

**FOREFATHERS AND SUCCESSORS AT THE DEPARTMENT
OF ETHNOLOGY AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY,
UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA:
PATHS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SLOVENE ETHNOLOGY/
CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY**

RAJKO MURŠIČ

University of Ljubljana

Department of Ethnology and Cultural
Anthropology

1000 Ljubljana, Aškerčeva 2
Slovenia

UDC / UDK 39:378.014.3(497.4

Ljubljana)

[316:572]:378.014.3(497.4 Ljubljana)

39-05(497.4)

Original scientific paper

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Accepted: July 9, 2008

In 1940, under Professor Niko Zupanič, the “Seminar of Ethnology and Ethnography” curriculum at the University of Ljubljana comprised comparative ethnology, prehistory, physical anthropology, linguistics and ethnography. Zupanič’s successor, Vilko Novak, claimed that ethnology should study “primitive peoples” as well as “common people” in “civilised countries”. Slavko Kremenšek initiated “urban ethnology” in the 1960s, but at the same time reduced it to a historicist approach. He claimed that “ways of life” and folk culture should be considered as the basic distinctive subject of the discipline. Zmago Šmitek and Božidar Jezernik expanded studies of “ways of life” through non-European examples and studies of life in extreme circumstances. They rejected the narrowness of historical and regional limitations of the discipline and reintroduced anthropological elements to the curriculum. Borut Brumen and Rajko Muršič criticised both epistemological limitations and the theoretical weakness of Slovene ethnology. They rejected differentiation between ethnology (the study of European peoples) and cultural/social anthropology (the study of non-European peoples).

The author presents the gradual development of curricula in ethnology/cultural anthropology at the University of Ljubljana. He compares topics of teaching and research since their beginning and discusses perspectives of the discipline in Slovenia through an assessment of its current epistemological, methodological and disciplinary approaches.

Key words: *Slovenian ethnology, cultural anthropology, curriculum of ethnology and cultural anthropology, teaching and research in anthropology*

In the late 1980s, when I entered the field of ethnology as an undergraduate student, the question of disciplinary identity was a very hot and contested issue: at that time, almost every scholar and professional in Slovenia was supposed to define his or her position in the seemingly clearly distinct disciplines of ethnology and (cultural or social) anthropology. If someone did not accept any clear demarcation line, or even dared to consider that “ethnology” and “cultural anthropology” were just two denominations of essentially the same discipline, he or she could not fit him or herself into the seemingly black and white pattern. Even scholars who otherwise promoted anthropological streams of the discipline had to assume this dichotomy as a starting point:

We hold that the anthropological and the ethnological traditions in Slovenia cannot be equated. These two traditions often interlink or overlay one another and sometimes develop independently of each other (Šmitek and Jezernik 1995:172).

In this paper, I will briefly introduce some sources and streams of Slovene ethnology and cultural anthropology and critically assess epistemological discrepancies, theoretical confusion and disciplinary practices in the development of the initial and main school of ethnology/cultural anthropology as it developed at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, from 1940 when it was introduced as a field of study.

The history of ethnology in Slovenia was shaped by several colleagues who were engaged in politics. In fact, this was - at least in some cases - positive, not only for individual careers, but also for the development of the discipline.

THE PREHISTORY OF ETHNOLOGY AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN SLOVENIA

In pre-modern times, interest in the specificities of other peoples and places was much more common than interest in the peculiarities of the national population, no matter how this “people” was defined in the many different aspects of its appearance. Therefore, authors from what is Slovenian territory today often included some quite “proto-ethnographic” descriptions of the ways of life of other peoples. The first comprehensive “poli-historical” study of the Slovene lands was published in the late 17th century. Only when the Slovene lands were the focus of observation of foreigners were they described vividly. The first such source describing everyday life (especially gastronomy and housing) in the Slovene lands is Paolo Santonino’s *Itinerarium*, a corpus of travelogue diaries from Carinthia (Kärnten), Carniola (Krain) and Styria (Steiermark) from 1485 to 1487. The diaries of the Pope’s supervisor were translated into Slovenian and published in 1991.

In the 16th century, two authors born in the Slovene lands published two very influential works with descriptions of not well-known parts of Europe. Benedikt Kuripešič (Benedicten Curipeschitz) visited Istanbul as the Habsburg emperor’s emissary and described the Ottoman Empire at its zenith (*Wegrayss Kö(nighler) May(estät) potschaft gen Constantinopel zu dem Türkischen Kayser Soleyman*, 1531). Sigismund Herberstein was an ambassador to Moscow and described life in the emerging eastern European empire (*Rerum Moscoviticarum Comentariorum*, 1549).

A century later, Johannes Weichard Valvasor travelled through the main Slovene (Carniola) and other Habsburg lands in present-day western Slovenia, north-eastern Italy and north-western Croatia, describing them in his monumental *Die Ehre des Hertzogthums Crain* (1689). Together with topographic and geographic descriptions (for his explanation of the water circulation at the Cerknica Lake he was awarded membership of the Royal Academy of Sciences in London) he described the ways of life of ordinary people, their legends and peculiarities, their habits and outlook. Despite many

misconceptions, his work may be considered a very rich ethnography, based on observation and the use of native language in communicating in the field.

According to the analysis of Zmago Šmitek and Božidar Jezernik (1995), descriptions of other peoples and the authors' own countrymen have been intertwined, though separate. In their overview of important works of this kind, they mention Gian Rinaldo Carli (*Andropologia, ossia della società e della felicità*, 1786) and the first Slovene historian, Anton Tomaž Linhart, and his *Versuch einer Geschichte von Krain und den übrigen Ländern der südlichen Slaven Oesterreichs* (Vol. I and II, 1788, 1791), which offers some ethnographic data. There was also another foreigner interested in the peculiarities of people in South-Slavic lands: Balthasar Hacquet (*Abbildung und Beschreibung der südwest- und östlichen Wenden, Illyrer und Slaven*, Vols. I-IV, 1801-1808). The first "native scholar" who described the ways of life of his own people (though not in his native language) was Josef Košič (*A Magyar Országú Vendus – Tótokról*, 1824).

In the 19th century, interest in more distant lands and people became very strong. Among the first important works on North American native peoples was the study by missionary and bishop Friderik I. Baraga of Ojibwas (e.g., *Geschichte, Character, Sitte und Gebräuche der nordamerikanischen Indier*, 1837).

At the same time, Polish émigré Emil Korytko and Slovene "Illyrian" Stanko Vraz published collections of Slovene folk songs (Vraz, *Narodne pjesni ilirske*, 1839; Korytko, *Slovénske písmi krajnskiga naróda*, 1839-1844). Scholarship in comparative Slavic literature paved the way to academic writing in early ethnology related to Slavic studies. A typical example is Gregor Krek's *Einleitung in die slawische Literaturgeschichte* (1874). Worth mentioning is Styrian historian Josip Pajek who compiled ethnographic material on Styrian Slovenes (*Črtice iz duševnega žitka štajerskih Slovincov*, 1884).

Karel Štrekelj and Matija Murko were, together with the above-mentioned Gregor Krek, the first scholars who held the position at Austrian universities (in Graz and Vienna). Both were trained in Slavic studies. Karel Štrekelj edited a monumental scholarly critical edition of collected Slovene traditional songs (*Slovenske narodne pesmi*, Vols. I-IV, 1895-1923), while Matija Murko wrote a programmatic text on the necessity of the introduction

of ethnographic work in Slovenia (*Narodopisna razstava československa (Nauki za Slovence)* - Ethnographic exhibition Czecho-Slavic, 1896). He made first studies of Slovene vernacular architecture and later broadened his interests to other South Slavic lands, especially Bosnia (*Zur Geschichte des volkstümlichen Hauses bei den Südslawen*, 1906).

The first scholarly journal for history and ethnography (*Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje*, “Journal of History and Ethnography”) was established in Maribor in 1904. Publications of other institutions followed. At the University of Ljubljana, which was established in 1919, “ethnography” was considered as one of the initial fields of study but was not introduced at that time because there was no teacher to hold the chair. In 1923, the Slovene Ethnographic Museum was established under the directorship of Niko Zupanič. He launched the first proper ethnological journal in Slovenia in 1926 – *Etnolog* (“Ethnologist”). In 1934, the Institute of Folklore (*Folklorni inštitut*) was established under the leadership of France Marolt, and finally, in 1940-1941 the Seminar for Ethnology and Ethnography (*Seminar za etnologijo z etnografijo*) was founded under Professor Niko Zupanič. From the perspective of later interpretations of the “introduction of anthropology” to the “department of ethnology” together with belief in an essential and unbridgeable distinction between “ethnology” and “cultural anthropology”, it is important to underline that the initial name of the department was the Department of “Ethnology” and “Ethnography”, which should have been translated at that time into the Department of “Social Anthropology and Ethnography” (English terminology) or the Department of “*Völkerkunde und Volkskunde*” (German terminology). At that time, the Slovene language differentiated between *narodopisje* (ethnography) and *narodoslovje* (ethnology). *Narodopisje* was the study of national peasant culture, while *narodoslovje* was considered as the comparative study of “folk” cultures and “primitive” cultures. Niko Zupanič had in mind general, comparative scholarship. In the minutes of the faculty senate we read:

Ethnology is a discipline about peoples in all aspects; it studies their material, spiritual and social culture and also deals with their racial-theoretical problems (Niko Zupanič 1946).

Despite the controversial use of racial theories (from today’s perspective), this indicates a clearly anthropological orientation of the

discipline. This was clearly expressed in the study curricula of that time. Let us take a look at the curricula at the beginning of ethnological studies in Ljubljana.

FROM INTEGRATED ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND ETHNOLOGICAL CURRICULA TO THE PREDOMINANCE OF “ETHNOGRAPHY” (NARODOPISJE)

In the academic year 1940-1941, when Prof. Niko Zupanič had finally obtained the status of professor, he introduced a unit named “Seminar of Ethnology and Ethnography” (*Seminar za etnologijo z etnografijo*). Its curriculum comprised a study programme in “ethnology and ethnography”. Not many different courses were given, but the structure of the programme is apparent from the following list of courses in the first year:

Winter semester (Zupanič): Origins of the Slavs and Slavic peoples. Seminar.

In 1941-42, the courses were:

Winter semester (Zupanič): Slavic antiquities 1; People (*narod*) and race 1; Seminar.

Spring semester (Zupanič): Slavic antiquities 2; People (*narod*) and race 2; Seminar.

ETNOLOGIJA IN ETNOGRAFIJA.

Dr. Županič Niko, red. prof.: Začetki Slovanov in slovanskih narodov; 4 ure: torek, sreča, četrtek, petek od 18. do 19. ure; balkonska dvorana.

Seminarske vaje; 2 uri: čas in kraj dogovorno.

Excerpt from the Book of Lectures for the study year 1940-1941 (Ethnology and Ethnography. Niko Županič: Origins of Slavs and Slavic Peoples; Seminar Practice).

Throughout the decade of the 1940s, the unit retained the name “Seminar of Ethnology and Ethnography” (*Seminar za etnologijo z etnografijo*). During the Second World War, Prof. Zupanič did not give lectures, although his lectures were announced. After the war, the curriculum was further expanded. Courses offered in the study year 1946-47 (under Prof. Zupanič) were as follows: Ethnological methods; Material culture of the Slovene people 1 and 2; Seminar.

In 1947-50, additional lecturers (from museums and other institutions and disciplines) were invited to give lectures, so that Niko Zupanič, who was already 70 years old, could teach courses he specialised in. The curriculum became much more attractive (even from today's perspective). It included the topics: important issues in general ethnology and ethnography; elements of folk culture; current views on origins of the family and tribe; folklore and art; technological ethnology; an outline of Slovene folklore, habits, customs; legal customs and antiquities in Slovene folk narratives; the mentality of the peasant; an introduction to ethnology; the ethnography of Africa.

yruam predavanj za zimski semester 1950/51

7. Etnologija

Prédmet	Semester								Kolo- kvij	Ispit									
	I		II		III		IV			V		VI		VII		VIII		delni	dipl.
	p	v	p	v	p	v	p	v	p	v	p	v	p	v	p	v	po semestru		
Osnove družbenih ved	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4	-
Etnologija:																			
A. obča z osnovami antropologije .	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	-	2,4,6	8
B. posebna: južni Slovani, balkanski, evropski in izvenevropski narodi .	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	-	2,4,6	8
Materni sodobni in knjižni jezik z dialektiko	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
Prehistorična in slovanska arheologija	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-
Etnol. muzeologija in zaščita	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	8	-
Zgodovina narodov Jugoslavije	3	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Obča zgodovina	3	-	3	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
Tuj jezik (fakultativno)	2	2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
Pedagogika	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	2	3	-	-	-	7	-
Živi neslovanski balkanski jezik (fakultativno)	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,4	-	-
Predvojaška vzgoja	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	1-8	-	-
Specialna predavanja	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	4	-	4	-	-	-	-
Antropogeografija	2	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	-
Skupaj	20	10	20	10	20	9	13	7	11	4	11	4	13	7	11	4			

p = predavanje; v = vaja

The list of lectures for all 8 semesters in the winter semester 1950-1951 (Basic Social Sciences; Ethnology [a. General, with basic Anthropology; b. Regional: South Slavs, Balkan, European and Non-European Peoples]; Contemporary Mother Tongue with Dialects; Prehistoric and Slavic Archaeology; Ethnological Museology and Conservation; History of Yugoslav Nations; General History; Foreign Language (facultative); Education; Living Non-Slavic Balkan Language (facultative); Military Education; Special Lectures; Anthropogeography).

The courses at the Department clearly show an intertwining of “ethnology” and “anthropology” in the whole curriculum. How and when did the streams become separated and why did the “ethnographic” (*narodopisje*) stream prevail? Let us see what “ethnography” meant at the time of the establishment of the Department.

The term *narodopisje* (ethnography) was introduced to the Slovene language in the late 19th century from Czech. It literally means “description of the people”:

As the word itself indicates, ethnography is the discipline describing peoples. Like the Slovene word *narodopisje*, the Greek original is combined from the words *ethnos* (people) [sic!] and *graphia* (description). Together with these words, *narodoslovje* and *ethnology*, both combined words, are often mentioned.

Ethnography studies 1. people (nation), 2. products of its culture, i.e. antiquities. (Ložar 1944: 7)

One of the consequences of such a definition was the descriptive nature of the discipline. In the best case, it was just a denomination of ethnographic methods of research and their results, but in the worst case it was sometimes considered as a so-called auxiliary discipline, especially in relation to history or Slavonic studies. Without being able to develop wider comparative perspectives, and embedded in cultural-historical positivism, the discipline began to lose reputation. Therefore, Vilko Novak - Zupanič's first doctoral student and his assistant - declared in the early 1950s that it would be better to get rid of the term ethnography (*narodopisje*) and use only the term ethnology with its wider comparative and profound theoretical connotations. He understood ethnology in a very broad sense and did not limit its interests only to the national population. Moreover, he considered ethnology as a discipline aiming to discover and understand human culture in general:

The task of ethnology is to analyse and study – genetically and comparatively – cultures of the primitive peoples, as well as culture of the civilised nations, in order to determine general laws of the development of human culture. (Novak 1958)

Since the mid-1950s, the Department's curriculum as well as the scholarly works of its members no longer used the term "*narodopisje*" (ethnography). The standpoint that the same discipline aimed at studying one's countrymen and any other peoples had long-term consequences for the understanding of the discipline. The subject could no longer be reduced only to domestic studies. However, theoretical and methodological developments did not confirm this strategic orientation.

Niko Zupanič introduced a wider understanding of ethnology. As a scholar trained in the late 19th century and in the first decade of the 20th, he was more or less a comparativist of the late 19th century. Furthermore, his intellectual perspective was very much influenced by his engagement in politics.

ETHNOLOGICAL SCHOLARSHIP AND POLITICS: A PRODUCTIVE EXCHANGE

Slovene ethnology would have never developed the same way if the founder of the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology, Niko Zupanič, had not, before WWI, been sent into exile to Serbia as a pro-Yugoslav activist. After the war, he was more engaged in politics than in scholarship. This is one of the reasons why he did not receive a professorship for more than twenty years. His scholarship was definitely influenced by his political orientation, which was also based on his regional origin. He was born in Bela Krajina, a southern region of Slovenia with a population of mixed origin: Slovene, Croat and Serb (Orthodox). Although he was not Orthodox, he considered himself a "Serbo-Croat" or "Yugoslav". His views were thus very different from the views of intellectuals from Ljubljana.

Niko Zupanič was a member of Nikola Pašić's Serbian (later Yugoslav) Radical Party. In 1921 and 1922, he served for a while as a minister in the government of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. It is thus self-evident that he was interested in Slavic history and the origins of the Slavic peoples, especially the South Slavs. With his encyclopaedic knowledge and language skills, he accomplished profound comparisons of various kinds of ethnographic, archaeological, archival, linguistic, sociological and other data. For him, ethnology meant comparative scholarship aiming to understand human diversity.

Even if his successors were not directly engaged in politics or worked in a completely non-political manner, their scholarship was also related to their general ideological orientation. Vilko Novak was a rather conservative Catholic believer. He was initially trained in Slavic studies (before he started to study ethnology, he already held a doctorate in Slovene language and literature from the University of Budapest), and his methodological perspectives were only partially grounded in a comparative approach. Vilko Novak did not want to use the term ethnography because of its poor reputation as descriptive scholarship. Despite the fact that he always studied Slovenes within the framework of “national ethnology”, he saw ethnology as a study of culture in and outside Europe with the final aim of understanding human culture as such (see 1956; 1958).

He was much more influenced by structural studies and classifications of particular ethnographic examples and the spatial distribution of traditional cultural traits. He did not follow historical threads in his approach to ethnology.

However, seen from the perspective of the prevailing historical-materialist paradigm of that time, the only true science in the humanities was history. Therefore, Novak’s student and assistant Slavko Kremenšek, who was initially trained in history, introduced the dialectical-historical (i.e. Marxist) paradigm to Slovene ethnology. His contribution to the field has been considered as revolutionary in many ways, but in retrospect his main contribution was probably not the genuine theoretical orientation he named “structural-genetic” but his urban and historical studies of workers and settlers in the suburbs.

At the beginning of his career, he defined ethnology as a “...specialised discipline of historiographical character, which aims to study daily, habitual, typical cultural forms and the content of daily life among those social strata and groups that give an ethnic or national unit its specific character” (Kremenšek 1960/61:7). Together with another historian in ethnology, Angelos Baš, who was also interested in workers’ and professional culture, as well as the history of clothing, he initiated a paradigmatic shift in the understanding of the very subject of ethnology: ways of life. “... The subject of ethnology is the history of a people’s (nation’s) way of life...” (Baš 1968).

Though essentially an anthropological notion of culture (derived from Tylor's famous definition of culture in its "ethnographic sense", which was in its plural sense based on Herderian views on culture), the "way of life" became the marker of the radical epistemological shift from pure positivism and cultural history towards a more dialectical approach and modern scholarship able to cope with all problems brought to the fore by modernity and political development. This is the reason why the paradigm of studies of "ways of life" marked more than two decades of Slovene ethnology. Furthermore, in accordance with the anti-colonial non-alignment movement of socialist Yugoslavia, Slavko Kremenšek in his widely used textbook declared that having two disciplines for studying the national population on the one hand and foreign peoples on the other would "reek of apartheid" (Kremenšek 1973:16).

The only problem here was that ethnological research was practically reduced to regional studies of Slovenia and the Slovenes, while the old "*narodopisje*" was not only preserved under the cloak of ethnology but eventually again emerged as its hegemonic core:

Ethnology, once also ethnography or *narodopisje*, is the discipline that studies folk culture and the way of life of ethnic groups on all levels of their development, and especially on the level of everyday life (Kremenšek 1989).

Slavko Kremenšek thus confined his understanding of ethnology to the specificities of particular nations or ethnic groups with a historical perspective. With the reduction of ethnology to "*narodopisje*" (ethnography), it was only a matter of time until the anthropological elements of its legacy came to the fore again. This happened in the 1980s.

ETHNOLOGY AS CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY INSTEAD OF ETHNOLOGY *WITHOUT* ANTHROPOLOGY

In 1987, Slavko Kremenšek's doctoral student and assistant Božidar Jezernik studied at the London School of Economics. When he returned, he posed a very simple question: if the curriculum and the discipline at the LSE do not differ much from ethnology in Ljubljana, why do we call it ethnology, why we do not call it social anthropology? He could not have posed a more problematic question. Back in the 1960s, Slavko Kremenšek

was well aware that the concept of “ways of life” could be understood as anthropological. As a matter of fact, he imported this idea from the Soviet Union. Furthermore, he did not consider cultural or social anthropology as relevant, not only because (at least at that time) they were not historical disciplines, but because they were even strongly anti-historical. Therefore, he was satisfied when Stane Južnič, trained in the political sciences, started to teach “social anthropology” at the newly established Faculty of Sociology, Political Studies and Journalism. For Kremenšek, ethnology was something completely different from social or cultural anthropology. Back in 1965, in a response to Kuret’s report on the German national association of “ethnography” (European ethnology), Kremenšek strongly opposed any introduction of anthropological perspectives to ethnology (cf. Kremenšek 1965a, b; Kuret 1965a, b).

Therefore, Slovenian ethnology developed many different threads of study, including contemporary phenomena, with a strong accentuation on the study of the human being as a “carrier” of cultural phenomena. But only in the 1980s did studies of extreme living conditions in concentration camps (Jezernik 1983) and an overview of Slovene encounters with the non-European world (Šmitek 1986) make clear that Kremenšek’s paradigm was too narrow for further development. The renaming of the department from the Department of Ethnology to the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology was now seen as a necessary step towards a radical reevaluation of the discipline (see Brumen 2001). It was the late Borut Brumen who clearly proclaimed his political position, again radical, though this time anarchist. This stance was shaped by disappointment with socialism and a rejection of inequalities in the world. Brumen’s position took him from the critical observation of ethnological museology to urban anthropology, the ethnology of Europe and the Mediterranean, the study of social memories and migration, and, finally, to rebel movements in Niger.

In the mid-1990s, the two different streams of the discipline were again united:

Ethnology/cultural anthropology is a comparative study of ways of life and their traces in all times and places, based on researchers’ direct or indirect contact with individuals within a given environment (Muršič 2005).

REFLECTIONS OF GREAT DIVISIONS AND AFFINITIES IN THE CURRICULUM

These developments were reflected in reforms of the curriculum in 1996-1997, which introduced integrated studies in ethnology and cultural anthropology, and further in the academic year 2000-2001, when the last pre-Bologna BA programme in Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology was modernised. Before the last reform of the curriculum, students completed a full four years of the bachelor programme, after which they could begin two years of MA studies in the Ethnology of Slovenia, Cultural Anthropology, Ethnological Conservation, Ethnological Museology, Comparative Mythology and Non-European Ethnologies and Folklore. They could complete their studies with a Ph.D. in Ethnology.

The variety of topics and areas of expertise may be seen in the list of subjects offered at the Department (listed in alphabetical order):

Advertising Culture	Ethnology and the
Anthropology of Sex and Gender	Contemporary Slovene Society
Anthropology of Globalisation	Ethnology and History
Anthropology of Migrations	Ethnology of Africa
Anthropology of Music	Ethnology of America
Anthropology of Religion	Ethnology of Asia
Anthropology of Tourism	Ethnology of Europe
Comparative Mythology	Ethnology of Slavic Countries and Peoples
Cultural Management	Ethnology of the Balkans
Culture of Architecture and Living	European Studies
Current Research Results	Folklore Studies I
Current Theories of Culture and Society	Folklore Studies II
Ethnological Conservation	Foreign language I (Italian or German)
Ethnological Didactics	Foreign language II (Italian or German)
Ethnological Museology	Historical Anthropology

History of Ethnological and
Anthropological Theories
History of the Slovene
Ethnology and Cultural
Anthropology
Introduction to Methodology
Mass Media and Public
Relations
Medical Anthropology
Political and Economic
Anthropology
Popular Culture
Popular Culture and Public
Image

Psychological Anthropology
Regional Studies
Rural Planning
Slovene Culture and Lifestyle –
Genesis, Structure and Forms of
Economic Endeavour
Slovene Culture and Lifestyle –
Social Relations and Rituals
Symbolic Anthropology
Theoretical Seminar
Urban Anthropology
Visual Anthropology

The only radical reform with the Bologna adjustment has been the restructuring of the programme into three (BA) plus two years (MA) studies, but the structure of the courses has basically been preserved. Some further elective courses were added: ecological anthropology; ethnicity and nationalism; ethnographic research; cultures of Latin America; post-colonial anthropology; social memory and cultural heritage; theories of culture, ways of life and identities; anthropology and racism; anthropology and writing; anthropology of the body and movement; anthropology of conflicts, violence and natural disasters; anthropology of law; anthropology of nature; anthropology of space and place; ethnology of the European post-socialist states; intercultural communication; interpretations of folklore; linguistic anthropology; material culture; oral history

The Department is a partner in a joint MA degree CREOLE: “European Master in Social Anthropology” together with the universities of Vienna, Barcelona, Maynooth, Stockholm and Lyon (see <http://www.univie.ac.at/creole/>) and is working on another joint master in “Central European Ethnology” with partners in Bratislava, Pardubice, Krakow and Ljubljana.

CONCLUSIONS

The history of the discipline in its various regional centres is well reflected in its curriculum. The specificities of its local and regional development are related to social, historical, political and economic circumstances, as well as to the demands and expectations of society. As long as only one or two scholars directed the development of the discipline, it was linked to the idiosyncratic combinations of their intellectual training and knowledge. But even they may easily trace the path to the further reliable development of the discipline in its specific environment.

When a discipline evolves, and many new posts open up, a local school develops. In Ljubljana, it was possible to observe (and experience) the development of a new school of ethnology as cultural/social anthropology founded by the works of Božidar Jezernik and Zmago Šmitek, and later developed by the works of the late Borut Brumen and the writer of this text. Equipped with the legacy of their intellectual forefathers, younger scholars at the department in Slovenia may look optimistically to the future of their “Slovene” branch of the discipline.

All that was presented in this paper should not be understood as a defence of value-free scholarship. On the contrary, it seems that ethnological-cum-anthropological scholarship is inherently related to politics. In the past, Central and Eastern European ethnologists either participated in national-liberation movements (e.g., Radić in Croatia or Zupanič in Slovenia) or assumed a role in imperial projects and traditions (or, much later, either post-national[ist] or post-imperial[ist]). In the turbulent times of the early 20th century, Central and Eastern European scholars developed a strategy of hiding their theoretical positions behind a seemingly non-theoretical stance. “Fear of theory” (in German *Theoriefeindlichkeit*; see Rihtman-Auguštin, 2001) became a dominant position in continental ethnology, especially after it was used and abused in the Third Reich, Fascist Italy and the Soviet Union. With its seemingly objective historical-positivist orientation, it served nationalist and imperial causes well. From the present-day position of the discipline, a critical attitude towards nationalism (and imperialism with [post-]colonialism) is an essential point of departure for any Central and Eastern European ethnological-cum-anthropological scholarship.

REFERENCES

- BAŠ, Angelos. 1968. O predmetu etnologije (Teze za diskusijo). [On the Subject of Ethnology (Theses for Discussion)]. *Časopis za zgodovino in narodopisje*, 4:273-277.
- BRUMEN, Borut. 2001. "Refolucija" slovenske etnologije in kulturne antropologije. ["Refolution" of Slovene Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology.] *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva*, 41(1-2):8-16.
- JEZERNIK, Božidar. 1983. *Boj za obstanek (Oživiljenju Slovencev v italijanskih koncentracijskih taboriščih Gonars, Monigo, Padova, Rab, Renicci in Visco v letih 1942/43)*. [Struggle for Survival: On the Life of Slovenes in the Italian Concentration Camps Gonars, Monigo, Padova, Rab, Renicci and Visco in the Years 1942-1943.] Ljubljana: Borec.
- KREMENŠEK, Slavko. 1960/61. Nekaj pripomb. [A Few Remarks.] *Glasnik Slovenskega etnografskega društva*, 3(2):7-8.
- KREMENŠEK, Slavko. 1965a. Kulturnoantropološka načela. [Cultural-anthropological Principles.] *Naši razgledi*, September 25:367.
- KREMENŠEK, Slavko. 1965b, Metodološke dileme. [Methodological Dilemmas.] *Naši razgledi*, November 6:433.
- KREMENŠEK, Slavko, 1973. *Obča etnologija*. [General Ethnology.] Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- KREMENŠEK, Slavko. 1989. Etnologija. [Ethnology.]. In: *Enciklopedija Slovenije 3*. [Encyclopedia of Slovenia 3.], 63-67, Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga..
- KURET, Niko. 1965a. Nove smeri v nemškem narodopisju. [New Directions in German Ethnography.]. *Naši razgledi*, August 7, 1965:302-303.
- KURET, Niko. 1965b. Kulturnoantropološka pravda: čemu? [Cultural-Anthropological Debate: What For?]. *Naši razgledi*, October 9:389.
- LOŽAR, Rajko. 1944. Narodopisje, njegovo bistvo, naloge in pomen. [Ethnography, Its Essence, Tasks and Meaning.]. In (Rajko Ložar, ed.): *Etnografija Slovencev* [Ethnography of the Slovenes.]. Ljubljana: Klas.

- MURŠIĆ, Rajko. 2005. Kvadratura kroga dediščine: toposi ideologij na sečišču starega in novega ter tujega in domačega. [Squaring the Heritage Circle: Topoi of Ideologies at the Intersection of the Foreign and the Domestic.]. In (Jože Hudales i Nataša Visočnik, eds.): *Dediščina v očeh znanosti*. [Heritage in the Eyes of Science.], 25-39. Ljubljana: University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts.
- NOVAK, Vilko. 1956. *O bistvu etnografije in njeni metodi*. [On the Essence of Ethnography and Its Method.]. *Slovenski etnograf* 9: 7-16.
- NOVAK, Vilko. 1958. *Struktura slovenske ljudske kulture*. [The Structure of Slovene Traditional Culture.]. *Razprave* 4:3-27.
- RIHTMAN-AUGUŠTIN, Dunja. 2001. *Etnologija i etnomit*. [Ethnology and Ethno-Myth.]. Zagreb: Naklada Publica.
- ŠMITEK, Zmago. 1986. *Klic daljnih svetov: Slovenci in neevropske kulture*. [Call of Distant Worlds: Slovenes and non-European Cultures.]. Ljubljana: Borec.
- ŠMITEK, Zmago i Božidar JEZERNIK. 1995. The Anthropological Tradition in Slovenia. In (Han F. Vermeulen i Arturo Alvarez Roldán, eds.): *Fieldwork and Footnotes: Studies in the history of European anthropology*. London and New York: Routledge.

OSNIVAČI I SLJEDBENICI NA ODSJEKU ZA ETNOLOGIJU I
KULTURNU ANTROPOLOGIJU SVEUČILIŠTA U LJUBLJANI:
PUTOVI I STRANPUTICE U RAZVOJU SLOVENSKE
ETNOLOGIJE / KULTURNE ANTROPOLOGIJE

Sažetak

Iako je etnologija trebala postati jednim od studijskih programa već od osnivanja Sveučilišta u Ljubljani 1919. godine, trebalo je više od dva desetljeća evaluacija u različitim tijelima Sveučilišta da bi Niko Zupanič dobio mjesto profesora na današnjem Odsjeku za etnologiju i kulturnu antropologiju. 1940. godine, kada je prof. Zupanič konačno dobio profesuru, kurikulum iz "Seminara iz etnologije s etnografijom" na Sveučilištu u Ljubljani sadržavao je predavanja iz komparativne etnologije, prethistorije, fizičke antropologije, lingvistike i etnografije. Njegov sljedbenik, Vilko Novak, odbacio je termin "etnografija" za naziv struke i tvrdio da bi etnologija, kako se disciplina nazivala u Sloveniji od sredine 1950-ih godina, trebala proučavati "primitivne narode" kao i "običan puk" u "civiliziranim zemljama". Etnologiju je shvaćao kao disciplinu koja proučava i otkriva opće zakonitosti ljudske kulture.

Tijekom 1960-ih Novakov student, Slavko Kremešek, započeo je s etnološkim istraživanjima urbanih područja te time osnovao pravu "urbanu etnologiju". Međutim, istovremeno je etnologiju sveo na povijesnu disciplinu. Situaciju je dodatno zakomplicirao (zajedno s još jednim povjesničarom u etnologiji – Angelosom Bašem) uvođenjem "načina života" kao glavnog predmeta etnološkog interesa. Kako bi zadržao distinktivni karakter etnologije, koji proizlazi iz proučavanja folklor i tradicija, Slavko Kremešek je shvaćao "narodnu kulturu" kao drugi važan dio osnovnog predmeta istraživanja etnologije kao discipline. Nadalje, etnologiju je shvaćao kao disciplinu koja nema ništa zajedničko s "ahistorijskom" socijalnom ili kulturnom antropologijom. Zajedno sa svojim profesorom Vilkom Novakom, Kremešek je proučavao "način života" i "narodnu kulturu" Slovenaca.

1980-ih godina njegovi su studenti Zmago Šmitek i Božidar Jezernik proširili istraživanja "načina života" na mnogo općenitije teme. Zmago Šmitek potpuno se posvetio proučavanju slovenskih susreta s izvan europskim "načinima života" u opisima putnika, misionara i ostalih pisaca, a Božidar Jezernik se bavio životom i preživljavanjem u ekstremnim uvjetima talijanskih

i njemačkih koncentracijskih logora u Drugome svjetskom ratu. Obojica su postupno odbacivala naslijeđena povijesna i regionalna ograničenja discipline te su ponovo uveli antropološke elemente u kurikulum i u svoj znanstveni rad.

U 1990-ima su Borut Brumen (†) i Rajko Muršič kritizirali epistemološka ograničenja i teoretske slabosti slovenske etnologije. Odbacili su razlike između etnologije (bez obzira da li je definirana kao komparativno istraživanje europskih naroda ili u širem smislu kako su je definirali Novak i Kremenšek) i socijalne i kulturne antropologije (ne samo što se tiče proučavanja izvaneuropskih naroda, nego i recentnoga metodološkog i teoretskog razvoja tih dviju disciplina).

U članku autor prikazuje postepen razvoj kurikulumata etnologije / kulturne antropologije na Odsjeku za etnologiju i kulturnu antropologiju Sveučilišta u Ljubljani. Predstavlja nekadašnje i sadašnje kolegije koji su proizašli iz istraživanja vodećih sveučilišnih nastavnika na Odsjeku od njegovih početaka. Naposljetku razmatra budućnost same discipline u Sloveniji kroz kritički osvrt na njezine trenutne epistemološke, metodološke i disciplinarne postavke.

Ključne riječi: slovenska etnologija, kulturna antropologija, kurikulum etnologije i kulturne antropologije, predavanje i istraživanja u antropologiji

