: 210-216.

———. 1956. Savremena etnologija ili etnografija: Osvrt na članak Špire Kulišića 'Antiistorizam funkcionalne škole u etnologiji'. *Pregled* 3-4: 143-152.

Filipović-Fabijanić, R. 1970. Kratak pregled i karakteristike etnološkog rada u BiH u vremenu 1945-1969. In F. Ibrahimpašić (ed.), *Radovi XI savjetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, pp. 155-160. Zenica: Izdanja Muzeja grada Zenice.

Gluščević, M. 1963. Etnografija, etnologija i antropologija. *Sociologija* 3-4: 21-50.

———. 1966. Kritika između neobjektivnosti i proizvoljnosti. *Pregled* 14: 331-345.

Gorunović, G. 2006. Pseudomarksizam i protofunkcionalizma u srpskoj etnologiji: Kulišić vs. Filipović. *Etnoantropološki problemi* 1 (2): 185-208.

———. 2007. *Srpska etnologija i Marksizam: Naučno delo Špire Kulišića*. Knjiga 22. Beograd: Etnološka biblioteka.

Grđić-Bjelokosić, L. 1898. *Iz naroda o narodu*. Novi Sad: Štamparija Đorđa Ivkovića.

Hadžidedić, N. 1970. Sedmični pazar u Zenici i okolini. In F. Ibrahimpašić (ed.), *Radovi 11 savjetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, pp. 29-45. Zenica: Izdanja Muzeja grada Zenice.

———. 1996-1999. In Memoriam: Radmila Filipović, muzejski savjetnik. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja BiH (Etnologija)*, Nova Serija 48/49: 324-325.

Hadžiselimović, O. 2001. *At the Gates of the East: British Travel Writers on Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*. East European Monographs. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hangi, A. 1907. *Život i Običaji Muslimana u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: Naklada Daniela A. Kajona.

Hann, C. et al. 2007. Anthropology's multiple temporalities and its future in Central and Eastern Europe: A Debate. *Working Paper* 90. Halle/ Saale: Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology. Available at: http://www.eth.mpg.de/cms/de/publications/working_papers/wp0090.html (Accessed November 27, 2013).

Halpern, J. M., and E. A. Hammel. 1969. Observations on the Intellectual History of Ethnology and Other Social Sciences in Yugoslavia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11 (1): 17-26.

———. 1970. Milenko S. Filipović 1902–1969. *American Anthropologist* 72 (3): 558-560.

Halpern, J. M, and D. A Kideckel. 1983. Anthropology of Eastern Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 12 (1): 377-402.

Hammel, E. A. (ed.). 1982. *Among the People--Native Yugoslav Ethnography: Selected Writing of Milenko S. Filipovic*. (1st ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Kajmaković, R. 1978. Tradicionalno i savremeno u seoskim skupovima u Semberiji. *Novopazarski Zbornik* 2: 183-188.

———. 1987. Bogutovo selo-etnografski prikaz sela koje se raseljava. In *Zbornik radova XXXIV kongresa Saveza udruzenja folklorista Jugoslavije*, pp. 229-234. Tuzla.

Kraljačić, T. 1987. *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini (1882-1903)*. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.

Kulišić, Š. 1955. Antiistorizam funkcionalne škole u etnologiji. *Pregled* 11-12: 296-302.

Kürti, L. 1996. Homecoming: Affairs of Anthropologists in and of Eastern Europe. *Anthropology Today* 12 (3): 11-15.

Kurtović, L. 2010. Etnografski eksperimenti: Manifest za podršku razvoja društvenokulturne antropologije u Bosni i Hercegovini i kratak pregled studentskih radova. *Godišnjak Fakulteta Političkih Nauka Unverziteta u Sarajevu* (5-6): 359-390.

Ljubičić, S. 1980. Pregled sadržaja Glasnika Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu, Nova serija, Etnologija od 1953. do 1978. *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu (Etnologija)*, Nova serija 34: 163-178.

Lockwood, W. G. 1975. *European Moslems: economy and ethnicity in western Bosnia*. New York: Academic Press.

Lopac, M. 1951. Bibliografski podaci etnografsko-folklornih radova o Bosni i Hercegovini. *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu (Etnologija)*, Nova serija 6: 339-409.

Matičetov, M. 1966. The Concept of Folklore in Yugoslavia. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 3 (3): 219-225.

Mihăilescu, V, I. Iliev, and S. Naumović (eds.). 2008. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe.* Berlin: LIT.

Naumović, S. 1999. Identity Creator in Identity Crisis: Reflections on the Politics of Serbian Ethnology. *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 8 (2): 39-128.

———. 2008. Brief Encounters, Dangerous Liaisons and Never-ending Stories: The Politics of Serbian Ethnology and Anthropology in the Interesting Times of Yugoslav Socialism. In V. Mihăilescu, I. Iliev, and S. Naumović (eds.), *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II: Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*, pp. 211-260. Berlin: LIT.

Okey, R. 2007. *Taming Balkan Nationalism: The Habsburg 'Civilizing Mission' in Bosnia, 1878-1914*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Palavestra, V. 2003. *Legende iz Starog Sarajeva*. Drugo Izdanje. Zemun: Most Art.

Prosenica, S. 1981. In Memoriam: Cvetko Popović. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja BiH* (Etnologija), Nova Serija 35/36: 199-202.

Rakić, R. 1970. Zajednička I granična problematika etnologije i sociologije: proučavanje društvenog života. In F. Ibrahimpašić (ed.), *Radovi XI savjetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, pp. 175-200. Zenica: Muzej grada Zenice.

Rihtman-Auguštin, D. 1970. Neka pitanja odnosa sociologije i etnologije. In F. Ibrahimpašić (ed.), *Radovi 11. savjetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, pp. 199-208. Zenica: Muzej grada Zenice.

Softić, A. 1984. Tehvidi u Sarajevu. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja (Etnologija)*, Nova Serija 39: 199-207.

———. 1996-1999. In Memoriam: Radmila Kajmaković, muzejski savjetnik. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja BiH (Etnologija)*, Nova serija 48/49: 322-323.

Supek-Zupan, O. 1976. Od teorije do prakse i nazad: mogućnosti marksističkog shvaćanja u etnologiji. *Narodna umjetnost* 13: 57-76.

Supek, O. 1987. Etnologija u svijetu i mi. *Etnološke sveske* 8: 65-70.

Škerlj, B. 1955. Yugoslavia: An anthropological review for 1952-1954. *Yearbook of Anthropology* (1955): 651-670.

Todorova, M. 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Trajković, Č. XI Savetovanje etnologa Jugoslavije. In F. Ibrahimpašić (ed.), *Radovi 11 savjetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, pp. 345-359. Zenica: Izdanja Muzeja grada Zenice.

Wolff, L. 1996. *Inventing Eastern Europe: the map of civilization on the mind of the enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Chapter 16

An Anthropological Apprenticeship among Slovenes – From 'Behind God's Back' to the Schengen Frontier

Robert Gary Minnich

This text recounts the rise of anthropology in a particular 'margin of Europe' by describing my own involuted path to membership in that same guild. This began with training in international relations and political theory in 1960s California and continued with postgraduate studies in the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Bergen. At Bergen, I began to study the culture of marginal communities, a particular concern of the department that only recently had been created by Fredrik Barth. This theme inspired my fieldwork in the sub-Pannonian hills of Haloze, Slovenia, in what was then the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.[1] In this paper I first look back to this anthropological apprenticeship at the crossroads of Slovenia, Norway, and California, focusing on the interplay of field with fieldworker in the creation of theory. This sets the stage for considering my subsequent status as a journeyman within the guilds of social anthropology and Slovene ethnology and my relations with Slovene colleagues until the mid-1990s. I conclude with an account of a brief return visit to the site of my apprenticeship in 2006.

Why Slovenia and the Slovenes?

When challenged in 1973 by advisers in Bergen to select a location for postgraduate fieldwork my choice was clear.[2] I was not destined for any of the field sites then of interest at Bergen's Department of Social Anthropology – Oman, New Guinea, Sudan, Tanzania, India, Pakistan, Turkey, Peru, or various Norwegian settings. Rather, I was to be the first anthropology graduate from Bergen to study the Balkans. Yugoslavia, and especially Slovenia, the homeland of my bride, was my field of preference. Ultimately

[1] In my earlier publications, I gave pseudonyms for places and people within the region of Haloze; these are replaced in this account by the actual names.

[2] My advisers were Fredrik Barth, Jan-Petter Blom, and Reidar Grønhaug.

my entire career as a field anthropologist would focus upon speakers of Slovene.

Socialisation into the lives of my Ljubljana affines had begun with visits to Bela Krajina during the late 1960s. I was attracted to the cultural diversity of this historical military frontier between the Habsburgs and Ottomans – what better place to compare the cultures of marginal communities? Seeking to initiate fieldwork I contacted local ethnographers soon after arriving in Ljubljana in January 1974. Within days Boris Kuhar, then head of the Slovene Ethnographic Museum, politely received me and listened to my plan for studying the culture of marginal communities. He shared his own recent work on the folk culture of 'dying villages' in the Škocjanski Hills (Kuhar 1972). But months passed and I heard nothing from Kuhar or the museum. My proposal for fieldwork in Bela Krajina had not fallen on receptive ears. Apparently the Museum was not the right place to discuss structural-functionalism or promote transactionalist models of social organisation. I concluded that Social Anthropology and the Bergen department were not on the academic horizon of my interlocutor at the museum.

Eventually I found an alternative sponsor, Vladimir Klemenčič, then head of the Geography Department at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. He was intimately familiar with much of rural Slovenia and renowned for his promotion of interdisciplinary research. An avid fieldworker himself, Klemenčič was attracted to the concept of long-term participant observation fieldwork and offered to set me up in the field. With his support I sought permission from the authorities to conduct fieldwork in Bela Krajina. But after some weeks I was told that two meteorologists from Japan had recently been sent home after overstaying (for nearly a year) their visas for weather research on a mountain summit in this sensitive military hinterland. My entrance was effectively blocked.

Klemenčič soon suggested three alternative regions.[3] In early June I took up residence in one of them – Haloze, a hilly district of vineyards and orchards in south-central Slovenia that today borders the Republic of Croatia. This was a virtual backwater of rural Slovenia, a place of no strategic interest and certainly not an object for Western espionage. Vladimir Bračič, a colleague of Klemenčič and prominent scholar of the region, agreed to be my mentor in the field. In this way I initially fell outside the dominion of Slovenia's ethnographers – the academics who I had anticipated would be attracted to my endeavour. I bicycled and trekked across much of Haloze during that summer, in between reading works by Bračič (1967a, 1967b, 1969), Klemenčič (1968), and his student Danila Rudolf (1973), plus se-

[3] Kozjansko, Goričko, and Haloze.

lected Slovene ethnographers.[4] This type of survey work allowed no more than superficial contact with local people. It became essential to immerse myself full time in a locality where I could attain an intimate overview of daily life and participate in the everyday lives of my field interlocutors. At the end of August my wife and I moved from Ljubljana to Žetale, a village of small clustered settlements scattered to the east of Donačka Gora over the ridges and dales of western Haloze. We took rooms in the administrative centre near the main parish church, elementary school, and medical dispensary. My wife taught Serbo-Croatian and German at the Žetale Elementary School. I led the school's photography club, learned Slovene by exposure, and wrote copious notes by hand. Elsewhere in Slovenia in those days, Haloze was said to 'lie behind the back of God' – a bad place to be, a better place to come from.

Encountering Haloze

My curiosity upon entering this region of small subsistence oriented agrarian households was driven by more than my exposure to social anthropology. By upbringing I was versed in various practical skills. And as an adherent of American counterculture of the late 1960s and early 1970s I was fascinated by the idea of 'plain living' as presented, for example, in the *Foxfire Books* (Wiggington 1968) and promoted in the writings of Wendell Berry and E.F. Schumacher (1973). Haloze was an ideal setting for submersing myself in 'plain living' and learning about the practice of what nowadays is called sustainable agriculture.

Haložani, the people of Haloze, took a different view. As stigmatised private landowners in the backwaters of socialist Yugoslavia, their ambition was to surmount the way of life to which I was so attracted – a way of life they felt inhibited participation in modern society.

What could I possibly gain from studying them? When my wife joined me helping an informant family collect apples and spread manure, eyebrows were raised. The headmaster found it totally unacceptable that one of his teachers and a lady from Ljubljana should participate in such menial tasks. Eventually we were accepted. Our car – one of the few in Žetale – was an important asset. Visits to the medical dispensary in Ptuj and transporting crates of apples, cured pork, and brandy to relatives in Ljubljana became a regular part of our routine. Before long, sausages, fruit, brandy, and even freshly baked bread, were exchanged for our transportation services. We entered into relations of obligation and trust with many local families. Ultimately, it was my privilege to rub shoulders daily with practitioners of

[4] Boris Kuhar, Niko Kuret, and Marija Makarovič.

viticulture, horticulture, apiculture, field cropping, animal husbandry, and numerous artisan skills. Žetale's men and women invited me to harvest wheat with scythes and thrash it with flails. We milled grain, baked bread, pressed and barrelled wine and cider. I even assisted in making the storage barrels. We thatched roofs, hewed timbers with broad-axes, and raised barns. A happy apprenticeship in the art of brandy distillation was also my lot. In their supposedly non-existent free time *Žetalanci* (the people of Žetale) invited me to participate in pigstickings, hunt wild boar, and gather mushrooms and chestnuts in Croatian territory across the unpatrolled Macelj Ridge to the south. All of this was accessible to me *only* through the medium of a new language – Slovene. This wayward son of California had discovered his exotic other.[5]

From Fieldwork to Thesis

Before arriving in Slovenia I had been exposed to diverse bodies of theory, from Gregory Bateson's ruminations about *Ecology and Epistemology* (1972) to Fredrik Barth's *Models of Social Organization* (1966). I had adopted an understanding of global cultural diversity inspired by Julian Steward's concept of the 'culture core' (1955). In the early 1970s this was standard postgraduate fare in Bergen. However, my encounter with Haloze challenged these perspectives. I decided to make the practical life of the *Haložani* my central theme. I called it 'indigenous technology'. Three years later, when defending my dissertation, one of the examiners snidely alluded to the absence of Bateson and Barth in my reference list. I had turned instead to the likes of Lewis Mumford (1967, 1970), Scott Buchanan (1962), Lynn White (1964), Jacques Ellul (1964), Jack Goody (1971), Edmund Leach, and Clifford Geertz to understand indigenous technology as a cultural system. The work of the geographers Klemenčič and Bračič also figured prominently, and so did works by ethnographers of rural Slovenia such as Boris Kuhar, Niko Kuret, and Marija Makarovič (1978). Indeed this Slovene scholarship was an invaluable resource both for delineating a cultural and social order unique to Haloze and for stimulating my growing interest in comparative cultural history.

But the central problem of forming a thesis remained: how does one describe an indigenous system of technology? I read the classical Anglophone studies of peasants (Redfield 1960; Wolf 1966) and I digested the work of fellow students of Yugoslavia, but it was hard to get a handle on my

[5] My Bergen peers returning home with me from fieldwork had found exotic others in Sivas (Turkey), Osterøy (Norway), Al Kheiran and Equatoria (Sudan), Punjab (Pakistan), and Alto Mayo Valley (Peru).

material. By the mid-1970s village monographs were no longer in fashion, and the works published on other areas of Yugoslavia just a few years earlier did not appeal as models (e.g. Halpern 1967; Winner 1971). My material did not lend itself to an engagement with exotic kinship systems or household and family units that were unique to other parts of the Balkans (e.g. Hammel 1968; Rheubottom 1971; Mosely, Byrnes et al. 1976). Žetale lives and household economies were integrated into the wider society through labour migration and participation in the institutions of an increasingly intrusive socialist state (Hammel 1969; Simić 1973). How was I to describe indigenous technology without reverting to the closure of a village study?

My solution was to allow myself to be overwhelmed by fascination with one particular event in Žetale's ritual cycle. I judged that the local practice of pigsticking, called *furež,* might serve well as a vehicle to understand what I would first describe decades later as the life-worlds of *Žetalanci*. After all, as Edmund Leach had pointed out, every action has both its instrumental and expressive aspects (1968). Butchering pigs was not just pork making, it also was a commentary on the social relationships enabling it and the moral universe informing it (Minnich 1982). My preoccupation with pigsticking was propelled by discovery of comparative material. When reading Niko Kuret's wonderful monographs on the festive cycle of the Slovenes (1965, 1967, 1970a, 1970b) I discovered his account of *koline* (the more common Slovene term for *furež*). This led me to compare my own rich material and a survey of contemporary *koline* practices with his historical collation of the event throughout Slovenia. It was apparent that the Haloze *furež* retained traditional qualities that had gone missing in most other regions of Slovenia. From the perspective of Slovene ethnographers, the Haloze *furež* was a well-preserved remnant of folk culture. I was thus in a position to contribute to the ethnography of pigsticking in Slovenia. At the same time, case material from Scandinavia (Lid 1923) and New Guinea (Rappaport 1967), made it possible to consider ritualised pigsticking in a more universal manner, following the social anthropological predilection for comparative sociology across the full range of global cultural diversity. With this comparative material in hand, and drawing on notes and photos from participation in several Žetale pigstickings, I compiled a rich ethnography of the event. Once I had this 'self-contained ritual'[6] on paper I sought to extrapolate *furež* in terms of a local social and cultural order. Shortly afterwards, when writing my conclusion, I read Clifford Geertz's essays on *Thick Description* (1973a) and *Deep Play of the Balinese Cockfight* (1973b). Suddenly my enterprise gained anthropological legitimacy. I had engaged in

[6] This is the term of Don Handelman, who used this ethnography 30 years later to exemplify a general type (2004).

thick description and practiced what Geertz termed 'cultural interpretation' without being aware of what I was doing. Haloze pigsticking had become my cockfight. This serendipitous encounter with cocks on Bali allowed me to tie a final knot in the other end of that grand Haloze sausage that became my Norwegian *magistergrad.* My original quest to describe the practical life as a cultural system yielded to an interpretation of ritualised social interaction.

In the end, I argued that *furež* has a lot to do with pigs and little to do with pork. The life and death of the farmstead's closest non-human consociate (cf. Leach 1964) was a quintessential medium for celebrating a local social order. *Furež* participants stood in multi-stranded relationships with one another, in a local setting where both general and specific reciprocity was essential to household viability. Žetale social identities of the mid-1970s emphasised membership in autonomous, subsistence-oriented nuclear family farmsteads – *domača gruda.* In those days Žetale life-worlds acquired special meaning from the sequence of events constituting *furež*: (1) the early morning squealing of stuck pigs reverberating across the hollows and ridges of Haloze and the blessing of swine carcasses with a sprinkle of salt, (2) the concoction of blood sausages and the subsequent lewd presentation that men ceremonially made of the sausages, shaped into distinctly phallic arrangements, to embarrassed womenfolk in the kitchen, and finally, (3) the large gathering of kith and kin which concluded the event. Handelman (2004) concurs with me that these ritual segments convey solemnity, ribaldry, and conviviality in succession. Much of the meat attained through a *furež* was used to host the final feast. And subsequent gifts of fresh and cured *furež* pork – called *koline* – cemented more distant social relationships. *Koline* could not be bought or sold; it was a gift, not a commodity (Minnich 1987). *Furež* was a peasant holiday on a par with weddings and funerals, only it happened annually. As my wife confirmed from her classes at the Žetale School, a family's *furež* was one of the few days in the year when local school children were too sick to attend school. Their sick leave terminated not infrequently with delivery of *koline* sausages to their teacher.

When my regular visits to Haloze ended in the late 1970s, Žetale was still a marginal backwater. Aside from the local church, elementary school, and part-time medical dispensary, Žetale's communal infrastructure was poor. Most public services – emergency medical dispensary, police, and administrative – were located in the regional centre, Ptuj, an hour away by moped or bus. Investment in agricultural activity on private farmsteads was only possible when a household could raise capital, usually through temporary migration to well-paying jobs in western Europe. Opportunities for cash cropping and local employment were minimal. Government support for

private agricultural activity was non-existent. Žetale farmsteads remained marginal to the national economy and local infrastructure was neglected.

Yet far-reaching changes were already underway, even though I did not address them in my thesis. Emigration of the region's youth was escalating, and aging households were increasingly dependent upon the support of absent heirs. At the time of Josip Broz Tito's death in 1980, western Haloze was becoming a dismal region of rundown farmsteads, poorly kept roads, and sadly deficient public infrastructure. Yet the children of my Haloze peers were enjoying levels of training and education inaccessible to their parents. Their prospects were bright – though not if they stayed at home, in the country behind God's back.

From Apprentice to Journeyman – Connecting with Slovene Ethnographers and Anthropologists

My apprenticeship as participant observer was driven by fascination with an unknown way of life. The intense everyday task of penetrating the implicit understandings informing my interlocutors' actions led me – much like Sherlock Holmes – into unanticipated settings and involved me in unexpected tasks. I was, it seemed, hopelessly captivated by pursuit of the ever-unfolding drama of local life, whether it be mundane tasks punctuating the local agrarian cycle, religious and secular rites, or the periodic conflicts and confrontations which also marked local life. The nitty-gritty of observing and recording social life filled my waking hours and often occupied my dreams.

At some point, however, the apprentice must step back, take a breath, and reflect over this intense engagement with field interlocutors. Aside from family visits in Ljubljana, my 18 months in Haloze were broken only by a handful of consultations with my social geographer mentors and one short trip back to Bergen to share a field report with colleagues there. At the end of fieldwork, Klemenčič provided me a first opportunity to share my work with Slovene colleagues – his geography students in Ljubljana.

The travail of writing a *magister* dissertation back in Bergen was a time of self-isolation and introspection. But once on paper, my experience in the field became accessible to others. Following the publication of my dissertation (Minnich 1979), the guild's door was opened for a journey among colleagues. I was invited to lecture on *The Analysis of Peasant Identity* and *Social Anthropological Method* at the Department of Ethnology in Ljubljana. A colleague of my generation, Mojca Ravnik, asked if she could interview me for the major Slovene daily, *Delo.* I gladly accepted. Her interview began with a short review of my dissertation, emphasising my thick description of

furež. She then questioned me about participant observation, inductive analysis, and indigenous technology as a cultural system, giving me a platform to promote my understanding of social anthropology (Ravnik 1981). Opportunities subsequently opened for me to translate and publish my Haloze research in Slovenia (Minnich 1987a, 1993b). By sharing my own material from a region largely neglected by Slovene ethnographers in the twentieth century, I was able to become a modest voice for social anthropology in Slovenia.

Slovene ethnographers already had some acquaintance with cultural anthropology. For example, Clifford Geertz's concepts of cultural interpretation and thick description, derived from hermeneutics, opened a way for students with a background in the humanities to connect with more sociologically oriented anthropologists such as myself (Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 105-21, 509-24). Participant observation field methods were coming to the attention of ethnologists (cf. Makarovič 1976). In the late 1970s the Department of Ethnology in Ljubljana, under the leadership of Slavko Kremenšek, initiated a project entitled 'Ways of Life of the Slovenes in the 20th Century' (Slavec Gradišnik 2000). I was immediately attracted to the concept *način življenja* (way of life), and fascinated by the objective of this ambitious project that envisioned writing 60-80 monographs covering the entire Slovene ethnic territory. For me *način življenja* was a metaphor for human adaptations as conceived in Steward's cultural ecology (Steward 1955). In a naive way I assumed that the practical life I had documented as a cultural system (with its locus in Žetale households) was tantamount to *način življenja.* Could my monograph be of importance for the greater project?

Fortunately I delved more deeply into this extensive project before raising the possibility of my own participation. I learned that each monograph would follow a specific research program, including completion of an extensive pre-determined field survey. My inductive method was clearly alien to this approach. Moreover, our respective understandings of *način življenja* diverged. Slavko Kremenšek had introduced the concept of *način življenja* in order to free conventional Slovene ethnography from the epistemological strictures that were attached to other dominant concepts such as folk culture. His concern and concept resonated with contemporary developments in both German and Russian folk studies (see Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 332-37), and he hoped that the concept would promote the empirical and comparative study of 'everyday life' in all sectors of modern Slovene society (Slavec Gradišnik 2000; this volume). Nevertheless, Kremenšek viewed ethnology as essentially a historical discipline. And even though he was critical of *narodopisje* as a national science, he developed a program for investigating *način življenja* that was confined to Slovene ethnic territory.

Because he insisted on a historical approach and the ethno-national circumscription of ethnology, I ultimately found it difficult to adopt Kremenšek's new term. But regardless of our differences I was graciously tolerated within the fold of Slovene ethnology long before it became associated with cultural anthropology in a more formal way. This happened in 1991 when the department in Ljubljana was renamed the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology (Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 121).

Alongside my growing affiliation with Slovene ethnologists, the geographer Vladimir Klemenčič remained an essential companion to my anthropological enterprise. A suggestion from him led me to my next field location, the Three Border Region (TBR), where the borders of Austria, Italy, and Slovenia intersect, and to one of the best-preserved enclaves of traditional Alpine transhumance in the Carnian Alps – Ugovizza. My initial intention was again to explore the culture of a marginal community. But, similar to my experience with pigsticking in Haloze, a chance encounter with autochthonous Slovene speaking Ugovizza highlanders transformed the direction of investigation and shifted my theoretical perspective (Minnich 1998: 1). I benefited greatly from Klemenčič's familiarity with the autochthonous Slovene minority. His network of colleagues among the Slovene minorities of Carinthia and Val Canale was essential to the compilation of my second dissertation (Minnich 1992).

Klemenčič also helped me establish contact with the Society for Slovene Studies in the United States, where I subsequently published several articles in its journal, *Slovene Studies*. The most significant of these was on code switching and identity in the TBR where I argued that 'speakers of Slovene' in Ugovizza did not identify themselves as Slovenes (Minnich 1988). The following year Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik translated this controversial piece into Slovene for publication in the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts journal *Traditiones* (Minnich 1989). Four years later this translation became the central chapter in a Slovene anthology of my work (Minnich 1993a).

As I began associating with Slovene colleagues at the Department of Ethnology, I came to know Stane Južnič (Godina this volume). I was surprised to learn that he had been teaching political and social anthropology since 1969 at the Faculty of Sociology, Political Science, and Journalism in Ljubljana (FSPJ). I was puzzled that the ethnologists never referred to him or his work. The separation in Slovenia between the nationally-oriented humanistic disciplines of ethnography, ethnology, and folklore and the sociologically-oriented subject of social anthropology was reminiscent of the situation at the University of Bergen, where communication, not to mention cooperation, between the two fields was virtually non-existent in the 1970s. In

socialist-era Slovenia, the disciplinary division was not merely a matter of Party affiliation. Jurij Fikfak notes (2011) that Slovenia's ethnographers and folklorists generally were not Party members. Ethnography and ethnology were primarily national sciences anchored in the humanities. Similarly, Vesna Godina observes that Stane Južnič circumvented Marxist dogma in his theoretical discourse on anthropology, even though he taught at what was originally a Party cadre school.[7] Južnič constructed an understanding of anthropology based upon sources external to the Slovene tradition of ethnography, drawing heavily on American, British, and French founders of modern anthropology (Godina this volume). I found it easier to understand this situation of mutual avoidance by looking at the paths followed by Južnič and Kremenšek to their respective professorships (compare Godina and Slavec Gradišnik this volume). The fundamentally different epistemological orientations and life experiences of these two scholars effectively separated them in promotion and refinement of their scholarly disciplines, the one cosmopolitan and the other national, in much the same way that the careers of Fredrik Barth and his counterpart in the Department of Ethno-Folklore, Brynjulf Alver, diverged in Bergen.

Once Slovenia gained independence, this separation of the two disciplines lost its salience. Scholars of the human sciences at both faculties came to acknowledge the integrity of ethnography, folklore, and ethnology with social, cultural, linguistic, and physical anthropology.[8] Integration of the humanistic and sociological traditions of anthropology led to the creation of new study programs at the Faculty of Arts (home of the Ethnology Department) in the 1990s (Slavec Gradišnik 2000: 121). In 2006-07 a professorship in Social Anthropology held by Bojan Baskar, formerly in the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Arts, was transferred to the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology. One wonders if this might lead, once again, to a new name for the department. Perhaps it will soon be the Department of Ethnology and Socio-Cultural Anthropology? The consolidation of anthropology at the Faculty of Social Sciences (formerly FSPJ) is also demonstrated in recent years by the introduction of new study programs, *Cultural Studies* and *Sociology – Studies of Everyday Life*, with curricula that draw from both humanities and social science.

---

[7] FSPJ developed out of what was originally a Party Cadre School into an independent faculty that trained journalists, economists, and social scientists destined for careers in the public sector. Following Slovenia's independence it was incorporated into the University of Ljubljana as the Faculty of Social Sciences.

[8] This transition is the subject of Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik's comprehensive text, *Etnologija na Slovenskem: med čermi narodopisja in antropologije* (*Ethnology in Slovenia: Between the Reefs of* narodopisje *and Anthropology*) (2000).

When both faculties invited me to teach and publish in the 1990s, I experienced this as a happy coming together of the two ambivalently related departments with which I had been affiliated since my apprenticeship in Haloze. With the encouragement of Stane Južnič and support of his assistant, Irena Šumi, a collection of my work from both Haloze and the TBR was translated and published in 1993 by the Slovene Research Institute in Val Canale, where my second field study took place. The title marked my recognition in Slovenia as a social anthropologist – *Socialni antropolog o Slovencih – zbornik socialnoantropoloških besedil*. In his introduction Stane Južnič acknowledged my research among the Slovenes as a welcome and perceptive contribution to the discipline he had been promoting, in relative isolation, for so many decades. For him the occasion to publish this anthology was an opportunity to confirm the legitimacy of anthropology in Slovene public space. It has been satisfying to know that these translated articles have found readers not only among his students, but also at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology. In 1994 I was invited to lecture at both faculties. At the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology I chose as my title 'Fieldwork as a Common Basis for Ethnology and Social-cultural Anthropology.[9] Following Južnič's initiative I was also invited by the Faculty of Social Science to lead a compulsory one-semester tutorial (repeated again in 1996) entitled *Anthropological Method for the M.A. Degree in Anthropology.* This is an appropriate note on which to conclude these ruminations about my interaction with Slovene colleagues, who increasingly influenced the direction and exposition of my work over several decades, for which I am manifestly grateful.

Let us now return to the field, to Haloze, and examine the transformation of a locality that has accompanied the evolving academic discourses outlined above.

What a Difference Three Decades Make!

On a gorgeous spring day in April 2006, my wife and I decided spontaneously to visit Žetale for the first time in two decades. Approaching from the west we were soon surprised by a sign welcoming us – in Slovene, English, French, Italian, and German – to the Žetale *občina* (municipality). Seven years after Slovenia's independence in 1991 a referendum passed establishing this disenfranchised village as an independent municipality. The consequences were many. Along our way we passed a newly opened (1999) elementary school in the field where the local postman's cattle had once

[9] The lecture was given on 18 May 1994 in Slovenian under the title 'Terensko delo kot skupna osnova za etnologijo in socialno-kulturno antropologijo'.

grazed. As we drove up to the old school house, where my wife had taught, three flags were flying – the banners of Žetale, Slovenia, and the European Union. This was Žetale's new city hall, located in the village's most prominent public building, dating from 1882. Thirty minutes later a young woman living at the house across the road (where we had roomed) eagerly introduced us to the mayor of Žetale. Soon we were identified with our sojourn there in the 1970s. With pride the mayor gave us a signed copy of the recently published *Žetale Chronicle* (Butolen, Vidic et al. 2004). We discovered inside an account of our stay in the 1970s and a list of everything I ever wrote about Haloze. This was a surprise. In contrast to many fellow ethnographers, I had no part whatsoever in the production of this impressive village chronicle.

Alongside a vastly refurbished local dental and medical dispensary in the village centre a large sign advertised European Union financial support in the late 1990s for the creation and renewal of the municipality's water system. Every house scattered along the ridges of this drought-ridden region had been provided not only with asphalted access roads, but running water as well. Fire hydrants were set up in even the remotest of these dispersed ridge settlements. Not far from the centre, yet another sign designated the departure point and map for an ecological trail through the municipality – a New Age tourist attraction financed by the Royal Dutch Embassy in Ljubljana. Later that evening I discovered the Žetale municipality webpage listing elected officials and commissions and serving as a bulletin board for local events and public notices.[10] In 1980 it would have been simply impossible to imagine such a transformation of Žetale.

By 2006 pigs had become pork in Žetale. That former close knit community of inter-household cooperation and interdependence that once organised *furež* is now subsumed within a local polity of elected representatives. Formerly neighbours relied primarily on one another for initiative and cooperation to solve common problems. Now they can turn to their elected representatives and commissioners, who in fact are often the same kin and kith of yore. A vibrant and diverse set of local voluntary organisations is also manifest on the municipal webpage. How about joining evening aerobic classes for Žetale women in the gym of the new school? Pitchforking manure, splitting firewood by hand, cutting grass with scythes, and loading it by hand on cattle-drawn carts are all physical tasks of the past. The lives of *Žetalanci* have changed profoundly in the short span of one generation. Relations of cooperation and commensality are taking new forms. Social

[10] See: (http://www.zetale.si/). Having secured a phone line to each local household, municipal authorities now assume they are all online and accessible by this medium. Žetale pupils have access to computers at school, where they are an integral part of instruction.

relations and obligations among kin and kith are no longer assumed; they have become objectified and are contested in new ways.

One thing is certain. Social recognition and self-affirmation in Žetale no longer revolve around commitment to the preservation of one's homestead. And labour is explicitly understood in terms of its monetary value. The currency of *koline* gifts is no longer essential glue in the fabric of a local social order. The child of one of my wife's former pupils told me in June 2006: 'We no longer hold *furež*, but our parents have told us about it. Today people are too busy; they have tight schedules. If we need to butcher a pig we get someone who knows how to come in and help us on the weekend when we are free'.

Many of my wife's former pupils have remained there, taken jobs in the newly bloated public sector, or commute to work on vastly improved roads. Those few who make a living from farming have specialised in some form of cash cropping – wine, milk, or fruit. Any semblance of a household-based indigenous system of technology has given way to global flows of information and integration into the market economy of global capitalism. The 'homemade' world of Žetale is a thing of the past (Minnich 1979).[11] Žetale households, and relations among them, are no longer the motor of cultural reproduction.

On the other hand, the place of Žetale and its traditional culture remain important resources for constructing local self-identities in our shared 'late modern age' (Giddens 1991). Nowadays folk institutions of the past, such as *furež,* are identified as uniquely local traditions and as such can be emulated in the quest for self-identification. Suddenly the ethnographer becomes critical as conservator of such tradition. He is the means of its objectification. On the material level, the restoration of local farm buildings and implements, such as wine presses, provides another set of referents for self-identification.[12] *Žetalanci* now move in a social universe marked by selective self-identification. They are no longer so confined by ascribed identities reproduced within a local social order.

On 21 December 2007, the Schengen Frontier was implemented along Slovenia's southern perimeter. The Macelj Ridge, where we once gathered mushrooms and hunted wild boar, became a well-policed frontier, regularly patrolled by foot and helicopter. In August 2010, the Žetale Tourist Association invited young people from the Netherlands, Portugal, Latvia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Slovenia to participate in a youth exchange entitled: 'Where does Europe start? – Life along the Schengen border'. During the gathering participants were challenged to imagine Žetale as a perfect village, 'where

[11] See note 1 above.

[12] See: http://td-zetale.net/.

[they] will be able to think creatively [about] how to build an ideal village where all people would have jobs and [enjoy an] ideal style of living'.[13] Tongue in cheek, we might ask if this means Žetale has become a virtual village, more connected by internet than exchange of *koline* sausages. Let us hope that a budding anthropological apprentice will find fascination in answering such a question.

References

Barth, F. 1966. *Models of Social Organization*. London: Royal Anthropological Institute.

Bateson, G. 1972. *Steps to an ecology of mind; collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology*. San Francisco: Chandler Pub. Co.

Bračič, V. 1967a. *Vinorodne Haloze. Socialno-geografski problemi s posebnim ozirom na viničarstvo*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja

–––––. 1967b. Vzhodni del Haloz v luči cenilnega zapisnika gospoščine Borl iz leta 1542. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje* 38 (3): 25-74.

–––––. 1969. *Poetovio - Ptuj, 69-1969.* Maribor: Založba Obzorja.

Buchanan, S. 1962. Nature, Science, and Technology – Technology as a System of Exploitation. *Technology and Culture* 3 (4): 535-543.

Butolen, A., K. Vidic, et al. 2004. *Žetale in Žetalanci nekoč in danes: [zbornik]*. Žetale: Občina.

Ellul, J. 1964. *The technological society*. New York: Knopf.

Fikfak, J. 2011. *Niches and Interplay: "Non-Marxist" Folklore Studies under Communism*. Paper presented at the Workshop: "The Rise of Anthropology 'on the Margins of Europe', 1945-1991". Halle/ S., March 2011.

Geertz, C. 1973a. Thick description: toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 3-30. London: Hutchinson & Co.

–––––. 1973b. Deep play: notes on the Balinese cockfight. In C. Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 412-453. London: Hutchinson & Co.

Giddens, A. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Goody, J., and International African Institute. 1971. *Technology, tradition, and the state in Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.

[13] See: (http://td-zetale.net/wdes/).

Halpern, J. M. 1967. *A Serbian Village: Social and Cultural Change in a Yugoslav Community*. New York: Harper & Row.

Hammel, E. A. 1968. *Alternative social structures and ritual relations in the Balkans*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

———. 1969. *The pink yo-yo*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies.

Handelman, D. 2004. Introduction: Why Ritual in Its Own Right? How So? *Social analysis* 48 (2): 34.

Klemenčič, V. 1968. Problemi mešane strukture gospodinjstev in kmečkih gosodarstev v Sloveniji : (prispevek k študiju urbanizacije). *Geografski vestnik* 40: 19-52.

Kuhar, B. 1972. *Odmirajoči stari svet vasi: poljudno znanstvena razprava*. V Ljubljani: Prešernova družba.

Kuret, N. 1965. *Praznično leto Slovencev*. (1, Prvi del: pomlad). Celje: Mohorjeva družba.

———. 1967. *Praznično leto Slovencev*. (2, Drugi del: poletje). Celje: Mohorjeva družba.

———. 1970a. *Praznično leto Slovencev*. (3, Tretji del: jesen). Celje: Mohorjeva družba.

———. 1970b. *Praznično leto Slovencev*. (4, Četrti del: zima). Celje: Mohorjeva družba.

Leach, E. R. 1964. *Anthropological aspects of language: animal categories and verbal abuse*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Leach, E. R. 1968. Ritual. In D. H. Shils, *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, pp. 520-526. New York: Macmillan & Free Press.

Lid, N. 1923. *Norske slakteskikkar*. Kristiania: Dybwad i. Komm.

Makarovič, M. 1976. Neposredno opazovanje z udeležbo kot ena od metod etnološkega raziskovanja na terenu. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 16 (3): 49-51.

———. 1978. *Kmečko gospodarstvo na Slovenskem*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.

Minnich, R. G. 1979. *The Homemade World of Zagaj: An interpretation of the "practical life" among traditional peasant-farmers in West Haloze – Slovenia, Yugoslavia*. Bergen: Dept. of Social Anthropology, University of Bergen.

———. 1982. The symbolic dimension of West Haloze peasant technology. *Slovene Studies* 4 (1): 21-27.

———. 1987a. Koline kot darilo in izražanje identitete v slovenski kmečki družbi. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 27 (1-2): 115-122. (Slovene translation of 1987b).

——. 1987b. The Gift of Koline and the Articulation of Identity in Slovene Peasant Society. *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 27 (1-2): 171-179.

——. 1988. Speaking Slovene – Being Slovene: Verbal codes and collective self-images: some correlations between Kanalska dolina and Ziljska dolina. *Slovene Studies* 10 (2): 125-147.

——. 1989. Govoriti slovensko - biti Slovenec : jezikovni kodi in kolektivne samopodobe: nekaj primerjav med Kanalsko dolino in Ziljsko dolino. *Traditiones* 18: 65-88. (Slovene translation of 1988).

——. 1992. *Homesteaders and citizens : an ecology of person and self-realization among Slovene speaking villagers on the Austro-Italien frontier*. PhD thesis. Dept. of Social Anthropology, University of Bergen.

——. 1993a. *Socialni antropolog o Slovencih: zbornik socialnoantropoloških besedil*. Kanalska dolina/ Ljubljana: Slovenski raziskovalni inštitut - SLORI, Amalietti.

——. 1993b. *Simbolna dimenzija v tehnologiji zahodnohaloških kmetov*. In R. G. Minnich (ed.), *Socialni antropolog o Slovencih : zbornik socialnoantropoloških besedil*, pp. 53-66. Kanalska dolina/ Ljubljana: Slovenski raziskovalni inštitut - SLORI. (Slovene translation of 1982).

——. 1998. *Homesteaders and citizens : collective identity formation on the Austro-Italian-Slovene frontier*. Bergen: Norse Publications.

Mosely, P. E., R. F. Byrnes, et al. 1976. *Communal families in the Balkans: the zadruga: essays by Philip E. Mosely and essays in his honor*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.

Mumford, L. 1967. *The myth of the machine: technics and human development*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

——. 1970. *The myth of the machine; the pentagon of power*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Rappaport, R. A. 1967. *Pigs for the ancestors: ritual in the ecology of a New Guinea people*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ravnik, M. 1981. Antropolog v Žetalah, Furež – drama kmečkega življenja. *Delo*, 04.02.1981, pp. 29-30. Ljubljana: CGP.

Redfield, R. 1960. *The little community and Peasant society and culture*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press,.

Rheubottom, D. B. 1971. *A structural analysis of conflict and cleavage in Macedonian domestic groups*. PhD Thesis. University of Rochester, Dept. of Anthropology.

Rudolf, D. 1973. *Geografska podoba gozdnatih Haloz s posebnim ozirom na razseljevanje in razkroj kulturne pokrajine na primerih K. O. Kočice*

in K. O. Sitež. (diplomska naloga). Geography, University of Ljubljana.
Schumacher, E. F. 1973. *Small is beautiful; economics as if people mattered*. New York: Harper & Row.
Simić, A. 1973. *The peasant urbanites; a study of rural-urban mobility in Serbia*. New York: Seminar Press.
Slavec Gradišnik, I. 2000. *Etnologija na Slovenskem: med čermi naro-dopisja in antropologije*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
Steward, J. H. 1955. *Theory of Culture Change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
White, L. T. 1964. *Medieval technology and social change*. London, New York: Oxford University Press.
Wiggington, E. 1968. *The Foxfire Book*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press - Double Day.
Winner, I. 1971. *A Slovenian village, Žerovnica*. Providence: Brown Univ. Press.
Wolf, E. R. 1966. *Peasants*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Chapter 17
Afterword: Words and Things, Ethnologies and Anthropologies

Aleksandar Bošković

> 'When *I* use a word', Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean — neither more nor less'.
> 'The question is', said Alice, 'whether you *can* make words mean so many different things'.
> 'The question is', said Humpty Dumpty, 'which is to be master — that's all'. – Lewis Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*.

Locating the Field

The chapters in this book combine case histories and overviews, but they all centre around specific locations and discuss some key concepts. In this brief summary, I will begin with discussing the different locations to which the authors refer, and continue with the importance of words, as using certain concepts in former socialist countries (the majority in this volume) meant much more than 'doing things with words' (*pace* Austin 1962). Most of the countries whose ethnologies/anthropologies are discussed here have been included (at one point or another) in the Balkans, the area of Europe that has inspired so much imagination and occasionally provoked passionate arguments (Todorova 1997; Perica 2002). Even which countries are part of the Balkans has been passionately disputed, at least since the Balkan Wars of 1912-13. The ambivalence about Slovenia, for example, can be seen in different editions of Todorova's book: in the original English text, the author did not include Slovenia as part of the Balkans; she included it in the Serbian version published in 1999; but then excluded it in the 2001 Slovenian translation.[1] The geographic location of Slovenia also served as an inspiration for the title of the conference on which this volume is based: a workshop organ-

[1] For criticism of the concept of 'Balkanism' and its implications, see Doja (chapter 7), in reference to Lévi-Strauss, and Bošković 2010. The concept of 'Orientalism', on which it was partially based, was already criticised by Clifford (1988) and Sax (1998).

iser at the 2006 conference of the European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA) in Bristol referred to it as being 'on the margins of Europe'.[2]

The southernmost part of Europe discussed in this book, Greece, was described as 'a small "island" on the global map of anthropology, situated quite near both to the Anglo-American and the German mainland and therefore caught up in the anthropological wars of the twentieth century' (Papataxiarchis chapter 2). Greek anthropology has in common with other regional traditions (like Albania, Slovenia, and Croatia, as well more distant ones, like Brazil and Japan) the fact that its origins are closely tied to a nation-building project. However, these origins have also always been part of a larger debate on the relationship of ethnology (as the discipline was almost universally called in 1945) to folklore (especially in Greece, but also in Macedonia – see chapters 4, 5, and 13), or to other similar terms, like ethnography. In the case of Albania, it was the search for the key components of ancient 'Albanianness', whether in cultural elements or within customary law (chapters 7, 8).

Words and Things

The contributions by our Greek colleagues point to interesting debates (as well as different points of departure) when referring to concepts like *laografia*, folklore, or anthropology. The disciplinary debates and clarifications figure prominently in a previous volume based on studying peoples 'in the People's democracies' (Hann, Sárkány and Skalník 2005). The situation in former Yugoslavia and the countries that came out of it was both similar and different.

In Slovenia, as pointed out by Slavec-Gradišnik (chapter 9), there was an interesting mixture of peoples and concepts. Some of the prominent anthropologists were mostly brushed aside in the post-1990 period (e.g. the account of Stane Južnič in chapter 10). However, Slovenia also had a very interesting and important tradition of *narodopis* (Muršič and Ramšak 1995). Slavec-Gradišnik translates *narodopis* as 'ethnography', but it was more like a particular type of folklore. *Narodopis* (lit. description of the folk) was concerned with folk poetry, customs, and (to a lesser extent) with material culture. The Department of Ethnology was established at the University of Ljubljana in 1940, but, due to the outbreak of the Second World War, the

[2] In an earlier paper, I referred to Slovenia as part of the Balkans because it had formed part of the former Yugoslavia (between 1918 and 1941, and again between 1945 and 1991) (Bošković 2005). I no longer hold this view. Slovenia's post-1990 development has placed the country apart – both economically and culturally – from other parts of former Yugoslavia.

first academic year was never completed. The key person in its development was Niko Županič (1876-1961), who was its first professor, and taught there until retirement in 1957. Županič was interested in understanding humanity in the most general sense, so he combined history, palaeontology, and ethnology. He was also a romantic in the sense that he believed in a more general South Slav identity. As put by Rajko Muršič at the conference on which this book is based, he was 'a Yugoslav nationalist'. Furthermore, he worked in Belgrade (1908-14, influencing work on biological or physical anthropology), and, as a Professor in Ljubljana in later years, frequently gave visiting lectures in Zagreb.

There were other types of anthropology practised in Slovenia after the Second World War. One was practised by Božo Škerlj (1904-61), who taught physical anthropology, but was also considered to be 'the founder of scientific Yugoslav anthropology' (Vlahović 1971: 104), as well as a crucial person for the development of 'ethnic anthropology'.[3] There was also a tradition of teaching social anthropology within the University of Ljubljana's Department of Sociology (by Bojan Baskar, but his work falls outside the time frame of the present volume), and, as Vesna Godina described in chapter 10, the tradition at the present-day Faculty of Social Sciences, introduced and maintained by the late Stane Južnič (1928-2013).

The term ethnography (*etnografija*) was used in the post-1945 Yugoslav republics of Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia)[4] to refer to the concept that was supposed to be close to the Soviet one, so it was less ideologically loaded than the related term ethnology (*etnologija*). In practice, there was not much difference, but museums and institutes were always ethnographic (*etnografski*), while the discipline was taught in Departments of Ethnology (*etnologija*).[5] The situation in Macedonia was different, as presented by Risteski and Dimova (chapter 13) – but the experiment with teaching *etnografija* lasted only until 1953. Writing about institutional developments in Albania, Kodra-Hysa (chapter 6) mentions how it was explained to her that the Department of Ethnography could not be renamed Ethnology, as that would imply a much wider scale for comparisons. The consensual view (as expressed in Hann, Sárkány and Skalník (2005) that a single term (like anthropology, as they advocate)

[3] That is to say, anthropology of ethnicity.

[4] For discussion about some elements of the disciplinary development in Serbia, see Mihăilescu, Naumović and Iliev (2008).

[5] With the exception of the Department of Sociology and the present-day Faculty of Social Sciences in Ljubljana. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Zemaljski muzej was a much larger institution that dealt with more complex issues, including history and archaeology, as pointed out by Kurtović (chapter 15).

should be used would have been impossible to implement because of the diverse places where the subjects were taught and practised, different research agendas (and research funds were exclusively provided by the state – that is to say, through a particular federal unit's authorities), as well as the feudal nature of the ethnological 'field' in former Yugoslav republics – as it was expected that researchers would normally study only within the borders of 'their' home republic.[6] Anthropology (*antropologija*) was primarily understood as biological or physical anthropology – at least officially. As pointed out by Martinović Klarić (chapter 12), this tradition was robust in Croatia where it gained international prominence – even to the effect that the authors of a recent survey of opinions of race among physical anthropologists refer to 'the Croatian exception' (Kaszycka, Štrkalj and Strzalko 2009).

Unofficially, things were more complicated. As noted by Larisa Kurtović (chapter 15), there were also local museums in charge of preserving local customs. Also, scholars like Erlich Stein received their training in the tradition of (American) cultural anthropology. According to later accounts by Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, Milovan Gavazzi (1895-1992) was well aware of the American tradition, and he made reference to it in his writings, although not in his teaching. Gavazzi, who started teaching ethnology at the University of Zagreb in 1927, and taught until his retirement in 1965, was the dominant figure in Croatian ethnology until the mid-1970s. Gavazzi also taught the ethnology of non-European peoples as a visiting professor at the Department of Ethnology in Ljubljana. As the Department of Ethnology was formed at the University of Zagreb in 1960, one of the primary points for disseminating ethnological (and anthropological) knowledge were institutes.

The most important institute in Croatia was formed in 1948 as the Institute for Folk Art. Between 1977 and 1990 its name was the Institute of Folklore Research (within the Institute of Philology and Folklore), and then in 1991 finally changed its name into the current one, the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research. The Institute was at first established as a centre for studying ethnomusicology, but soon expanded its research topics to philology. Three of the four women discussed by Potkonjak in chapter 11 (Rihtman-Auguštin, Supek, and Sklevicky) worked at this Institute, and Rihtman-Auguštin was the dominant figure in Croatian ethnology and anthropology from the early 1980s until her death. The extraordinary influence

[6] There were of course some exceptions; in addition to those mentioned by Vujačić and Kurtović (chapters 14 and 15), Petar Vlahović's studies in Montenegro gained some notoriety. Perhaps one of the reasons for the home-based approach is the active role that some Serbian ethnologists played in promoting the dominance of Serbian cultural forms in the region before the Second World War. During this time, for example Tihomir Đorđević (1868-1944) actively tried to prove the Serb ethnicity of Macedonians. Similarly, Jovan Cvijić's study of 'character types' did not sit well with non-Serbs.

that this Institute had (and still has) in Croatia is not typical for the other countries of the region. Its original name is still echoed in the name of its journal, *Narodna umjetnost* (Folk Art).

Interchanges

While the presence of Western influences was recognised in Greek scholarship in this period, it was not the case for the other countries whose anthropologies are discussed here. Fieldwork in former Yugoslavia was possible (as witnessed and described by Minnich in chapter 16 with reference to Slovenia), but the country did not seem so exotic as some other destinations, and the anthropology of Europe was still not very much developed as a subfield. Greece was an exception, and Greek communities provided crucial points of reference for some key ethnographies (like Herzfeld's *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass*, but also *Ours once More*). At the same time, Greeks were presented as powerful symbols of Europe's others, and this was not an easy position for their scholars to address (Friedman 1992). But there were also internal others – for example, very few people in Croatia (or former Yugoslavia) were aware of the work of Vera Erlich Stein until the mid-1970s. Furthermore, according to Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, her views were not part of the curriculum at the University of Zagreb (personal communication, 2001).

Linguistic boundaries seem to have figured prominently in the possibilities of academic interchange so, paradoxically, while by the late 1980s most scholars in the region read the works of their British, American, or French colleagues, anthropology in the region remained mostly *terra incognita* – at least until the 1988 congress of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) in Zagreb. As one can see from the papers in this volume, there were lively debates both within research traditions, and with the foreign scholars whose works were read and used. There were also some specific features – as implied by, for example, the classification of ethnology (and subsequently cultural anthropology) within the humanities – as opposed to within the social sciences as in Anglo-American traditions. The 1988 IUAES Congress provided an important point of the actual meeting of different traditions, and it was very important regionally.[7] By then, the changes that culminated in the fall of the Berlin Wall were already behind the corner. Socialism was losing the battle for the hearts and souls of the people in the 'people's democracies', and the new era was about to begin. Departments throughout the region were renamed after 1990,

[7] As well as locally – as Sklevicky and Supek organised a panel that practically introduced gender studies to Croatia and the whole of Yugoslavia.

but this was a product of sometimes almost a century of development, and not just the result of a Humpty Dumpty-like attitude as quoted at the beginning of this text.

One of the purposes of this volume is to open the door for communication between different scholars from different fields. Disciplinary allegiances aside, all the chapters point to constant questioning of the premises of how one might approach social, cultural, gender, ethnic, and other types of difference, and what it is that unites these differences within a single society. One of the main things that all the countries whose traditions are discussed here have in common is an attempt to situate all the differences within a framework of a single society.[8] Whether it will be possible remains to be seen.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Chris Hann for his comments, and for being the driving force behind this conference. The late Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin was mostly responsible for my interest in the former Yugoslav ethnologies and anthropologies. Many thanks are due to Vesna Godina for her support of my research and teaching in Slovenia.

References

Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do Things with Words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bošković, A. 2005. Distinguishing 'self' and 'other': Anthropology and national identity in former Yugoslavia. *Anthropology Today* 21 (2): 8-13.

——. 2010. We are all indigenous now: Culture versus nature in representations of the Balkans. In D. James, E. Plaice, and C. Toren (eds.), *Culture Wars: Context, Models and Anthropologists' Account*, pp. 86-96. Oxford and New York: Berghahn.

Carroll, L. 1992. Through the Looking-Glass and what Alice found There. In L. Carroll, *Alice in Wonderland*, pp. 105-198. Ware: Wordsworth Classics.

Clifford, J. 1988. On Orientalism. In J. Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, pp. 255-276. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[8] With the possible 'Bosnian exception' described in chapter 15.

Friedman, J. 1992. The Past in the Future: History and the Politics of Identity. *American Anthropologist* 94 (4): 837-859.

Hann, C., M. Sárkány, and P. Skalnik (eds.). 2005. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe*. Münster: LIT.

Herzfeld, M. 1986. *Ours once More: Folklore, Ideology, and the Making of Modern Greece*. New York: Pella.

–––––. 1987. *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaszycka K. A., G. Štrkalj, and J. Strzalko. 2009. Current Views of European Anthropologists on Race: Influence of Educational and Ideological Background. *American Anthropologist* 111: 43-56.

Mihăilescu, V., S. Naumović, and I. Iliev (eds.). 2008. *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II. Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe*. Münster: LIT.

Muršič, R., and M. Ramšak (eds.). 1995. *Razvoj slovenske etnologije od Štreklja in Murka do sodobnih etnoloških prizadevanj*. Ljubljana: Slovene Ethnological Society.

Perica, V. 2002. *Balkan Idols*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sax, W. S. 1998. The Hall of Mirrors: Orientalism, Anthropology, and the Other. *American Anthropologist* 100 (2): 292-301.

Todorova, M. 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Vlahović, P. 1971. Dr. Božo Škerlj in njegova pomen za etnično antropologijo. *Slovenski etnograf* 40/41: 101-104.

Contributors

Georgios Agelopoulos holds a PhD in Social Anthropology from the University of Cambridge. He is Assistant Professor in the Faculty of History and Archaeology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Nebi Bardhoshi received his PhD in Legal Ethnology from the History Faculty, University of Tirana. He is Associated Professor at the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Art Studies in Tirana.

Aleksandar Bošković holds a PhD in Social Anthropology from the University of St. Andrews. He is Professor of Anthropology in the Department of Ethnology and Anthropology, University of Belgrade, and Head of the Center for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research, Institute of Social Sciences, Belgrade.

Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou received a D.Phil. in Social Anthropology from Oxford University. She is Lecturer in Folklore and Society on the Faculty of Philology, Department of Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

Rozita Dimova received her PhD in Anthropology from Stanford University, and is Associate Professor at the Department of Slavonic and East-European Studies at Ghent University.

Albert Doja completed his PhD in Social Anthropology at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, and is University Professor at the Institute of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Sciences and Technologies, Lille.

Vesna V. Godina holds a PhD in Sociology from University of Ljubljana. She is Associate Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, and at the Faculty of Arts, University of Maribor.

Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik received a PhD in Ethnology from the University of Ljubljana. She has held the position of Head of the Institute of Slovenian Ethnology since 2010.

Chris Hann holds a PhD in Social Anthropology from the University of Cambridge. He is Director of the Department 'Resilience and Transformation in Eurasia' of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology.

Irena Martinović Klarić earned a PhD in Biology from the University of Zagreb. She is Scientific Advisor at the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, Zagreb, Croatia.

Armanda Kodra–Hysa holds a PhD in History with a specialisation in the field of Ethnology from the University of Tirana. She is currently the Alexander Nash

Fellow in Albanian Studies at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University College London.

Larisa Kurtović received her PhD in Anthropology from the University of California, Berkeley. She is Adjunct Professor in International Studies at DePaul University.

Robert Gary Minnich is Professor emeritus at the Department of Social Anthropology, University of Bergen. He completed his postgraduate studies (*magister artium* and *philosophiae doctor*) at the same department.

Vassilis Nitsiakos holds a PhD in Social Anthropology from the University of Cambridge and is currently Professor of Social Folklore at the Department of History and Archaeology, University of Ioannina.

Evthymios Papataxiarchis received his PhD in Social Anthropology from the London School of Economics. He is Professor in the Department of Social Anthropology and History, University of the Aegean.

Sanja Potkonjak holds a PhD in Ethnology/Cultural Anthropology from the University of Zagreb. She is scientific researcher at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Croatia.

Ljupčo S. Risteski received PhD in Ethnology at Sts. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje; he is professor at the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology at the same university.

Lidija Vujačić holds a PhD in Sociology from the University of Montenegro (Nikšić). She is Associate Professor, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Montenegro, Podgorica.

Index

Albanology 14, 154
anthropology; anthropological field 1-6, 8-10, 13, 15-21, 25-6, 28, 280, 293; applied 16, 34, 39, 201, 203, 208; biological 2, 17, 32n, 223, 230-1, 259-63, 267-9, 361, 362; as bourgeois science 4, 13, 53, 68, 70, 72, 134, 163, 210, 229, 317, 318, 320; courses of study in 18, 24, 55n, 56, 193, 224, 225n, 228-9, 231, 259, 276, 278, 298, 301, 306, 313, 351; empire-building 32, 160; history of 9, 22, 66; global 2, 3, 4, 8-9, 11, 18, 21-2, 24, 31-2, 35, 55n, 274, 294, 301, 344, 345, 360; legal 14, *see kanun*, law; linguistic 2, 13n, 100, 132, 140, 224, 229, 251, 263, 274, 294, 350; metropolitan 51, 67n, 263; militant 243-4, 251; nation-building 66, 154, 160, 163, 169, 197, 289, 300, 305, 331, 360; psychological 42, 43, 71, 101, 144, 161, 169, 206, 230, 242, 260; seminars in 17, 44, 47, 199, 225n, 273n, 275-8, 281, 282, 284, 298, 332; urban 283, 300, 302, 327, 329; white settler 34, *see also* biological anthropology; cultural anthropology; physical anthropology; social anthropology; socio-cultural anthropology
archaeology 42, 55-6, 70, 87, 94, 100, 130, 132, 140-1, 146, 263, 274, 276, 306, 323, 330, 361n
archive(s) 15, 65n, 70, 87, 91, 99-115, 136, 138, 144, 155, 159, 177, 178, 180, 181, 203n, 253-4, 276-8, 287, 297-8, 309, 314-6, 321, 323, 325-6, 331, 334
Association(s); of anthropology 19, 21, 226n, 234, 261, 268, 316, 360; of ethnic minorities 287; of ethnography 296; of folklore 296n, *see also* Societies
Athens Centre for Social Research 10-1, 65-6, 68, 73, 75-7
atlas; ethnographic 13, 107, 111
Austro-Hungarian Empire 7, 309, 310n, 311

Balkan Institute 311
Balkanism 153, 309, 359n
Battle of Kosovo 286
Bauernkunde 196
Beljkašić, L. 310, 313, 318, 324, 325, 328-31
biological anthropology 2, 17, 32n, 223, 230-1, 259-61, 263, 267, 269
Bošković, A. 28, 305n, 360, 364
Britain 5, 35, 41, 48, 51, 69, 77, 94, 149, 223n, 263
Buda, A. 132, 140, 141, 143, 182, 183

Campbell, J. 10, 37-41, 44n, 49, 51, 65, 76
Cepenkov, M. 278
Chatzimichali, A. 42, 44n, 114
Chinese Cultural Revolution 165, 183
collections of (national music, etc.) 42, 55, 105-107, 109, 114-5, 135, 155-6, 161, 164, 165n, 194, 201, 294-6, 305, 306, 334
Communist Party; (Yugoslav League of Communists) 137, 164, 201n, 209, 212, 227, 253, 277, 283
continuity thesis 42, 50, 53, 73n
cultural anthropology 288, 321, 333, 348-51, 362, 363, *see* anthropology
cultural-historical 193, 195, 196n, 203, 206, 208, 243, 299
culture, *see* folk culture; material culture; social culture; spiritual culture; traditional culture

culturologia 34n
customary law 14, 100, 109, 138, 147, 153, 155, 164, 166, 167, 175, 177.82, 184-5, 299, 360
Cvijić, J. 275, 305, 311, 314, 362n

Dimitriou, S. 52
Durham, E. 14, 136, 178

Ehrlich, L. 196n, 210
Enlightenment 156, 193, 305
Engels, F. 88, 134, 138, 140, 142, 143, 145, 146, 178, 183
Erlich Stein, V. 237-42, 254, 362, 363
ethnicity 8n, 18, 89, 137, 141, 212, 230, 233, 283, 285, 315, 330, 361n, 362n
ethnic minorities (Arbanasi; *Ciganite*; Muslims; Roma), 7, 11, 17, 20, 38, 66, 68, 78, 105, 114, 198, 226, 241, 264
ethnic relations 208, 226n, 294, 315
ethnikofrosyni 37, 38, 47, 49
ethnikos 33n, 103
ethnocentrism 36, 44, 53, 54, 153
ethnography (courses of, study in, seminars in) 1, 13, 17, 24, 34, 38, 39n, 40, 44, 49, 53, 65n, 91-2, 99, 129-33, 135-44, 146-7, 149, 154-7, 161, 175-9, 181-3, 185, 194-9, 202, 203n, 204-10, 212-3, 214n, 228, 237-9, 243-5, 247-8, 250, 252, 254-5, 273, 275, 282, 307, 321, 345, 350, 361
ethnografia 32, 361
ethnologia 32, 42, 55, 67, 70
ethnology 1, 13, 17-9, 34, 65n, 67-70, 76, 85, 88, 90, 93, 97, 101n, 117-8, 129-32, 138, 145, 154, 176-7, 191-9, 203n, 204-15, 223, 226, 228-9, 230n, 231, 237-40, 242-51, 252n, 254, 263, 273-8, 280-5, 287-303, 305-29, 331-5, 337, 338, 341, 347-51, 360, 361, 362; anthropologisation of 193, 301, *see also* anthropology, the anthropological field
ethnomusicology 99n, 110, 116, 130, 170, 313, 362
ethnosociology 118, 208, 322
etnografiia 157, 177
etnografia 132-3, 135, 139, 142, 176
etnografija 16, 194n, 197, 199n, 204, 206, 293, 361
etnologjia 132-3, 176
Evans-Pritchard, E. E. 40, 223n, 229
evolution 43, 69, 141-3, 146, 166, 247, 267, 281, 285, 291, 309, 313, 318, 320, 321, 325

family (Balkan) 3, 16, 239-42, *see also zadruga*
feudalism 14, 54, 134, 137, 148, 183, 184, 185, 206, 362
fieldwork 8, 10, 12-3, 18-9, 22-3, 25, 33, 35-6, 39-42, 44-5, 48-9, 51-2, 56, 69, 70n, 71, 75-6, 97, 99, 102-8, 110-3, 119, 132n, 136, 138, 142-3, 145, 159, 201, 232-3, 239, 263, 282, 288, 320, 321, 325, 328-30, 333, 341, 342, 344, 347, 351, 363
Filipović, M. 18, 19, 307, 308, 310-22, 324, 326, 331
folk life 91, 106, 133, 156, 192, 194-5, 197, 200, 202, 204, 244, 314
folk tale 89, 100, 102
folk culture 8, 14, 16, 24, 88, 93, 98, 100, 104, 106-7, 114-5, 129-30, 140-2, 149, 155, 161, 176, 179, 192-7, 201-3, 206-8, 278, 279, 298, 302
folklore 48, 278-281, 283, 285, 287, 289, 299, 300
folkloristika 130n, 157, 197n
First World War 67, 238, 308, 311, 313n

Food and Agricultural Organization 39n
France 6, 34, 48, 51, 69, 77, 91, 93-4, 101n, 149, 247, 261, 263, 284
Frazer, J. 14, 43, 70, 98, 158, 281
Funding 10, 20, 21, 25, 106, 203n, 205n, 269, 280n, 296n, 298, 307n, 362; Rockefeller Foundation 39n, 316

Gavazzi, M. 132, 306, 323, 362
geography 17, 45-6, 50, 76, 179, 266, 273-5, 277-83, 285, 287-9, 313, 319, 321, 323, 342, 347
Germany 2, 4, 16, 48, 69, 87, 89, 90, 93, 149, 162, 191, 263, 306
gender 3, 9, 11, 49, 51, 57, 111, 230, 233, 238, 250n, 251-2, 274, 283, 325, 329, 330, 363n, 364
Gjeçovi, S. 136, 153, 170, 178, 180, 182, 184
Gjergji, A. 138, 139, 142, 144, 178, 184
Grafenauer, I. 196n, 198n, 199n, 212, 213n
Greek diaspora 108, 114, 116

Hadži-Ristić, K. 309
Halpern, J. 145
Hann, C. 305, 364
Hasluck, M. 184
Haxhihasani, Q. 155
Heimatkunde 197
Hellenic Folklore Research Centre 97, 100, 102
Hellenism (also neo-) 33n, 34n, 53, 88, 154, *see also* pan-Hellenism
Herder, J. G. 12, 14, 133, 156, 182
historical materialism 4, 13-4, 16-8, 39n, 129, 131, 133-4, 138-9, 143, 145, 193, 198, 201, 206, 249
historicism 32, 131, 159
Hörmann, K. 309
Hoxha, E. 13, 14, 15, 21, 129, 134, 138, 142, 145, 149, 178, 182-4

ideology 4-5, 9, 13-4, 31, 36-7, 39n, 53n, 74, 90, 129, 133, 136-8, 140, 144, 147, 149, 154, 158-9, 161, 164-5, 167, 177, 182-5, 191-3, 201, 212-3, 227, 244, 246-7, 267, 286, 300, 308, 320
Illyrians 131, 141, 147, 264, 296
Ivanova, J. 175

Jukić, I. F. 309
Južnić, S. 16, 17, 19, 214, 223-34, 349-51, 360, 361

kanun 14, 15, 135, 136, 139, 148, 175-8, 179, 180-5, *see* law
Karavidas, K. 70, 77
Kardelj, E. 200, 203n, 227
Kilišić, Š. 18, 19, 300, 301, 311, 312, 317-26
Kingdom of Yugoslavia 275
Klemenčič, V. 342, 344, 347, 349
Konstantinov, M. 282-4
koinoniki anthropologia 10-3, 32-6, 50, 52-7, 70, 78
Kostallari, A. 139, 142, 184
Koumaris, I. 42, 43, 69, 70, 72, 78
Kremenšek, S. 16, 193, 204-13, 348-50
Kuhar, B.342, 344
kultura popullore 14, 39n, 142, 144, 155-9, 164, 179
kulturhistorische (School) 156
Kyriakides, S. 12, 42, 43, 68, 70, 85, 86-9, 91, 92, 94, 100-4
Kyriakidou-Nestoros, A. 12, 92, 93, 111, 115

laboratory (laboratoire) 23, 74, 78, 201, 262

language 1, 6, 7, 15, 22-4, 26, 32, 35, 41, 68, 71, 86-8, 99-100, 104, 114-5, 139, 141, 147, 161, 166, 175-6, 181, 225, 231-2, 238n, 251, 262, 264, 284, 285, 296, 302, 306, 316, 317, 324, 331, 344
laografia 7, 10, 13, 30, 32-8, 42-4, 47, 50-1, 53-7, 65, 67-8, 74, 76-7, 85, 89, 100-1, 103, 106, 109, 110, 114, 116-8
law (customary); *kanun* 14, 15, 135, 136, 139, 143, 175-6, 178-85
Lekatsas, P. 43, 52, 69, 74, 77
Lévi-Strauss, C. 12, 15, 71, 93, 111, 131, 154, 176, 177, 229
linguistic anthropology 224, 229
London School of Economics 11, 44, 52, 71, 76
Loukatos, D. 44n, 91-3, 102, 103n, 104, 109, 111, 115, 116
Ložar, R. 196, 198

Macedonia 6-7, 15, 17, 18, 20-1, 49n, 54, 56, 65n, 66n, 70n, 75, 86-8, 105, 192, 227, 273-83, 285-92, 314, 330, 360-2; Aegean Macedonia 276; Vardar Macedonia 275, 276
Malinowski, B. 11, 12, 32, 44, 52, 70, 71, 88, 131, 153, 178, 229, 320
Marx, K. 14, 88, 138, 143, 183, 201n
Marxism (critical, European, French, -Leninism) 11, 16-8, 39n, 43, 48, 50, 52-3, 90, 93, 131-5, 137, 139, 140, 142-4, 164, 178, 191-2, 193n, 198, 201n, 209, 211, 228, 248-9, 251
Marxist; anthropology 229n, 247-9; social theory 157, 247
material culture 24, 42, 91, 100, 101, 107, 110, 111, 116, 130, 138-40, 142, 144, 147, 155-8, 180, 195, 202, 285, 291, 298, 302, 317, 324, 326, 360
Maver, H. 8, 17, 260-2
Megas, G. 12, 42, 68, 70, 85, 89-91, 101-6, 108-10, 113-6
Meraklis, M. 55, 67, 92, 93, 101, 104n, 111, 113, 117
Milingkou-Markantoni, M. 105, 114, 115
military/ junta (in Greece) 5, 12, 36, 46-7, 48, 65, 77
modernisation; effects on traditional subjects 158, 241, 327; role of discipline in 33, 39, 68, 156, 166-7, 178, 185, 243n, 321; state projects of 9, 11, 18, 19, 36, 56, 65, 66, 78, 317, 319, 329
Morgan, L. H. 43, 133, 134, 140, 178
Murko, M. 194
Muršič, R. 226, 361
museums 6, 42, 55, 117, 139, 197, 208, 273, 277, 280n, 293, 313, 361, 362; anthropological 69, 70; ethnographic 114, 115, 198, 201, 202n, 203n, 213, 275n, 294-7, 342; national 16, 20-1, 166, 197, 210, 295, 305; *Zemaljski muzej* 18, 19, 20, 306, 307, 309, 311, 322-3, 327, 332-3, 361n
Muslims 11, 114, 226, 241, 287, *see* ethnic minorities
mythology 85, 87, 100, 138, 144, 147, 148, 155, 195n, 199n, 286

narod 7, 15-6, 295, 308, 316, 321
narodnost (minority) 285
narodopis 7, 15, 16, 194, 285, 348, 360
narodopisje 194, 196-7, 198n, 199n, 203n
National Revival 133, 137, 149, 287
nationalism 11, 14, 44, 63, 84, 87, 91, 131, 136, 154, 161-3, 169, 172, 175, 176, 277, 279, 281, 283, 285, 332-4
nation-building 9, 15, 21, 24, 31, 32, 66, 79, 102, 154, 160, 163, 169, 197, 289, 300, 305, 328, 331, 360

'New Man' 39, 165, 182
Nopcsa, F. 136, 141, 143, 178

Orel, B. 16, 198, 200, 202, 203, 212, 213
Orientalism 3, 154, 335, 359
Ottoman Empire 7, 70, 143, 148, 154, 264, 294, 309
Oxford University 10, 40-1, 44, 49, 76, 78, 210

Papić, Ž. 251
participant observer/observation 35, 110, 342, 347, 348
Petropoulos, D. 91, 92, 101, 102, 110, 111, 115
philology 42, 55, 99, 100, 113, 161, 162, 197, 362
physical anthropology 1-5, 9-22, 25-8, 30-6, 38-46, 49-63, 65-7, 69-84, 88, 90, 93, 94, 97-9, 103, 106, 111, 112, 116-24, 129, 131, 132, 143, 145, 154-57, 159, 162, 169-77, 223, 225, 228, 231, 259, 262, 268, 274, 281, 350, 361, 362, *see* biological anthropology, anthropology
patriarchy/ patriarchal 9, 16, 51, 144, 147, 165, 181, 183, 238-41, 246, 254, 293, 299, 316
Peristiany, J. 40, 44-7, 50, 54, 65, 73, 76
Politis, N. 67, 85, 87, 100-6, 110, 113
post-war 33, 35-7, 39, 42, 45, 46, 90, 183, 197-8, 201, 205, 212-3, 312, 313, 315, 317, 332, 333
Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark 11, 43, 65, 66, 71-5, 77-8
psychology 11, 16, 50, 54, 66, 69, 70, 71, 90, 111n, 161, 166, 238, 240, 321, 324
public folklore 106

race 17, 43, 70, 230, 231, 233, 267-8, 273n, 285, 362
Radić, A. 239, 306
religious organisations (role of churches, monasteries) 6, 43, 66n, 91, 101, 109, 118, 138, 144, 158, 164, 165, 195n, 196n, 209
Reliktforschung 158
Rihtman, C. 309, 313, 324
Rihtman-Auguštin, D. 16, 237, 240, 243-6, 252, 254, 255, 318, 327, 334, 362-4
Romans 73, 147, 264, 296
Romanticism 33, 154, 162
Rudan, P. 8, 17, 260-3, 266, 267
Rusiń, B. 273n, 275n, 276-80, 282, 289
Russia 2, 3, 16, 71, 149, 154, 175, 191, 210, 226n, 247, 303, 348

Second World War 6, 34, 35, 38, 67, 68, 70, 74, 75, 78, 86, 87, 88, 98, 133, 136, 137, 157, 181, 191-2, 194, 197, 208-9, 223, 238-9, 243n, 247n, 252, 254, 260, 275, 294, 295, 311, 312, 315, 321, 323, 328, 360, 361, 362
Shkurti, S. 130, 131, 142n, 143, 144, 179n
Sklevicky, L. 17, 237, 244, 246, 250-5, 363
social anthropology 1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, 26, 33, 34, 35, 44, 45, 50, 52-6, 59, 61, 66, 69, 70, 72-4, 76, 78, 88, 93, 94, 97, 98, 117, 119, 122, 155, 160, 225, 226n, 230
social culture 138, 144, 195
socialism 1, 3, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19-21, 24, 48, 57, 86, 90, 124, 129, 130, 131, 132, 139, 149, 151, 153, 155, 157, 158, 162-70, 174, 179, 184-5, 191-3, 198, 203n, 209, 214-5, 226, 227n, 262
Societies 52n, 56n, 68, 76n, 87, 104, 117, 137, 159

sociology 1, 16, 26, 36, 38, 39, 45, 46, 50-4, 61, 62, 68, 76, 80-2, 90, 97, 111, 118, 119, 134, 141, 142, 151, 173, 192, 207n, 208, 210, 211n, 213, 223-4, 238n, 242, 243n, 247n, 250n, 274, 299, 301, 313, 322, 327, 332, 333, 345, 349, 350
Soviet Union 4, 192, 200, 210, 226
spiritual culture 22, 130, 138, 139, 157, 184, 195, 202, 282, 294, 323, 326
Spoudasterion Laografias 74, 114
Škerlj, B. 214, 223, 228, 231, 261, 361
Štrekelj, K. 194
Švob, T. 261, 267, 271
statistics 263, 266
Stocking, G. 2, 31, 32, 34, 281
structuralism 48, 50, 53, 93, 111, 318
subculture 17, 24, 244-6, 254
Supek (Zupan), O. 17, 237, 239, 247-50, 254, 255, 363n
survival 12, 18, 83, 102, 146, 158, 159, 164, 178, 182, 319, 320, 321
survivalism 85, 102
Svetieva, A. 282, 283, 288, 289

taxonomy 159, 242
Tirta, M. 129-32, 144, 176, 177, 181
Todorova, M. 30, 154, 359
Tokarev, S. A. 16, 210
tradition; criticism of 158-9, 167, 193, 244-6; definition of 3, 133-4, 136, 137, 141, 183, 298; as problem for socialism 164, 168, 300
traditional culture 110, 134, 136, 158, 176, 182-3, 242, 244, 245, 278, 298, 300, 353
Trifunoski, J. 286
Tylor, E. 14, 98, 102, 158, 178

Uçi, A. 129, 130, 142-4
UNESCO 44-6, 75, 267
unilineal 40, 134, 140
United States 4, 7, 17, 48, 51, 77, 82, 93, 94, 98, 111, 198n, 223n, 228, 247n, 263, 274, 349
University; of the Aegean 11, 54, 56, 65, 115; of Athens 38, 42, 55, 65, 69, 70n, 72, 74, 75, 76n, 77n, 78n, 87, 89, 99-101, 105, 109, 113-4; of Bergen 25, 341, 342, 349; of Belgrade 6, 17, 18, 223n, 276, 283, 287, 297, 306, 312, 313, 324; of Crete 56, 92; of Ioannina 12, 50, 55, 77n, 92, 93, 113, 115, 116; of Ljubljana 6, 15, 17, 19, 197, 209, 225-6; of Montenegro 6, 15, 18, 21; of Patras 92; of Sarajevo 18, 19, 20, 21, 262, 305, 313, 319; of Thessaloniki 12, 42, 50, 55, 68, 72, 77n, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92-3, 94, 113, 115; of Thessaly 56, 65; of Thrace 55n, 101, 102, 115; of Zagreb 6, 8, 18, 179, 238n, 243n, 247n, 250n, 252n, 260-2, 267, 306; of Zadar 247n; Ionian 113n; Panteion 56, 65; Sts. Cyril and Methodius 273, 282, 283, 289
urbanisation 9, 167, 203
Urosević, A. 276

Venizelism (anti-Venizelist) 33n, 66n
Vienna cultural-historical school 196
Vlahović, P. 261, 297n, 362n
Volksgeist 7, 156, 162, 185
Volkskunde 2, 7, 16, 32, 38, 42, 67, 100, 101, 156, 162, 168, 192-3, 194n, 195, 205, 230n, 308, 331
Völkerkunde 2, 16, 34, 67, 160, 193, 194n, 195, 205, 210, 230n
von Hahn, G. 179, 184
Vojvodina 227, 285, 316
Vukmanović, J. 296, 297

War; Balkan Wars 67, 87, 276, 359; Greek Civil War 4n, 74n, 75, 88,

89; Ottoman Wars 148; Yugoslav War 227n
women; subculture of 17, 244-6, 254; ethnography of 17, 51, 113; anthropology of 17, 244-6, 250-1

Xhagolli, A. 129, 130

Zadruga 3, 244-5
Zarnik, B. 260
Zojzi, R. 13-5, 132-8, 140, 144, 155, 178-82, 184

Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia

"... anthropology needs a broader vision. It needs to shake off its strong association with the primitive and the exotic and become genuinely global in its comparisons. From this perspective, more sustained attention to Eurasia and a renewed focus on its underlying unity might launch the transformation of our parochial scholarly traditions into a mature cosmopolitan science."
– Chris Hann, in his Preface to this series

The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945–1991

The social lives of the peoples of the Balkans have long stimulated the imagination of their northern European neighbours, including anthropologists. Yet these peoples and places have anthropological traditions of their own, shaped initially by nationalist movements and later (more superficially) by socialism and other political constraints. This volume explores the anthropological field between Greece and Slovenia when political pressures were strongest, in the era of the Cold War. However, the environments were by no means uniformly repressive. These studies provide indispensable insights for new generations pursuing innovative research agendas in this region in the new century; they also raise deeper issues about the boundaries and substance of the anthropological endeavour.

Contributors:

Georgios Agelopoulos, Nebi Bardhoshi, Aleksandar Bošković, Vassiliki Chryssanthopoulou, Rozita Dimova, Albert Doja, Vesna V. Godina, Chris Hann, Armanda Kodra-Hysa, Larisa Kurtović, Irena Martinović Klarić, Robert Gary Minnich, Vassilis Nitsiakos, Evthymios Papataxiarchis, Sanja Potkonjak, Ljupčo S. Risteski, Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik, Lidija Vujačić

978-3-643-90507-9

LIT
www.lit-verlag.ch