

TWO FACES OF THE MONUMENT: POLITICS AND PRACTICES IN THE USAGES OF THE MONUMENT TO THE PEASANT REVOLT AND MATIJA GUBEC IN GORNJA STUBICA

(Translation)

TOMISLAV OROZ
University of Zadar
Department of Ethnology and Anthropology
Dr. Franje Tuđmana 24i, 23 000 Zadar

DOI: 10.17234/SEC.27.4
Original scientific paper
Received: 1 March 2015
Accepted: 6 August 2015

NEVENA ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ*
University of Zagreb
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology
Ivana Lučića 3, 10 000 Zagreb

The aim of the paper is to analyze the Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec in Gornja Stubica as materialised memory of the past constructed in relation to present-day circumstances. The monument is approached through the prism of people who use it and bring it to life in diverse ways, with the emphasis on their cultural practices and performances in the memorial space. Out of a number of potential approaches to the Monument, the authors focus on its two faces, related to two historical moments, but also two different modes of memory. One is connected with the construction of the monument and its commemorative and anniversary usages in socialism. The other is created in the 21st century, when images of the past also become embodied in living history performances.

Keywords: *Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec in Gornja Stubica, Antun Augustinčić, socialism, Chivalry Tournament, Gubec Theatre, social memory*

“May this monument – a monumental work by our talented sculptor Augustinčić – be an embodiment of the continuity of our peoples’ struggle for a better life, social justice and freedom, and their vitality in that struggle. May it stand as a reminder to the present and future generations of the common interests and the destined interconnectedness of our peoples, of the brotherhood and unity as

* The contribution by Nevena Škrbić Alempijević was a part of the project *City-making: space, culture and identity* (project leader: Jasna Čapo Žmegač, PhD, no.: 2350), financed by the Croatian Science Foundation

the fundamental guarantee of their living in freedom and peace and their continued progress.” (Broz Tito 1975:[s.p.]

“Gubec theatre used the combined techniques of animation, film and light effects to bring the Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec to life. It connected a historical theme with ample rhetoric of an art work in a creative way. A special novelty was the way in which some of the characters were ‘animated’ on the monument itself so that they moved in a whirl of colours and shapes thereby constantly intensifying the experience. As the 21st century is the period of flourishing new technologies, we have shown how new dimensions contributed to connecting virtual solutions, works of art and public memory and in this manner transformed a real historical event into a multimedia national legend.”¹

INTRODUCTION

The paper views the Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec in Gornja Stubica as the materialised memory of selected episodes from history, namely heroes and victims, which has been objectifying and evoking the existing imagery and narrations about the past from its inception in the 1960s until today. We approach it as a focal point of diverse cultural practices which bring to life dynamic dialogues between past and present in order to legitimate, and sometimes re-examine a present social order (Connerton 1989:3). In research we ask the following questions: what are the motives for taking a historical figure from the 16th century out of the pages of history text-books and relocating it in the immediate and imminent present day of the second half of the 20th century? What caused the Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec to become an obligatory reference in culture and tourism supply of Croatian Zagorje which puts it shoulder to shoulder with already trusted places of gathering and pilgrimage like Marija Bistrica or political tourism destinations like Kumrovec? We shall try to shed

¹ <http://www.msb.mhz.hr/html/projekti/teatar.html> (accessed 10/3/2015)

light on the above mentioned questions by focusing on constructing and using the Monument in Gornja Stubica as a materialisation of the images of the past, which have performative potential and which are created in accordance with the present day needs.

The Monument itself represents an artistic intervention in a rural landscape of Croatian Zagorje and is a part of the Peasant Revolt Museum inventory, one of the sections of the Croatian Zagorje Museum. Therefore, researchers can discuss it from the standpoint of cultural policy. However, researching the social production of public space by way of materialised memory in it does not exhaust the possibilities of monument interpretation in ethnology and cultural anthropology, bearing in mind the numerous and heterogeneous instances of monument social construction, its everyday reinterpretations, usage and imagination (cf. Low and Lawrence-Zúñiga 2003). As a result, it is our goal to simultaneously cover the politics of remembering and the practices/materialised memory that this monument reflects and at the same time generates. In such an analysis a fruitful link between these spheres reveals a concept of representational space, which Henri Lefebvre designates as the arena in which images and complex symbolisms embodied in space are brought to life through experiences and actions of its various users (1991:33).² We are interested to see how and for whose benefit history had been concretised in space by means of a monument, thereby creating in it the “enacting of the everyday” (Rihtman-Auguštin 2000:16).

Although the statue of Gubec with open arms with a petrified and seemingly unchanged face had been greeting the visitors to the Oršić Palace, a part of the Peasant Revolt Museum, for several decades, the diversity of cultural practices enacted at the foot of the Monument could by no means be reduced to the lowest common denominator. Out of a multitude of different possible views, we chose two from which to observe the Monument in more detail. We wish to present its two socially constructed faces: a public

² Representational space, together with spatial practices and representations of space, constitute the elements of Lefebvre’s concept triad through which he explains the social definition of public space (1991:1-67).

one, inaugurated on the occasion of putting up the Monument in 1973 and a newly interpreted one through mechanisms of revitalizing history by organizing Chivalry Tournaments and other public events to which the Monument has been a backdrop since 2000. Although these two ways of using the monument are not mutually exclusive, we insist on their separate representation. Not only does this reflect the dichotomy of official and public use of monuments in two different periods, but it also increases the visibility of diverse practices which are re-enacted in the immediate vicinity of the monument. One of the problems that we touch upon is the question of its usage. Should we perceive Antun Augustinčić's work primarily as a monument or is it rather to be viewed as a backdrop to be adapted to various performances? The latter approach has been referred to us by the staff of the Museum that the monument belongs to: "Today the monument is used as a stage, but it is because it was constructed as one. It was designed so that different events can be organised there. The monument has a PA system, (...) there are changing rooms behind it. The fact that it is used as a stage today is in accordance with its original design".³ By analyzing the performative function of the Monument in the socialist and post-socialist period, based on the research of diverse practices that take place in its immediate vicinity, we shall try to examine the relationship between historical narratives which emanate from the Monument's dais and their reception and reproduction. The performative dimension of the social dynamics that is instigated by the Monument refers us to Erving Goffman's theoretical hypotheses and the way he problematizes dramatizations of everyday situations. When asked about how we present ourselves in everyday life, Goffman offers a reply by making an analogy between social interactions in everyday life and mechanisms of performance in the institutional theatre. He observes social situations through the prism of a theatre play and considers the complexity of social roles and performances through a metaphor about audience and performers (1956:8-9). In the paper we look at the presentational component in connection to both faces of the Monument which we are presenting. In doing so we are aware of the fluid boundary between the audience and the performers that Goffman warns about (*ibid.*).

³ From the interview with Vlatka Filipčić Maligec, museum consultant and current director of the Peasant Revolt Museum in Gornja Stubica, conducted on 10 February 2015.

We are basing our analysis on diverse methodological procedures and various materials which could shed light on the Monument's contemporary as well as its past usage. Such materials encompass media reports on the occasion of the Monument's ceremonial unveiling on the eve of the Peasant Revolt quadricentennial; monographs and magazines published to mark the celebration; different visual materials that could explain how the Monument was experienced in the 1970s. We are aware that such a dominant discourse, which followed the creation of the Monument, in many ways remains devoid of heterogeneous experiences, impressions and practices that are not in line with its official purpose. Unofficial, individual and variable uses of the Monument often went unrecorded in the available source. The aim was to create an impression that the official, "monumental" face of the monument was at the same time the only possible face of the socialist views of the Peasant Revolt and therefore the only one worth mentioning. Wishing to distance ourselves from the thesis that there could only be one, generally accepted face of the Monument during the socialist period, in the first part of the paper we shall give an analysis of the Monument policy which was orchestrated by those on top of the social hierarchy.

Furthermore, we tried to make the understanding of its contemporary needs easier through interviews with those who implement the policy concerning the Monument by observing and participating in contemporary events like the Chivalry Tournament in Gornja Stubica, which takes place in the vicinity of the Monument, Gubec Theatre project presentation and by means of professional and scientific papers on the Monument that problematize its artistic, historical and commemorative functions. Among the many present day reinterpretations of Gubec's figure by means of the Monument, we chose to do a more detailed research of those reinterpretations that are encompassed by the phrase "re-enactment of history".⁴

⁴ We would like to stress that the two faces of the Monument, which we are elucidating in the paper, are by no means considered representational or indeed the only ones. Each of the cultural practices in the two time periods is relevant and worthy of attention and research. However, an analysis which would comprise the overall multitude of perceived practices and the complexity of meaning that are attributed to it goes beyond the scope of this paper. We feel that in focusing on but two faces of the Monument we can still provide insight into some of the ways in which people re-enacted specific historical events in the landscape during the two observed periods.

“A PLACE OF GATHERING, A PLACE OF NEW CREATION” – THE CREATION OF THE MONUMENT TO THE PEASANT REVOLT AND MATIJA GUBEC

“Now we have a monument to the Peasant Revolt around which hundreds of people from all over the country gather daily. As was once customary to go on a pilgrimage to Marija Bistrica, today the same journey is taken to visit the monument in Stubica. No monument has attracted so many visitors, and that fact speaks for itself, proving that the monument is fulfilling its intended function”. (Sabolić 1974:84–85).

The intention of this chapter is to refer to the relationship with the past that is re-enacted by erecting a Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec, that we have been following through available sources like newspaper articles, writings of politically and socially engaged persons of the time, monographs published on important occasions and professional periodicals. The end of WWII and the introduction of a socialist political system marked the beginning of a new era in which the ways of interpreting and using the historical figure of Gubec were largely determined by the ideological worldview and political reversals in the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia. From sporadic announcements during WWII in which the revolt embodied in the figure of Gubec calls for denouncing authorities and joining the Partisan movement (cf. Žanić 1998:315–320) to post-war rhetoric which tries to pacify his rebel spirit, the activation of the symbolic potential of the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec has been adapted to the needs of time, changing accordingly its dynamics, rhetoric and addressees. In spite of creating a dominant narrative about Gubec’s rebellion which paved the way to the Yugoslav Front of the World War II and Tito’s historical greatness, the political discourse on Gubec during almost 50 years of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia should not be considered static and petrified. In socialism Matija Gubec is depicted as a dynamic, complex and layered phenomenon that has been changing its configuration and adapting to new contexts. Unlike the war cries of Gubec’s name⁵, reaching for the revolutionary aspect of his subsequently written biography in times of peace did not call for the “clinking of weapons” but rather for the post war recovery of the country and putting in place the socialist

system. Also, when it comes to constructing adequate social remembering, the emphasis is transferred from Matija Gubec to the Peasant Revolt because it symbolises the power of the proletariat. In the dissemination of ideological heritage of a barely finished “socialist revolution” and “national liberation” that stuck to the already proven tenets of media propaganda (Senjković 2008:59–60), the topos of the Peasant Revolt became an apt metaphor for the values of liberty, brotherhood and unity. For example, in Miroslav Krleža’s speech in Stubica in 1951, the historical martyrdom of the peoples of Yugoslavia is evoked by means of remembering the Peasant Revolt which is, according to Krleža’s interpretation, a reflection of “the will for national freedom, social justice and equality” and “a signpost in dark historical times (cf. 1975:[s.p.]). Its significance for the present times, comparable to the French Revolution and the socialist revolution under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito, is further emphasized by Krleža by means of a dramatic description of the fatal battle, images of light and darkness, good and evil, disenfranchised people and the arrogant potentates.

Ideas on how to appropriately mark the monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec fell on fertile ground in subsequent years, which resulted in specific proposals for putting up memorials devoted to them.⁶ Thus, for example, in a newspaper article from 29 October 1954 published in *Glas Hrvatskog Zagorja* and entitled “Augustinčić and Zagorje”, which

⁵ A clear example of evoking Matija Gubec’s revolutionary tendencies during WWII is noticeable in Tito’s address to the Croats. Tito evoked the memory of Gubec “who fought for freedom and justice in the past” (Damjanović 1983:61), while he instructed the partisans to “sing partisan songs” as they pass through Croatian villages, “especially the song about Matija Gubec in order to instigate rebellious feelings and mass physical resistance of the Croatian peasants and broad masses of workers” (Jelić 1973:336).

⁶ Josip Mataić, one of the members of the Committee for the Celebration of the Peasant Revolt quadricentennial, states in his records of the first ideas about the monument that the first Committee for monument building was set up as early as in 1951. However, it did not come to be at the time. Monuments to the Peasant Revolt were erected as early as in 1962. According to the data provided by the current Museum of the Peasant Revolt Director, Vlatka Filipčić Maligec, a memorial was put up on Kapelščak hill in the same year and a memorial plaque was put up on the house under Gubec’s linden tree by mountaineers (2010:72).

depicted life and work of the most famous sculptor from Zagorje – Antun Augustinčić, a special emphasis is given to his deep connection to Croatian Zagorje which “calls and attracts him”, which speaks to him in “that special voice of childhood experiences and first excitements” (Krklec 1975: [s.p.]). Although the article pays tribute to his work and states that his “monument to Marshal Tito in Kumrovec still sounds its bronze echo”, it raises a question of Augustinčić could pay the debt to his native Zagorje in the form of a monument to one of Zagorje’s greatest sons. “Stubica is there, with the old linden tree in the village... As soon as I meet him, I shall whisper in his ear, how wonderful it would be if he could design and create another piece, a monument to Matija Gubec in his birthplace”. (ibid.). *The Committee for the celebration of the quadricentennial of the Peasant Revolt* was set up in 1966 in response to Krleža’s considerations on the significance of the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec in the current political moment (cf. Vujčić 2013:3).⁷

“In a historical setting especially characteristic of Stubica, hills and vales, villages, hamlets and settlements exude an air of history” (Zdunić 1975:[s.p.]). Cultural policy makers of the time were of the opinion that in building a monument in a space that exudes history, to borrow Drago Zdunić’s words, the ambience of the space and its historical component needed to be taken into account as well as its physical properties. The first attempts at evaluation of the natural ambience in which the intervention was planned underline the state of disrepair and neglect of Samac hill in Gornja Stubica, which the construction of the monument was to address. After the hill had been cleared of acacia coppices and overgrown vineyards, nature and landscape potential became evident, which made it possible for the monument to be seamlessly embedded in the historical dimension of the space (Mataić 1975: [s.p.]). During the time of drafting its concept

⁷ In the article “Sketches from prehistoric times of the Peasant Revolt Museum (from the Museum’s newspaper library 1959-1973 and the documents on Museum establishment) Vlatka Filipčić Maligec references 1963 as a year in which the Committee was founded (2010:72), with a remark that the Committee did not become a reality in that year. *Matija Gubec* monograph, published on the occasion of the anniversary and *Memories of the Monument* publication both cite 1966 as the year of its founding (c.f. Zdunić 1975; Vujčić 2013:4).

design on a historical stage with dense symbolic interlinkages, the answers to questions about what the Monument should be dedicated to and in what ways memory should be recorded in space, were often changed and expanded.⁸ The original plans of a memorial to the Peasant Revolt were subsequently expanded to include the construction of a number of facilities, such as a road called Yugoslav People's Army Linden Avenue, which would connect the Monument with the Oršić Palace thus "completing a logical whole of authentic historical events" (*ibid.*).⁹ The request for respecting the special characteristics of the setting became even more prominent in the legal provisions of the Law on Erecting Monuments to Historical Events and Persons that stipulated that monuments "make an organic whole with real life" (Vujčić 2013:5). Considerations of Josip Mataić, the president of the Fund for the Monument Construction and the celebration of the Peasant Revolt quadricentennial, which was founded on 20 March 1969 in

⁸ Initial ideas about a memorial to the Peasant Revolt speak of the need to have a monument to Matija Gubec (c.f. Krklec 1975:[s.p.]), and only later it a monument to the Peasant Revolt mentioned (Mataić 1975:[s.p]). The institutional coordination of memorial area and facilities began with the setting up of the Fund for the Monument Construction (*ibid.*; Vujčić 2013).

⁹ On the anniversary of the Peasant Revolt many tourist agencies organized excursions to Gubec's native land and the winners of school history competitions were often awarded visits to Gubec's native land (Mataić 1974:93). Newspaper headlines report on the tour "Following in the footsteps of Zagorje and Gubec's brigades", which included visiting historical sites in Croatian Zagorje that are important for understanding the history of the Yugoslav Front of WWII and the Peasant Revolt. The tour ended in students' parade along the Yugoslav National Army Linden Avenue and in an assembly under Gubec's linden tree where WWII soldiers told children their memories of Partisan days, which were completed by references to Matija Gubec (c.f. N.R. 1972:7). "Right here, under this tree, and on Zagorje soil, where we keep the tradition worthy of a hero such as Matija Gubec and the ideals that he fought for. A file of young men and women carrying flags were brought to this historical place by soldiers of the Yugoslav Front of WWII, presidents of war veterans' associations from Varaždin and Donja Stubica, comrades Franjo Žitnjak and Fabijan Sukelj, in order to tell them a few proud words about what Matija Gubec had started and Josip Broz Tito finished on the lines of what Miroslav Krleža wrote about this place some twenty years ago: 'Our will to live today is the will for social justice, egalitarianism, equality and national freedom, these were the slogans under which Matija Gubec and his Stubica comrades had given their lives'" (*ibid.*).

Donja Stubica, go along the same lines. A few days before the unveiling ceremony Mataić said that “the monument gives the impression of having been standing on this spot for hundreds of years” (Mataić 1975: [s.p.]).

The first outlines of the monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec began to emerge in the 1960s, when Antun Augustinčić was contacted by the members of the Committee asking him to come up with a concept design for the memorial space. However, the adoption of the Law on Erecting Monuments to Historical Events and Persons from 1967 temporarily put Augustinčić’s work on the project on hold.¹⁰ Namely, according to the above mentioned Law, “a general nation-wide, anonymous tender” had to be launched prior to the building of a monument of architectural or artistic significance. One of the provisions in the tender called for the monument to be built at the foot of the Oršić Palace, popularly called Gubec’s home, without spoiling the landscape characteristics. More than 80 different concept designs were submitted for assessment by the jury of experts, which consisted of renowned art historians, authors, artists, civil engineers, urban planners and architects, provoking different and often contradictory reactions to the visions of the future monument. “Opinions on sculptors’ searches for new forms and their rebelling against the conventional representations were expressed; the difficulties in transforming an idea into a symbol were discussed together with the monument’s purpose and future and the ways in which it could be reconciled with the environment and the palace.” (Vujčić 2013:6). Disagreement among jury members led to shortlisting 6 designs, although they were all characterized as excessive and either ambiguous in terms of ideas or unnaturally abstract so that they could not be embedded in the picturesque landscape near the Oršić Palace (Filipčić Maligec 2010:74-78).¹¹ Moreover, even newspaper articles that

¹⁰ *Official Gazette*, no. 1, year XXIV, 12 January 1968.

¹¹ Upon the completion of the tender, all of the 86 works that participated were exhibited at the Art Pavillion. Branko Ružić’s work no. 37, which was the runner-up, provoked the most discussion among jury members, but also in the media space. For example, *Večernji list* published an article “A bit of joke, a bit of reality – on the monuments to the Peasant Revolt”, in which the author poses the following question: “What would a person from Zagorje say if he saw the legendary Peasant Revolt depicted as three upright bludgeons and a line of concrete walls stacked together?” (Filipčić Maligec 2010:78)

were following the discussions between advocates for and against the abstract vision of the monument, sided with those who criticized the runner-up Branko Ružić's design. It reminded a journalist of the *Večernji list* daily Vlado Novak of "lunar modules, advertisements for plywood or Ferimport (chain of DIY stores; translator's note), Pharaonic tombs" (ibid.). In contrast to the abstract proposals, figurative concept designs, which Antun Augustinčić had preferred, were more acceptable to the jury members. After the decision had been made not to award the first prize, the jury directly contacted Antun Augustinčić with an *ad hoc* offer and he accepted the task of creating the monument. The construction lasted two years and the monument was completed a few days before the ceremony marking the quadricentennial of the Peasant Revolt on 14 October 1973. Augustinčić designed the monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec as a "great stage for historical events" (Mataić 1974:95), "a panoramic vision of people's life and suffering", that is to say "a place where people gather, a place for new creation" (Mataić 1975: [s.p.]). Therefore, he designed it as an open stage carved into a hillside from where there is an open view of Donja Stubica. The backdrop to the monument consists of two wings 20 meters long and 7.5 meters tall. The left wing depicts an image of the battle of Stubica, while the right offers a collage of characters from Krleža's collection of poems *Ballad of Petrica Kerempuh* (c.f. Vujčić 2013:10–12). The figure of Matija Gubec is a departure from the figurative narration of the monument's wings with arms spread, outstretched towards the sky with clenched fists. It is 6.5 meters tall and Gustav Krklec described it as a tragic figure which is at the same time an invisible link between two past, i.e. "a symbol of a folk leader engaged in conflicts long gone at odds with unsustainable reality" (Krklec 1975: [s.p.]). The figure of Matija Gubec in the central part of the dais dominates the Monument and is juxtaposed with the figure of Petrica Kerempuh, Krleža's folk chronicler and caustic observer of a century-long oppression of the people. Augustinčić's contemporaries also found their place in the figurative narration of the Monument such as Miroslav Krleža¹² positioned on the left wing of the Monument observing the battle of Stubica, Josip Mataić, president of the Fund, and on the right

¹² Krleža was located on the left hand side as an observer of historical events.

Vladimir Herljević, a sculptor who collaborated with Augustinčić and Velibor Mačukatin. Positioning the living contemporaries in the relief representation of a historical event and in the phantasmagorical *Ballad of Petrica Kerempuh* literary work, and constructing a dais, which makes it possible to enter the space that emanates history, indicate the omnitemporal universality of the Peasant Revolt.

From today's perspective the ceremony of unveiling the Monument in Gornja Stubica appears to be a combination of highly stylized and formalized commemorative celebrations. Newspaper articles and occasional publications like monographs complete the atmosphere with a festive mood. They report on the audience's piety, Yugoslav Republics' flags and banners addressed to Tito and Gubec. Descriptions of events that took place on the day of the ceremonial unveiling of the Monument not only abound with exact protocol detail, but also help create a feeling of mysticism that envelops the overall occasion. Thus, there is a description of the fog that hangs over the Monument but recedes just as Tito approaches it and there is a clear view from Gubec's home on the valley filled with visitors. "In the valley below, a unique sight: a sea of vehicles emerges through the fog, whole fields are overflowing with them, all roads are filled with buses and cars, rows of trains are on the railway tracks, and people are still pouring in" (Mataić 1974:97). Soon a line of cars with Tito emerges from the multitude. He is greeted by the Yugoslav People's Army, and young men and women dressed in folk costumes. "The gathering place is chock-full and looks like a beehive. Flags are flying; people are cheering and applauding to comrade President and other guests. Everyone is elated and comrade Tito is overjoyed and in a very good mood." (ibid.). The formalised and performative languages are intertwined, as Paul Connerton points out (1989:58), which helps create authenticity, sincerity and the sanctity of the Peasant Revolt and the figure of Gubec and is especially emphasised on the day re-enacting the figurative narration in the background. It speaks of the figure of Gubec, the Peasant Revolt and its place in the history of the Yugoslav Front of WW II. Gun salutes are fired, the national anthem is performed ceremonially, praising the socially acceptable image of a folk hero who contributed to the development of socialist, liberal, national ideas. Jakov Blažević, the Speaker of the House in the Socialist Republic of Croatia,



Figure 1: Josip Broz Tito before the ceremony of unveiling the Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec on October 14, 1973. Source: Zdunić, Drago, ed. 1975. Matija Gubec: monografija o spomeniku Seljačkoj buni i Muzeju seljačkih buna u Gornjoj Stubici. Gornja Stubica: Muzej seljačkih buna, Zagreb: Spektar, p. 44

pointed to the importance of the Peasant Revolt in his speech. He characterised Augustinčić's vision of the revolt as "a monument which will re-enact history and connect it with the socialist present". (1974: [s.p.]). The incumbent Zagreb mayor, Ivo Vrhovec, saw the monument as a link between the liberal past and the socialist future (c.f. Zdunić 1975: [s.p.]). Just before Tito ceremonially took the cover off the monument (Figure 1), the choirs began to sing "a rebel song 'Zdignite brati zastave, hej!' [Brothers, lift up your flags, hey!]" (Mataić 1974:98). "At that solemn moment, the multitude fell silent, and a sonorous choir song was heard while the flag-bearers raised the flags gradually revealing the figure of Matija Gubec" (ibid.). In order to strengthen the link between

the figures of Tito and Gubec, who are continuously described as “the leaders of the masses in two different periods (...) two men of the same kind, two revolutionaries, rebels against the contemporary situation and oppression” (Kovačić 1972:8); the ceremony that marks the anniversary is given even more grandeur by planting a new linden tree, this time Tito’s linden tree. Before taking a tour of the Peasant Revolt exhibition with an expert, during which Tito remembered “details of the Revolt, some places from his birth place where it took place, as well as folk customs” (Mataić 1974:99), Tito was welcomed by Ivan Goran Kovačić folk ensemble who performed a *kolo* and in doing so led Tito to the space designated for the planting of the linden tree. As he was planting the linden tree as a symbol of “brotherhood and unity, development, progress and peace for our peoples” (ibid. 98) peasants wearing folk costumes were assisting him thus giving legitimacy to Tito’s “personality, who together with the Party, achieved the realization of the ideas that Matija Gubec had carried in his consciousness for all our peoples”. (ibid.100). Gubec’s linden tree, which oral legends describe as a meeting place of all rebelling serfs (c.f. Zečević 1969:12-13; Bonifačić Rožin 1966:15), and the linden tree planted on the occasion of the quadricentennial together symbolise the cycle that began with the revolt led by Gubec and is completed in Tito’s time, thus transcending the particularities of space and time (c.f. Halbwachs 1992:200).

Soon after that the Monument became not only a destination for school trips, trade union and family excursions, but also for the visits by political organisations, football clubs, etc. Being a reflection of “the freedom loving spirit of our people that suffered under the centuries-long oppression” (Zdunić 1975: [s.p.]). In the next few years the monument attracted more than 70 000 visitors from all over Yugoslavia and beyond: from Czechoslovakia, Italy, Romania, USSR, Germany, Belarus, France, USA, several South American states and Australia to China. Most visitors favoured Augustinčić’s vision of Matija Gubec and the Peasant Revolt, judging by the large number of positive comments in the visitors’ book which was opened to the public on the occasion of the unveiling ceremony. The impressions from the visitors’ book depicted the monument as “the most beautiful work in our country” (ibid.), i.e. as something “monumental”, “majestic”, “functional”, “unobtrusive”, “extraordinary”,

and even “authentic” (ibid.). One of the visitors concluded: “In our freedom loving country, even our hero Matija has become free” (ibid.). A visitor from Belgrade wrote: “Past, present and future will live inside us like a meteor light, (...) as the memory of Matija Gubec somewhere deep in our hearts” (ibid.). Matija Gubec’s ideals, which were ahead of his time, were manifested in the monument as a tangible expression of the utopia of egalitarianism that was ingrained in the socialist everyday life and in the visitors’ experience.

HISTORY RE-ENACTED IN THE CONTEMPORARY – THE USES OF THE MONUMENT TO THE PEASANT REVOLT AND MATIJA GUBEC IN THE 21ST CENTURY

In the 1990s, within the context of the Croatian War of Independence and the establishment of the independent Republic of Croatia, the historical monuments that were created during socialism were used as one of the many platforms for reidentifying the nation and constructing adequate national remembering that legitimises the established social system (c.f. Connerton 1989). They were also used to encourage collective oblivion when it comes to the previously valid “glorious pasts”, particularly those connected with the Yugoslav front of WW II and the creation of Yugoslavia. Since these monuments were symbolically equalized with the aggressors and enemies of Croatia, many of them became undesirable objects. Therefore, they often disappeared from the public, especially open spaces or were put out of the visitors’ reach: i.e. they were locked in museum and galleries’ storage spaces; transferred to public institutions’ basements; or were forgotten in the landscape where, neglected by the authorities, they gradually fell into disrepair (Potkonjak and Pletenac 2011:13). In some instances they were targets of vandalism or – as is the case with Augustinčić’s monument to Josip Broz Tito in Kumrovec – were blown up by explosive devices (Belaj 2006:201).

There were no interventions into the physical appearance, landscape or the site of the Peasant Revolt monument either at the time or subsequently. Its historical monument status and its categorization as a museum object belonging to the collection of the Peasant Revolt Museum,

which became a part of the Museums of Croatian Zagorje in 1992, stayed unaltered. The monument itself remained a prominent tourist destination in the post-socialist period and was often advertised by emphasising that: “for most Croats the name of Gornja Stubica is synonymous (...) with Matija Gubec, the leader of the Peasant Revolt from the 16th century”.¹³ It is a spot not to be missed in cultural tourism routes that underlined its connection with the Peasant Revolt (for example a 35-kilometer circular cycling tour is entitled “Through Gubec’s Native Land”, a hiking tour is organized under the name of “The Path of Gubec’s Rebels”, etc.).¹⁴ Apart from being a destination recommended by tourist agencies to organized groups of school students, pensioners, various other associations and individual visitors coming to Gornja Stubica, the monument is also a part and parcel of the political itinerary at the local, regional and national level, especially on the occasions of Revolt anniversaries.¹⁵ Thus the Peasant Revolt theme and the figure of Matija Gubec are connected with the concepts embedded in the foundations of political programmes, with the aim of supporting the idea of continuity and sustainability of particular political persuasions and methods of social activity. For example, during his last visit to Gornja Stubica in 2013 on the occasion of the 440th anniversary of the Peasant Revolt, former President Ivo Josipović analysed the role of Matija Gubec in the Croatian history and added an air of contemporary history to the idea of justice that he emphasised as one of his fundamental political goals: “Zagorje was the birthplace of many great personalities, one of whom is Matija Gubec. So many years after the revolt we are still admiring that man because he had the idea of justice, and the same idea must move people today, too. We shall fight for that justice” (sp/VLM 2013). In similar ways the images of the past connected with the Peasant Revolt are evoked at the stage at the foot of the

¹³ <http://www.zagreb-touristinfo.hr/istrazi-zagreb/zagreb-i-okolica/sjever> (available from 10/3/2015)

¹⁴ <http://www.tzzz.hr/biciklisticke-karte/karta-3/> (available from 10/3/2015); <http://www.hpd-kapela.hr/docs/stazama%20gupcevih%20puntara%2007.01.2015.pdf> (pdf available from 10/3/2015)

¹⁵ According to the Museum of the Peasant Revolt data in the second half of the 20th century the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Croatia used to take its distinguished guests on a tour of the Monument relatively frequently.

hill where the Monument is situated, during election campaigns, assemblies and other public events organized by the political parties.¹⁶

The component that has changed in these festive situations in comparison to commemorations and ceremonies which were held around the Monument in the socialist period is the addressee, i.e. persons and groups that are usually presented as comparable to the long perished Peasant Revolt participants, as a kind of Matija Gubec figures of our time. Therefore, references to Tito and the Yugoslav Front of WW II are taken out of the narratives and practices connected to the Monument as socialist equivalents of the main hero and the Peasant Revolt ideals. Expressions such as brotherhood, unity, progress and (workers') self management are also removed from the rhetoric. Such detachment from the previous patterns of remembering is a reflection of the resemantization of Matija Gubec and the Peasant Revolt that are noticeable in the broader social context. On the other hand, the imagery of the Peasant Revolt remained an extremely potent location for new meanings and references to the current social needs even in the independent Republic of Croatia. Events that had generally been described as actualizations of protagonists and motives of the 16th century Revolt in the media discourse were connected with farmer protests and road blocks in the northern part of Croatia from 2010 on. Hence just after organized farmers' protests began, Mile Prpa, an author and columnist, sees the road blocks in Zagorje, Podravina and Slavonia as an echo of Gubec's fight for justice and a kind of a democratic intervention of the disenfranchised in a highly stratified society:

¹⁶ According to the words of the Museum of the Peasant Revolt staff members, representatives of the Croatian Democratic Union and the Croatian Peasant Party organized events on the stage at the foot of the monument. However, they emphasised that in using this space multiparty system was visible, that is to say heterogeneity in expressing various political aspirations and ideas (based on the transcript of the interview with Vlatka Filipčić Maligec, from 10 February 2015). In other words, the space around the monument is not being occupied by only one political option nor is the monument being experienced in line with only one political quota system as is the case with places of memory related to other eminent historical persons who are often linked to Matija Gubec and referred to as "the three great sons of Croatian Zagorje" – with monuments and places of birth of Josip Broz Tito and Franjo Tuđman (c.f. Belaj and Škrbić Alempijević 2014; Škrbić Alempijević and Hjemdahl 2006).

“The Peasant Revolt A.D. 2010 – the same battle is still being fought today albeit by different means, namely by tractor road blocks which are coming closer and tightening their grip around Zagreb, political and business capital of Croatia. Contemporary Tahys (oppressors) [are] taxes, tycoons, the mafia, bureaucracy, selling off Croatian national heritage, disregard for Croatia (...). It seems that there are signs of resistance to the politics of degrading and disenfranchising all that is Croatian, all that is patriotic. But who are going to be our new saviours after the likes of Nikola Kupinić, Josip Thurni, Gašpar Alapić that will dispel and ‘defeat’ this contemporary ‘army’ of peasants that is gathering from all sides and whose numbers are rising in the fight for justice of old? Who will be those to follow in the footsteps of famous serfs and fighters like Matija Gubec contemplating, like their predecessors, not only the fight for justice of old, but also how to root Croatia in the foundation of work, order and justice, in the foundation of dignity, humanity, patriotism and courage?” (Prpa 2010)

The author’s comment clearly demonstrates that the notion of the fight against a superior enemy for the ideals of social justice, dignity, freedom, peace, etc. is summarized in the Peasant Revolt syntagm and embodied in the figure of Matija Gubec which represent a fertile ground for imagining the Croatian present and creating a vision of a better future based on the perception of our nation’s heroic past. As was already indicated in the above mentioned quotation, there is another category which is presented as a contemporary successor of Gubec’s struggles, that is to say Croatian war veterans, participants of the Homeland War. The fact that actualization of the Peasant Revolt heritage is one of the identification strategies for many groups of war veterans is further corroborated by the account of a staff member from the Peasant Revolt Museum,¹⁷ saying that Homeland War Veteran Associations’ visits to Croatian Zagorje regularly include tours of the Monument in Gornja Stubica and taking photographs in front of it (c.f. Gaši 2009).

The basic purpose of the above mentioned usages of the Monument in the post-socialist period, which are primarily connected with commemorations and anniversary celebrations, is the inauguration of new

¹⁷ Based on the transcript of the interview from 10 February 2015.

historical truths that are symbolically profiled as being opposed to the socialist politics of remembering, although their structure constitutes of the same elements that are used for creating the politics of remembering. However, alongside a corpus of protocol related procedures and narratives which imply the existence of a monolithic national History, from the beginning of this century the Monument has also been linked to more relaxed and heterogeneous usages of history, namely those that define themselves as syntagms for creative reshaping of the past by involving as large a number of participants in their own (re)creation of the historical events and persons that are re-enacted in performances. We are referring to festivals, performances and other public events which have been designed as “portals into the past”, as arenas in which history is staged not only for the purpose of its better recognition and understanding, but also in order to allow different participants to experience it through their own senses and make it real once again in their performances (c.f. Škrbić Alempijević 2012:185–212). The analysis of such phenomena and processes is based on the review of two public events which used the space around the Monument to Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec and indeed its surface as a stage: multimedia 3D video mapping performed on the monument itself in 2013 by Gubec Theatre and Chivalry Tournament that has been held in Gornja Stubica since 2000. In researching these events we relied on heterogeneous methods and sources: observing Chivalry Tournament in 2014; interviews with organizers of both events; Gubec Theatre’s event presentation made on 1 December 2014 as a part of MUVI 05 events organized by the Museum Documentation Centre; analysis of literature dedicated to these events; media reviews; tourist materials; Internet forum discussions, etc.¹⁸

¹⁸ There is another event which directly evoked the images of the past in connection with occurrences and characters from the 16th century entitled the Peasant Revolt 1593. It is a several day event that takes place at the end of January and the beginning of February and is organized by the Knights of the Golden Chalice Society and Gornja Stubica tourist board. It is held in several sites in Donja and Gornja Stubica (Matija Gubec’s birthplace, Gubec’s linden tree, the atrium of the Peasant Revolt Museum, etc.). It is a staging of the beginning of the Peasant Revolt in which performers wear reconstructed clothing worn by nobility, knights and peasants (c.f. Lozančić 2009:58–68). However, since none of the event segments take place directly at the Monument or in communication with it, and the event itself does not serve as a platform for the monument reinterpretation, unlike the two events which we analyze in the paper, we did not include it in our research.

“Gubec Theatre’s multimedia 3D mapping was a part of anniversary celebrations. The aim was to use multimedia animation of the monument to depict the Peasant Revolt. All of a sudden many characters depicted in the relief could walk, fly or lunge into battle. The multimedia 3D mapping lasted for 15 minutes and was accompanied by music and a recital performed by Vid Balog who was reading the excerpts from the Ballad of Petrica Kerempuh written by Miroslav Krleža; parts from Habelić’s description of the Peasant Revolt dating from the 17th century; and a selection of passages from the so-called (serfs’) claim against Tahy, whose original from the 16th century is kept at the Croatian State Archives. The demanding animation of the selected scenes from the Monument succeeded in ‘breathing’ new life into the characters.”¹⁹

This was the way in which Novena Ltd., a professional digital media studio described the multimedia show in which it participated together with Pago Com Ltd., a company specialized in technical event production. Gubec Theatre event was performed once on 18 October 2013 before audience of more than a thousand members as the central part of celebrations marking the 40th anniversary of the monument complex and the Museum in Gornja Stubica and the 440th anniversary of the Peasant Revolt under the auspices of the President of Croatia, Ivo Josipović, who was present at the event and on that occasion delivered a speech on the significance of the Peasant Revolt’s messages in the present day.²⁰ The Peasant Revolt Museum was the organizer of the event whereas museum consultant Goranka Horjan was the author of the conceptual design and the script. Speaking about what prompted the organization of such an event Ms Horjan underlined that “we wanted to (...) show and animate the monument which has been located near the Peasant Revolt Museum for forty years in a new way by using a combination of new technology and performance arts.”²¹ Gubec Theatre

¹⁹ <http://www.novena.hr/hr/novosti/gubec-teatar,140.html> (available from 10/3/2015)

²⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rJMILDMrJI> (available from 10/3/2015)

²¹ Based on the transcript of the project presentation by Goranka Horjan on 1 December 2014 as part of MUVI 05 events: museums-video-film, organized by the Museum Documentation Centre.

performance was a combination of animation, whose main characters were figures from the monument, Miroslav Krleža and his Petrica Kerempuh among others, and excerpts from the film *The Peasant Revolt 1573* directed by Vatroslav Mimica, videos of the Peasant Revolt 1573 event held in Donja and Gornja Stubica, and the light show projected onto the wings of the Monument. Literary works connected with the topic of the Peasant Revolt, namely Krleža's *Ballad of Petrica Kerempuh* and Juraj Habelić's *First Sin of our Father Adam* were used as literary templates together with quotations from the serfs' claim against Franjo Tahy in the court proceedings. Additional music was performed by Minstrel medieval music ensemble and was supposed to evoke the atmosphere characteristic of the time that was re-enacted. The event was a contemporary performative reinterpretation of past events which added another layer of meaning to the monument surface and gave it new possibilities of interpretation and experience. Nevertheless, the historical grounds of the performance were chosen by the project authors as a concept in order to establish closer connections between this multimedia event and the space of the monument dedicated to Gubec, whose character was defined in the following way within the context of the project: "A symbol of centuries long fight of the little man for justice which is why we decided to stage the story about the Revolt and its leader in line with the new times."²² In this way the event renders additional aspects of remembering and performance to the monument as a place of remembrance.

Re-enactment and at the same time memory creation through performance is the essence of the next event that we look into, namely the Chivalry Tournament in Gornja Stubica:

"In an attempt to draw as many visitors as possible and give them an opportunity to experience the past in a new way, since 2000 the Peasant Revolt Museum has been offering its visitors a chance to step out of the hustle and bustle of the 21st century and step into a colourful world of the Middle Ages. On the day of the Chivalry Tournament in Gornja Stubica. (...) The idea behind the Tournament was to go back to the close of the Middle Ages, i.e. the second half

²² <http://www.novena.hr/hr/novosti/gubec-teatar---nagrada-simply-the-best,143.html> (available from 10/3/2015)

of the 16th century and the time before the great Peasant Revolt. From the very beginning we were aware that it was not possible to repeat the past so we tried to bring historical truth in line with our presentational possibilities.” (Filipčić Maligec 2005:18).

This is how the organizers, representatives of the Peasant Revolt Museum in Gornja Stubica, described the phenomenon which was central to bringing the medieval times just before the serf uprising to the contemporary stage. At the same time the past that was being re-enacted through festival performances and enactments was not a one-way past offered to visitors as passive consumers. Quite the contrary, this past was grounded in the everyday life thus enabling the visitors to enter the space of its creation. The Chivalry Tournament was designed as a part of a larger project entitled “The Middle Ages in Croatian Zagorje” in an attempt to “breathe new life” into the historical heritage of the region (Horjan 2009:430). This is a one day cultural and tourist event which takes place in June with the participation of several hundred performers and several thousand visitors (*ibid.* 442). The aim of the event is to provide visitors with an opportunity to participate in an event “that re-enacts selected episodes from the late Middle Ages or early Modern Times”, i.e. to offer the experience of history of the period, its customs and the way of life, in an innovative way (*ibid.*). Although the organizers saw the Tournament as a platform on which all the classes of the former feudal society could be presented, performers who dominated in the performances as well as the number of performances on the programme together with the name of the event all demonstrate that the odds are in favour of the knights as symbolic opponents of the peasant class whose chivalry was materialized at the site of the monument. (Figure 2) In other words, the backbone of the Tournament consists of staged jousting, horseback riding stunts and competitions in different events such as: pumpkin cutting with swords, spear throwing, ring jousting, etc. which take place on the battleground at the foot of Samac hill and of the monument (Filipčić Maligec 2005:19; Horjan 2009:434). The knights take central stage in other events such as night siege of the city, i.e. the Oršić Palace. Many knight societies’ members participate in pitching army camps dressed in different costumes: the Knights of the



Figure 2: Participants of the Chivalry Tournament at the foot of the Monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec in Gornja Stubica. Photo by Tomislav Oroz, 11. 6. 2011.

Golden Chalice²³, Tahy's Musketeers, the Croatian Knight, the Knights of Zelingrad, etc. The societies in question perform their programme in many events and tournaments dedicated to medieval times all over Croatia. However, they adapt their performances to the site on which the past is being re-enacted. Their attempts to establish a connection between the generally acknowledged ideas about the Middle Ages with local specificities are substantiated by one of the performers who was in charge of the Glagolitic alphabet workshop at the Chivalry Tournament in 2011:

“Look, all the groups here, these knights' societies and those of us who work near the battleground, of course we are all a part of the

²³ According to the Peasant Revolt Museum staff members, the society was established in part as a result of workshops and lectures organized at the Museum, which in time went beyond its walls thus offering an opportunity for a more liberal reinterpretation of history. Nevertheless, even today some Museum staff members actively participate in the Knights of the Golden Chalice Society activities (based on the transcript of the interview with Vlatka Filipčić Maligec, from 10 February 2015).

Middle Ages. We go everywhere where people want to do something with it. (...) In other bigger countries, they make films and seize business opportunities, we are just getting started and we are happy if anybody wants to do something like this. This [Chivalry Tournament in Stubica] is after all an event, an exceptional event. The knights' societies are doing it for themselves, and yet we are re-enacting a part of history in a way... adapted to the story of the place we come to. Perhaps these battles were not of global importance, but they are important to the local people."²⁴

Knight skills are being taught in heraldry and handling medieval weapons workshops as well as in Childrens' Chivalry Tournament. Thus the so-called high culture of the medieval period is also promoted in the way of dressing, medieval and renaissance music performances and court dances. Furthermore, knighthood is proclaimed as a historical and cultural value on the occasion of the festival opening. The actor who plays a nobleman – the host of the Tournament, extols the significance of the Tournament in preparing brave knights “for centuries-long war waging against the Turks. He refers to their honour and duty to defend their country and their Lord landowner, and urges them to keep their holy catholic faith and (honour) righteousness” (Horjan 2009:434). The chivalrous past of the Croatian people and the region is the past that can be experienced with all senses at the Tournament: aromas of traditional and medieval food, medieval fairground sounds, hot torches of fire eaters and fire jugglers, etc.

Some of the Tournament activities and segments take place in the immediate vicinity of the monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec, in fact in the interaction with it. Besides the battleground at the foot of the hill where horsemen compete, the dais in front of the monument is also used to re-enact the past in the Tournament. For example, the dais is the place where opening ceremonies take place, knight societies parade, particular Tournament events are announced, court dances and stage sword fights are performed. In the immediate surroundings of the monument complex,

²⁴ Based on the transcript of the interview with M. K., a participant of the Chivalry Tournament, from 11 June 2011.

a medieval fair is set up, which incorporates the monument in its festival reality. In all these different facets of the Tournament, the monument does not only serve as a kind of backdrop, a spectacular set for a specific aspect of re-enacting history, but also as an indication that history has already been inscribed in this space and is open to new interpretations and experiences. The historical plane to which both materialized memories refer is the basis for connecting the monument with the Tournament, a perception about the 16th century that is produced in the present in the form of practices linked to the monument as well as the tournament performances. The discrepancy in creating social memory in both contexts derives from the question whose heritage is being actualized and extolled in this place: the one connected with the Peasant Revolt or the chivalrous past?²⁵ The organizers are very much aware of the problem, saying that the monument “does not really fit with the story of the Chivalry Tournament”. However, they interpret the view of the medieval times from the knight’s perspective in the context of the audience’s expectations and needs:

“People like variety, a bit of pomp, they like everything to pivot on the higher classes whose clothes and customs are more interesting to them than the peasants themselves. (...) Our intention with the Chivalry Tournaments was to also show a part of peasants’ life. Unfortunately, the figure of a peasant at the Tournament didn’t attract as much attention. Alas, the peasants didn’t fight on horseback. They didn’t wear such fancy clothes. After all, they were not permitted to own swords or other weapons according to Werboczy Code, and these are all things that visitors like to see on a Tournament.”²⁶

An awakened interest in the medieval times and knight culture has been noticeable in Croatia since its independence (c.f. Biti and Blagaić 2009). On

²⁵ A further analysis of the views of Gornja Stubica inhabitants about the usage of the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec motifs in making their village into a brand and about what they thought were adequate ways of going about it, would shed more light on this issue. Unfortunately, such a research goes beyond the scope of this article, which primarily focuses on the analysis of the public events as a place of creating memory, on a particular episode in history and its protagonists.

²⁶ Based on the transcript of the interview with Vlatka Filipčić Maligec, from 10 February 2015.

the one hand, it is a reflection of trends that are observable in festival industry all over Europe, and on the other it indicates new identification strategies on the national level, which treat Croatian medieval times as a potent place of symbolic re-foundation of the nation. The Chivalry Tournament in Gornja Stubica does not fit in with the trend. At last, the organizers emphasise that although the Tournament does not represent a direct reference to Matija Gubec and the Peasant Revolt, organizing events at the place of remembering that is dedicated to them at the same time encourages deeper awareness and experience of the past which the monument embodies. In view of the fact that we as ethnologists and cultural anthropologists do not separate events into those that are authentic, original and historically founded from those that are not, but rather see each such event as a place of creating culture (c.f. Kelemen and Škrbić Alempijević 2012), we perceive the chivalrous past memory re-enactment only as one more corpus of heterogeneous cultural performances generated by the users of this place of remembering.

CONCLUSION

What can we conclude from the review of the two faces of the monument to the Peasant Revolt and Matija Gubec in Gornja Stubica? For us the thematization of the two faces of the monument meant focusing on the variety of practices that were awakened in the immediate vicinity of the monument, the purposes that were assigned to it and meanings that were inscribed in its manifestation. In other words, we were interested in the diverse uses of the monument more than the monument itself. In this respect, we viewed an episode in history which had ended more than four centuries ago as a basis for current social and cultural performances in which the monument was being revealed to us as a space where the real and the fantastical intertwined, dialogues between different truths took place, that is to say, the space where illusions about what is real fell apart thus opening the possibility of alternative histories performance.

The approach that enabled us to observe the behaviours in the immediate vicinity of the monument and the perceptions and experiences which it encouraged in socialist times on the same plane as well as look into how imagining of the past and alternative histories was played with and

performatively staged in the post-socialist context, was our focusing on the dynamics around the monument from the perspective of performance in line with Goffman's thesis that every social interaction in the public space can be interpreted as a way of presenting ourselves to the others in the everyday life (1956). At the same time, Goffman's structuration of a performative situation by using terms such as "stage", "performers", "shows", etc., which derive from the analysis of interpersonal communication between several people, proved to be too narrow to encompass the complex and layered network of relations which is created between the participants in the public space, at the place of remembering, in a landscape filled with history. Namely, in our study the monument works both as a stage and as a generator of particular evocations of the past and performances of memory, as well as the addressee of these remembrances.

In discussing the heterogeneous people's perceptions and activities in the interaction with the monument, it is important to mention that unlike many other historical personalities who were proclaimed national heroes in socialism, Gubec undoubtedly continued to be a positive personality thus abundantly realizing his symbolic potential. However, regardless of the continuity of this type of valorization of his life and role in history, the concepts connected with Gubec and the ways in which his work is remembered are exceptionally variable and so can be observed as a reflection of the time in which they were practiced. In fact, highly stylized commemorative practices that took place at the foot of the monument just before it was revealed, lamenting the martyrdom of the defeated peasantry and Gubec's timeless ideals of freedom and equality, significantly differed from the ones that the monument had been connected with from the beginning of this century on when it was used as a backdrop for evoking romanticized medieval times by means of enacted battles with knights in costumes and children's workshops. In the first case, the dais of the monument complex was primarily defined as an arena for strictly formalized state ceremonies, which regardless of the strong commemorative structure, because it is open to the public, created the possibility of manifold parallel interpretations and uses of the motives linked to the Peasant Revolt. In the case of contemporary events, the monument is intentionally transformed into the space where the past is re-enacted by means of performances which need not be entirely true to the historical model. Whereas in the first case that we analyzed, brotherhood and

unity were extolled as key values exemplified in the Peasant Revolt, in this century the priority is given to creativity and individuality as determinants of contemporary citizens, who remember the past but do so in their own way. In both observed contexts ideals such as social justice (at least in the rhetoric of certain political actors) and the sacrifice of the nation/common people for freedom and peace are places of concurrence in the creation of the politics of remembering connected with the monument.

The two faces of the monument to Matija Gubec and the Peasant Revolt that we refer to in the title of the paper do not imply two essentially different time periods. We are aware that there were examples that pointed to the more relaxed interpretations and experience of history that the monument inspired in the socialist period, too. Moreover, in the post-socialist era of festival or multimedia performances in Croatia the ceremonial, commemorative attitude to the monument, accompanied by the sounds of national anthems and formal speeches, did not abate in any way. Therefore, we understand the two studies that we have presented here more as a framework within which we are considering the dispersion of diverse memories and creations of the past, so that we deny neither the existence of different practices at the site, nor the intertwining, intermingling and mutual conditioning of the perceptions and actualizations of the monument in various episodes of history. In this respect, the two faces of the monument, i.e. the “monumental” one in which the glorious history of the nation is reflected and the “re-enacted” one which offers the possibility of different, creative enactments of past events, signify a point in which various imaginations of the past, perceptions of the present and visions of the future intersect.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES

- BELAJ, Marijana. 2006. "Tito poslije Tita. Kip Josipa Broza kao žarište obrednog ponašanja". In *O Titu kao mitu. Proslava Dana mladosti u Kumrovcu.*, ed. Nevena Škrbić Alempijević and Kirsti Mathiesen Hjemdahl. Zagreb: FF Press; Srednja Europa, 201–219.
- BELAJ, Marijana and Nevena ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ. 2014. "Remembering 'The Father of the Contemporary State of Croatia'. The Celebration of Tuđman's Birthday in His Birthplace". *Traditiones*, vol. 43:79–109. DOI: 10.3986/TRADITIO2014430107
- BITI, Ozren and Marina BLAGAIĆ. 2009. "Vitezi na usluzi: preispisivanje tradicije u kulturnom turizmu Raba i Postojne". In *Jedna granica – dvije etnologije?*, ed. Željka Jelavić, Sanja Potkonjak and Helena Rožman. Zagreb: Hrvatsko etnološko društvo, 93–102.
- BLAŽEVIĆ, Jakov. 1975. "Izvod iz govora na proslavi 400-godišnjice Seljačke bune 14. listopada 1973. godine". In *Matija Gubec: monografija o spomeniku Matiji Gupcu i Muzeju seljačkih buna u Gornjoj Stubici*, ed. Drago Zdunić. Gornja Stubica: Muzej seljačkih buna; Zagreb: Spektar, [s. p.].
- BONIFACIĆ ROŽIN, Nikola. 1966. *Folklorna građa iz okolice Stubice*. [Manuscript. 756 IEF].
- BROZ TITO, Josip. 1975. "Ideali Seljačke bune ostvaruju se danas". In *Matija Gubec: monografija o spomeniku Matiji Gupcu i Muzeju seljačkih buna u Gornjoj Stubici*, ed. Drago Zdunić. Gornja Stubica: Muzej seljačkih buna; Zagreb: Spektar, [s. p.].
- CONNERTON, Paul. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DAMJANOVIĆ, Pero, ed. 1983. *Josip Broz Tito sabrana djela: tom sedmi: kraj aprila 1940-28. Novembar 1941*. Beograd, Zagreb: Izdavački centar Komunist; Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod; Naprijed.
- FILIPČIĆ MALIGEC, Vlatka. 2005. "Viteški turnir – pokušaj oživljavanja prošlosti". *Informatica museologica*, 36/3–4:18–23.
- FILIPČIĆ MALIGEC, Vlatka. 2010. "Crtice iz prapovijesti Muzeja seljačkih buna". *Časopis za kulturu Hrvatsko zagorje*, 3–4:72–86.
- GAŠI, Sabit. 2009. "Plitvički branitelji na izletu u Zagorju". *Slobodna Lika.com*, 6. prosinca, http://slobodnalika.com/novosti/4506_plitvicki+branitelji+na+izletu+u+zagorju.html, access: 10. 3. 2015.
- GOFFMAN, Erving. 1956. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- HALBWACHS, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press.
- HORJAN, Goranka. 2009. "Viteški turnir/ Knights Tournament". In *Arheologija i turizam u Hrvatskoj*, ed. Sanjin Mihelić. Zagreb: Arheološki muzej, 430–442.

- JELIĆ, Ivan. 1973. "O značenju tradicije velike seljačke bune 1573. u povijesti komunističkog pokreta i revolucije u Hrvatskoj". *Radovi Instituta za hrvatsku povijest Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*, 5:327–341.
- KELEMEN, Petra and Nevena ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ. 2012. "Uvod: festivali kao mjesta stvaranja kulture". In *Grad kakav bi trebao biti. Etnološki i kulturnoantropološki osvrti na festivale*, Petra Kelemen and Nevena Škrbić Alempijević. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk, 7–14.
- KOVAČIĆ, Zvonko. 1972. "Tražimo lik Matije Gupca". [copy from personal archive of Vatroslav Mimica]. *Vjesnik*, 6–8.
- KRKLEC, Gustav. 1975. "Uz Augustinčićev spomenik Matiji Gupcu i Seljačkoj buni". In *Matija Gubec: monografija o spomeniku Matiji Gupcu i Muzeju Seljačkih buna u Gornjoj Stubici*, ed. Darko Zdunić. Gornja Stubica: Muzej seljačkih buna; Zagreb: Spektar, [s. p.].
- KRLEŽA, Miroslav. 1975. "Govor u Stubici 1951. godine". In *Matija Gubec: monografija o spomeniku Matiji Gupcu i Muzeju seljačkih buna u Gornjoj Stubici*, ed. Darko Zdunić. Gornja Stubica: Muzej seljačkih buna; Zagreb: Spektar, [s. p.].
- LEFEBVRE, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Malden – Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- LOZANČIĆ, Marta. 2009. "Seljačka buna". *National Geographic Hrvatska*, 1:52–69.
- LOW, Setha M. and Denise LAWRENCE-ZUÑIGA. 2003. "Locating Culture". In *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*, eds. Setha M. Low and Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga. Oxford & Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 1–47.
- MATAIĆ, Josip. 1974. "Zapisi". *Kaj: časopis za kulturu i prosvjetu*, 3–4:91–101.
- N. R. 1972. "Omladina pod Gupčevom lipom". *Varaždinske vijesti*, 27. svibnja, no. 1427:7.
- POTKONJAK, Sanja i Tomislav PLETENAC. 2011. "Kada spomenici ožive – 'umjetnost sjećanja' u javnom prostoru". *Studia ethnologica Croatica*, 23:7–24.
- PRPA, Mile. 2010. "Seljačka buna A.D. 2010". *Hrvati AMAC*, 9. ožujka, http://amac.hrvati-amac.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3457&Itemid=192, access: 10. 3. 2015.
- RIHTMAN-AUGUŠTIN, Dunja. 2000. *Ulice moga grada: antropologija domaćeg terena*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
- SABOLIĆ, Ivan. 1974. "O počecima – spomeniku – muzeju". *Kaj: časopis za kulturu i prosvjetu*, 3–4:80–91.
- SENJKOVIĆ, Reana. 2008. *Izgubljeno u prijenosu. Pop iskustvo soc kulture*. Zagreb: Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku.
- sp/VLM. 2013. "Josipović uveličao jubilej Muzeja Hrvatskog zagorja". *Večernji list*, 18. listopada, <http://www.vecernji.hr/sjeverozapadna-hrvatska/josipovic-uvelicao-jubilej-muzeja-hrvatskog-zagorja-629829>, pristup: 10. 3. 2015.

ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ, Nevena. 2012. “Festivali i sjećanje. Studija slučaja: Ogulinski festival bajke”. In *Grad kakav bi trebao biti. Etnološki i kulturnoantropološki osvrti na festivale*, Petra Kelemen and Nevena Škrbić Alempijević. Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk, 185–270.

ŠKRBIĆ ALEMPIJEVIĆ, Nevena and Kirsti Mathiesen HJEMDAHL, ur. 2006. *O Titu kao mitu. Proslava Dana mladosti u Kumrovcu*. Zagreb: FF Press; Srednja Europa.

ZDUNIĆ, Drago, ed. 1975. *Matija Gubec: monografija o spomeniku Matiji Gupcu i Muzeju seljačkih buna u Gornjoj Stubici*. Gornja Stubica: Muzej seljačkih buna; Zagreb: Spektar.

ZEČEVIĆ, Divna. 1969.–1972. *Usmeno pripovijedanje u selima hrvatskog zagorja*. [manuscript 1000 IEF sv. I., II., III.]

ŽANIĆ, Ivo. 1998. *Prevarena povijest. Guslarska estrada, kult hajduka i rat u Hrvatskoj i Bosni i Hercegovini 1990–1995*. Zagreb: Durieux.

<http://www.hpd-kapela.hr/docs/stazama%20gupcevih%20puntara%2007.01.2015.pdf>
(Accessed 26 February 2015)

<http://www.msb.mhz.hr/html/projekti/teatar.html> (Accessed 26 February 2015)

<http://www.novena.hr/hr/novosti/gubec-teatar,140.html> (Accessed 26 February 2015)

<http://www.novena.hr/hr/novosti/gubec-teatar---nagrada-simply-the-best,143.html>
(Accessed 26 February 2015)

<http://www.tzzz.hr/biciklisticke-karte/karta-3/> (Accessed 26 February 2015)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rJMILDMrJI> (Accessed 26 February 2015).

<http://www.zagreb-touristinfo.hr/istrazi-zagreb/zagreb-i-okolica/sjever> (Accessed 26 February 2015)

