

VJERA BONIFAČIĆ
Travnijska 18, Zagreb

ETHNOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY AND CULTURAL HISTORY OF THE MEDITERRANEAN: INSIDE AND OUTSIDE PERSPECTIVES

The four of the papers I will be commenting on (Ravnik, Čapo Žmegač, Leal and Driessen) are reflexive in nature, yet each one of them takes a somewhat different approach in attempting to evaluate what has been accomplished in Mediterranean studies until now. Generally speaking, three of the papers, whose authors come from Mediterranean countries Slovenia, Croatia and Portugal, look at selected aspects of the history of ethnological and folklore research of the Mediterranean region within their own national frameworks. Henk Driessen's paper, from the more northern Netherlands, discusses some of the concepts and approaches that have been used and developed for the whole Mediterranean region by "outside" researchers, namely by older cultural historians in North America, social historians in France, and more recently by Anglo-American anthropologists.

Mojca Ravnik from Slovenia gives an overview of Slovenian ethnologists and early folklorists who, at different points in time and using different criteria, attempted to define various cultural borders of the Mediterranean region in Slovenia, and, equally importantly, those authors who pointed to the problems in establishing such borders. While reading this paper, I was struck by the similarities and differences I could observe in relation to Croatian ethnological literature with which I am more familiar. When I arranged the selected authors chronologically, rather than thematically as Mojca Ravnik has done, I could see that Slovenian and Croatian ethnological studies to a certain extent paralleled each other during the course of this century. Namely, in both cases one can observe similar sequence of changes in terms of prevailing research paradigms: from the extensive collection of ethnographic data at the turn of this century; followed by the diffusionist or cultural historical method of collecting data which resulted in demarcation of the Mediterranean region

as one of *ethnological regions* (in Croatia also called *ethnographic regions* or *cultural regions*); and finally, in more recent times, one can observe the questioning and re-evaluation of the previously used research models and methods, and a gradual shift toward more detailed and historically accurate analyses of various cultural and social processes in the complex history of the Mediterranean world.

The main difference, however, that I perceived was that on the whole Slovenian ethnologists appeared to have accomplished more than ethnologists in Croatia. To put it more precisely, they seem to have collaborated more successfully in completing or at least summing up certain collective projects, which allowed them to critically evaluate the obtained results, and collectively move on to new projects and challenges. For example, according to Mojca Ravnik, already in 1948 Matičetov wrote *On ethnography and folklore of Western Slovenes*, which appears to be a summary of ethnographic reports that had been collected prior to that time for the (Western) Mediterranean region in Slovenia. This publication by Matičetov must have served not only as a useful reference, but also allowed for easier evaluation of both the scope and the limits of that early approach of collecting ethnographic data. To my knowledge, no such review of the early Mediterranean research has been published in Croatia, certainly not as early as 1948. The first reference book of that nature, *Etnografija: Svagdan i blagdan hrvatskoga puka* [Ethnography: Everyday and Holiday of Croats], which summarizes ethnological knowledge about peasant culture(s) of Croats (and unfortunately not of other ethnic minorities in Croatia) in the first half of this century, has only recently been published (Čapo Žmegač et al. 1998). However, its publication fifty years later, in 1998, has an entirely different effect on Croatian ethnology as a whole, as well as on the more specific regional Mediterranean research.

Secondly, during the 1950s, a number of European countries, including Slovenia and Croatia, initiated collective projects of creating ethnological atlases for their respective territories. Using at that time prevalent diffusionist or cultural-historical model for interpreting the historical dynamics of peasant cultures, they hoped that such atlases would allow them to gain an insight into patterns of "diffusion" of cultural forms on the territory of Europe and its neighbouring countries. According to Mojca Ravnik, eight large anthologies of maps, complemented by introductory texts and analyses, were published in Slovenia between 1956 and 1975. For Slovenian ethnologists, such extensive work on creating ethnological atlases and, even more importantly, the evaluation of obtained results in collaboration with international scholars, must have contributed towards clearer perception of the weaknesses inherent in diffusionist or cultural-historical model when it comes to interpreting the historical dynamics of cultural processes.

In Croatia, a special *Centre for Preparation of Ethnological Atlases* was also founded at the University of Zagreb in 1961 (which was

expanded into *Centre for Ethnological Cartography* in 1984), whose specific mandate was to work on creating ethnological atlases in close collaboration with the Department of Ethnology, University of Zagreb. However, in contrast to the eight anthologies of maps published in Slovenia, no results were published in Croatia except for one small folder of maps which was published as late as 1989 (Belaj 1989a). Needless to say, it would hardly be relevant to publish such ethnological atlases today, in the 1990s, since most of the European countries involved in that project, including Slovenia, which had published their results a long time ago, concluded that they were informative but not sufficiently accurate in explaining historical dynamics of diffusion of cultural forms, and consequently abandoned investing further efforts into this project. Not unrelatedly, from that time onwards, they also gradually ceased using diffusionist or cultural-historical model in ethnological research, because they realized, as Eric Wolf has pointed out back in 1982, that one cannot properly interpret the patterns of transmission of cultural forms from group to group, without paying any attention to "the ecological, economic, social, political, and ideological matrix within which the cultural forms were being transmitted in time and space" (Wolf 1982:15). Consequently, European ethnologists have since that time moved on to embrace new topics and research approaches which can answer questions about historical dynamics of popular culture, including peasant culture, with greater precision and accuracy. Unfortunately, this transformation of the discipline of ethnology has not yet been accomplished in Croatia on all relevant levels of institutional activities, as cultural-historical approach still prevails in undergraduate education of ethnology. I stress this fact, because I consider it to be the main stumbling block that is preventing Croatian ethnology as a whole to advance and transform itself into a socially relevant and dynamic academic discipline. Scholars associated with the *Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research* in Zagreb, whose fiftieth anniversary is marked by this conference, joined the interdisciplinary and international dialogue already back in the 1970s, and have since incorporated new topics and various new theoretical approaches into their research programme. Folklorists at the Institute have on the whole succeeded to transform folklore studies in Croatia, and their advances in the study of oral and popular literature, ethnoteatology and ethnomusicology have by and large been accepted and incorporated into undergraduate programming of various relevant departments of literature and music at the University of Zagreb. Ethnologists at the Institute have also invested much effort to critically evaluate Croatian ethnology in terms of its past practice; as well, they introduced new topics and theoretical approaches into their own research programme. However, they have not been successful in radically transforming the discipline of ethnology in Croatia as a whole, because the critical discussion of the old and new theoretical approaches and methods has not been properly incorporated into the undergraduate educational programming, which is, of course, the

crucial step in transforming an academic discipline — without it, research advances are not transferred to the new generations of students who are supposed to build upon them.

It is not unusual, of course, when different institutions within the same country (university departments, research institutes, museums) do not change and develop in exactly the same ways at all times; in fact, struggles among institutions over prevailing research models within a given academic discipline are the rule, rather than exception. When based on reasoned discussions, such struggles indeed guarantee eventual advancement and maturing of the academic discipline in question. In the case of Croatian ethnology, however, these institutional struggles have lasted for almost thirty years without bringing constructive changes; instead, they continue to waste much energy that could be used more productively, so that Croatian ethnology, and ethnology of the Mediterranean within it, can truly move forward to the forefront of contemporary disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarly research both within Croatia and internationally.

Jasna Čapo Žmegač addresses in her paper this very problem of stagnation of Croatian ethnology on the whole, and ethnology of the Mediterranean in particular. However, she addresses this problem from one specific point of view, namely, by examining possible relationship between Croatian ethnology, local Mediterranean research, and political programmes of building national identities on the territory of Croatia in the second half of the 20th century. More precisely, from a review of ethnological literature she identifies three main constructs of the Mediterranean that have thus far been proposed by Croatian ethnologists, and examines the roles, if any, that these scholarly constructs played in the (re)construction of national identity in the period after the World War II. Her conclusions are that none of the three ethnological constructs of the Mediterranean played any substantial role in the construction of national identity, neither in the socialist state of the former Yugoslavia, nor in the now independent Croatia. Furthermore, she suggests that perhaps the reticence of Croatian ethnologists to get involved in public discussions regarding various political programmes of (re)defining national identities, is the very reason for the undue stagnation of the discipline of ethnology. More specifically, she suggests that, during the socialist period, Croatian ethnologists perhaps continued to use cultural-historical research model, which concerned itself primarily with the distant past of peasant cultures, in order to avoid studying politically sensitive topics such as, for example, "People's Liberation War" or the culture(s) of workers in socialist Yugoslavia, topics which could have been ideologically manipulated by the former socialist state. Secondly, in the more recent period in independent Croatia, she suggests that as a result of their continuing political restraint, Croatian ethnologists have stagnated and "failed to develop Mediterranean studies as a field in its own right", and, by extension, also failed or avoided to join more outspoken art and literary historians in public discussions

over the question of the Mediterranean as a desirable metaphor for national identity in contemporary Croatia.

I would like to add some of my own thoughts to this topic, because I tend to interpret the stagnation of Croatian ethnology in relation to processes of (re)construction of national identities on the territory of Croatia somewhat differently. It is true that cultural regions (including the Mediterranean one), as defined by cultural-historical model, have not been directly used in attempts to (re)construct national identities either in socialist Yugoslavia or in the now independent Croatia. However, the canonization of diffusionist or cultural-historical model within the discipline of ethnology during the 1930s led to the secondary canonization of somewhat older *cultural products* (which were suitable for diffusionist type of research) as "authentic" or "autochthonous" national heritage (see Bonifačić 1996; 1997). These cultural products, which included both material objects and behaviour — especially older costumes, songs and dances — formed a ready-made set of symbols of regional and local identities, which were then further grouped and re-grouped and utilized in the construction of Croatian (ethnic and/or national) and Yugoslav (supra-national) identities on the territory of Croatia from the 1930s onwards. The fluctuation of state borders, and subsequent shifts in emphasis between ethnic, national and supra-national identities, did not seem to weaken the efficacy of these symbols among the population; on the contrary, the persistent use of the same (or slightly altered) cultural products strengthened their efficacy, because people have simultaneously developed enduring emotional associations of these products with their regional and local identities.

These "autochthonous" costumes, songs and dances have for the first time been extensively utilized as symbols of Croatian national identity by Croatian Peasant Party (HSS) during the late 1930s, when HSS changed its ideology from being oriented to the future to being oriented to the past (Leček 1995), and started to actively promote (often mythologized) "old ways" of rural life as symbols of Croatian identity. Between 1936 and 1941, in their renewed efforts to mobilize rural population in their political struggle to gain greater autonomy for Croatia within the Yugoslav state, HSS organized numerous folklore festivals in Zagreb as well as in rural regions of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Performers at these folklore festivals were allowed to display and perform only selected costumes, songs and dances, which were considered "genuine" or "autochthonous", as sanctioned by the most prominent ethnologists at the time, Gavazzi and Bratanić (Sremac 1978).

After World War II, in its effort to modernize the country, the socialist state of Yugoslavia actively discouraged older customs in real life of communities, especially those which used to be publicly sanctioned by religious authorities. However, the socialist state wished to preserve "autochthonous" folklore arts. To this end, they established the new *Institute for folk art*, opened new ethnographic museums and collections,

and promoted and financed various amateur cultural societies and semi-professional performing groups in cities and rural areas, whose aim was to preserve performing skills of songs and dances through staged performances. Whenever possible, the choice of costumes and performing repertoire continued to be sanctioned by professional ethnologists (Bošković-Stulli 1971). Naturally, even when monitored by ethnologists, such representative "autochthonous" songs and dances of each locality have not been simply fixed and frozen; also, the performers themselves changed, styles of choreography, the methods of transferring skills, so that the performing arts practice somewhat changed with time (Ceribašić 1998). Nevertheless, it remained within the general category of "genuine" or "autochthonous" folklore art. However, the most significant change in the socialist period was that the whole repertoire of amateur or semi-professional performing groups (consisting of mostly young people) had to include dances from the whole territory of Yugoslavia. The socialist state also expanded the network of ethnographic museums and collections across Croatia. Again, the museum curators/ethnologists were educated not to question the canonized cultural-historical interpretation and evaluation of popular art forms; as a consequence, only "autochthonous" cultural products (with minor variations) came to be displayed in museums' permanent exhibits, as well as in museum publications, promotional publications for tourists, etc. The intentions of the socialist state in promoting the preservation of canonized "traditional folklore arts" were both ideological and, with the rapid development of tourism from the 1960s onwards, also economic. Through organized festivals and museum programming, the state could simultaneously promote and inter-connect local, regional, national (in this case Croatian) and supra-national (Yugoslav) identities both among performers and attending audiences, which, paradoxically, worked perhaps most successfully after the development of international tourism — namely, when tourists became the new "Other".

It was during the 1970s and 1980s, when scholars associated with the *Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research* gradually assumed the leading role in Croatian ethnology and folkloristics that the "authenticity" of these canonized products in museum displays and staged public folk festivals began to be questioned. Through their role as expert advisors for International folklore festivals held in Zagreb, for example, ethnologists and musicologists from the Institute broadened the range of allowed repertoire to include some of the more contemporary versions of costumes, songs and dances. Through this, they were actually beginning to assert among general public their scholarly "deconstruction" of cultural-historical model and its canonized forms of "genuine" or "autochthonous" peasant arts, which were supposedly "destroyed" by modernization, and promoting instead their new scholarly definition of popular culture as a living process, whose products are subject to continuous change, and

whose contemporary versions are, therefore, equally worthy of public attention and celebration as those from a more distant past.

This change in research paradigm which was about to occur in Croatian ethnology, and which was only beginning to influence related educational, museum and performing arts practice, was soon to be disrupted by the severe political crises during the late 1980s and the early 1990s. The collapse of the socialist Yugoslavia led to the military conflict and subsequent creation of independent Croatia. Among the symbols that emerging political parties and the newly formed state used in an attempt to rapidly (re)create the Croatian national identity, were the well tried "autochthonous" costumes, songs and dances (albeit somewhat changed or modified). They reappeared in public life on various levels: from organized celebrations in community life (now often sanctioned by religious authorities), election campaigns, organized folk festivals, organized projects of reconstruction of "autochthonous" costumes from regions devastated by the war, temporary museum exhibits, etc.; these were further transmitted and shared with wider public through publications, press, and especially TV programmes. In such public climate, the Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb started to publish a new journal, *Studia ethnologica* (later renamed to *Studia ethnologica Croatica*), and reasserted once again that cultural-historical model be retained in ethnological education and research, because, they claimed, this model enabled them "to reconstruct ethnic history (of Croats, note V. B.) through research of culture" (Belaj 1989:13). Although this argument was not accepted among many ethnologists in Croatia, and even received a reasoned scholarly response (Čapo 1991; Čapo Žmegač 1994), the fact remains that cultural-historical model still prevails in undergraduate educational programmes in Croatia.

To round up my response to the argument raised by Jasna Čapo Žmegač, I tend to think that Croatian ethnology has not stagnated because of political restraint of ethnologists over the past fifty years. On the contrary, Croatian ethnology as a discipline, and cultural-historical model in particular, have been directly and indirectly very much implicated in political processes of (re)constructing national identities on the territory of Croatia over the past sixty years. Individual ethnologists in Croatia, each in their particular role and capacity, more often than not granted scholarly legitimacy to such political instrumentalization of canonized interpretations and classifications of popular culture (albeit with differing degrees of zeal and consciousness), while some chose to refrain from it. It was towards the end of more liberal period in socialist Yugoslavia, in the late 1980s, that Croatian ethnology was about to become fully transformed in all of its aspects (research, education and museum programming), and brought to the forefront of current developments in social sciences, both in Croatia and internationally. That momentum was unfortunately lost and deflated with the onset of war, and it now needs to be rebuilt once again. I hope that contributions by Jasna Čapo Žmegač and other authors will re-

-open this discussion among Croatian ethnologists, as well as facilitate its resolution.

The paper by João Leal from Portugal brings yet another comparative perspective to this discussion. Leal has selected three scholarly discourses, from the disciplines of geography, ethnology and social anthropology, and examined their different ways of appropriating the countryside of Mediterranean Portugal as a metaphor for Portuguese national identity in this century. I found his analysis of mixing between scholarly and literary genres in Portuguese scholarly writings very interesting. Upon reflection, however, I came to think that the relative absence of this phenomena in early Croatian ethnographic texts is perhaps equally interesting. I would suggest that this is largely due to the fact that we were fortunate to have Antun Radić as a founder of Croatian ethnological and folklore studies.

According to Leal's paper, the described Portuguese texts and books were not only written *by* scholars who were city dwellers, but also *for* the city dwellers, namely for "nationalizing" only the elite and city (and not peasant) populations in Portugal. Radić, by contrast, had entirely different personal background, as well as both scholarly intentions and political orientations. First of all, Radić was from a peasant (rather than elite) background, and therefore less prone to romanticizing rural life; instead, he knew the harsh reality of living conditions in rural regions at the turn of this century, and, having had a highly developed sense of social conscience, eventually left ethnology for a life of social activism within the Croatian Peasant Party. Secondly, being a brilliant and intuitive thinker and scholar, he developed in a very short period of time a complex and insightful framework for Croatian ethnology, including its relationship to short and long term politics. As evident from his early writings, Radić held a conception of scholarly research as a patient gathering of knowledge that should not have a direct pragmatic purpose, either philanthropic, political, or economic, but must be satisfied with the answers to the questions as to *how* and *why* (Radić 1896:319-320). He also explicitly stated that ethnology as a science should not serve either religious (1897:9) or political ideologies (1896:362). Only in the long run did Radić hope that scientific research would influence society in how it perceives itself, thus bringing leveling of all cultures (1897:10). He further proposed, with an insight and value judgment quite unusual for his time, that theories and methodologies for studying rural culture should not in principle differ from those for studying elite culture (1897:86). He also wanted ethnology to be multidisciplinary in its approach, in order to explain the functioning of all aspects of rural culture; in other words, he wanted ethnology to reveal, aside from cultural and spiritual riches and values, the historical determinants of dismal economic conditions of life among the rural population at the time. He actually considered elite city dwellers to be incapable of adequately recording or writing ethnographic reports, and specifically instructed that only rural people document and write about the

life and culture of their communities. I believe that this insightful guidance by Antun Radić, which accompanied the questionnaire for collecting ethnographic data, to a large extent explains the absence of pastoral element in early Croatian ethnographic texts.

As for the presence of counter-pastoral discourse in ethnographic writings in Croatia, we did perhaps have an equivalent to Portuguese José Cutileiro in Rudolf Bićanić, although Bićanić wrote his texts somewhat earlier, during the 1930s. Perhaps this paper by João Leal will inspire similar analysis of Rudolf Bićanić's writings, which are certainly deserving of more attention.

Henk Driessen takes us outside of national scholarly frameworks and introduces in his paper the name of Fernand Braudel, the author whose work marked the Mediterranean studies perhaps more than any other in this century. Relating for a moment back to João Leal's theme, it is well known that Braudel's writings have been described as having literary qualities. Braudel was indeed able to warm the hearts of readers regardless of the subject he was writing about — from his beloved France, to the Mediterranean, to all of the civilizations of the world, past and present. Only his style was perhaps sufficiently modern, less 'foreign' to our ears, so that many of us could gladly submit ourselves to it.

When it comes to scholarly aspects of Braudel's work, Henk Driessen reminds us of the great influence that his work, *Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Philip II*, exerted on Anglo-American anthropology of the Mediterranean. I would like to add that Braudel's great trilogy (first published in 1979, and since then translated to many languages including Croatian), *The Structures of Everyday Life, The Wheels of Commerce, The Perspective of the World: Civilization & Capitalism 15th-18th century*, is of equal importance for Mediterranean studies. The titles themselves are indicative of its subject matter. What is of particular importance for Mediterranean studies, is that they cover the period of time when the Mediterranean world, including the Adriatic coast which was at the time divided between Republics of Dubrovnik and Venice, played a very important role in global macro-processes of early *pre-industrial* capitalism. The book by Eric Wolf's, *Europe and the People Without History* (1982), represents a kind of extension to Braudel's trilogy. It deals with the 19th and the 20th century, and traces global macro-processes of *industrial* capitalism, when Mediterranean lost its importance as a naval power, and started to experience great economic, political, and demographic changes. To name just a few of these changes: gradual formation of nation-states, rapid industrialization and urbanization across Europe, massive immigration of Mediterranean population to Americas — with all the social and cultural consequences these changes entailed.

Finally, let me comment on the future-oriented question Henk Driessen poses in his paper: how to go forward in Mediterranean research? More specifically, what are the most meaningful units of study: micro-

-units of communities, larger regions, national borders, or the whole of the Mediterranean? My own answer is that each one of them can be a meaningful and manageable unit of study depending on the type of research question posed, remembering only that national state borders can be meaningful units of study only after the formation of nation-states, and that they are only one kind of border among many others simultaneously present on the same territory. I would go even further and say that we also need to include global macro-processes into Mediterranean studies, for which the appropriate unit of study is the whole world (as in Braudel's and Wolf's work).

Yet the spatial and geographical borders are not the only borders that determine the unit of study. We also need to consider the borders that are imposed by the time period selected for study, which will again be determined by the nature of the research question posed. Finally, the third kind of borders, as Henk Driessen implies, will be determined by the concept of culture. Is culture the sum total of elite cultural products and monuments and their formal characteristics, as older cultural historians perceived culture to be? Is it an a-historical closed system of symbols, similar to language system, as French structuralists proposed? Is it a collage of texts, as James Clifford proposed? Does it include all forms of elite and popular culture, including sport or tourist culture, for example, or is it restricted to canonized aspects of elite cultures as well as canonized "autochthonous" folk cultures?

Personally I take the definition of culture from cultural semioticians in the tradition of Russian formalism, the Prague school of structuralism, and further developed into polysystem theory by Even-Zohar (1990) in Tel Aviv, Israel. The polysystem theory defines all cultural activities, or larger units such as culture, as dynamic, functional, stratified, heterogeneous *open systems* which are subject to change over time. This definition of culture as a polysystem parallels Pierre Bourdieu's concept of the *field* of cultural production. It is indeed proper to mention the name of Pierre Bourdieu, the influential French sociologist/anthropologist, as someone who has also greatly contributed to Mediterranean studies through his work in Algeria. It was his fieldwork in Algeria which prompted him to reflect on the shortcomings of the French structuralism approach to the study of culture, and to subsequently develop his own theoretical model of the *field* of cultural production, and related theoretical concepts such as habitus, symbolic capital, and others. Both his theoretical approach to the study of cultural dynamics, as well as results of his work in Algeria, are discussed in his book, *The Logic of Practice* (1990), which is by now a classic among scholars from various disciplines who favour the interdisciplinary approach to the study of culture.

To conclude, I consider that Mediterranean cultural studies ought to become one large international and collaborative project among sociologists, anthropologists, ethnologists, folklorists, and social and cultural historians. Not only could specific projects be collaborative, but

scholars from various disciplines should also discuss and share their research models, theories and concepts, continue to improve research methodologies, as well as actively share and cross-reference publications across disciplines. We need to collectively study various macro-processes relevant for the Mediterranean region, as well as micro-studies of meaningfully selected social groups or communities which will show the imprint of the larger macro-processes on the local life and culture of a selected time period. We also need to reveal the dynamics of change in various types of *borders* which intersect through geographical and historical space of the Mediterranean. The archives in the greater part of the Mediterranean world are particularly rich, and much has already been published about its various histories, allowing for ambitious projects of many-layered interpretations of its historical and contemporary reality.

Let me try to demonstrate this briefly on the example of my own research of lace history on the island of Pag in the Adriatic part of the Mediterranean. Lace has been made, exchanged on domestic and foreign markets, and used in local life of Pag for several centuries now. My research has very quickly revealed that this relatively isolated island has been very much connected with the outside world through lace production and exchange. First, it is likely that the initial technologies and designs for lace came to Pag from Venice, which were modified for local use with time; then, in the early part of the 20th century, both technologies and designs were greatly modified again through establishment of lace school in Pag and its connections with the Arts and Crafts School in Vienna and later in Zagreb. Secondly, Pag lace has always been to some extent exchanged on local markets, but it has also been exchanged on Italian, Austrian, European city markets, and recently on international tourist markets. Furthermore, my research about lives of women lacemakers has revealed that their history is inseparable from much wider sphere of European women's history, family history, religious history, institutional history of churches and schools, global and local economic history, history of population migrations, history of international tourism, and, of course, political history. I need to have as much knowledge as possible about all of these histories in order to properly interpret one life story of an elderly woman lacemaker from Pag, the complexity of their collective story, or what Appadurai (1986) has termed 'the social life of things' — in my case 'the social life of Pag lace'. In short, the whole world mirrors itself even in this segment of life on this small Adriatic island in the Mediterranean.

Acknowledgements:

The author gratefully acknowledges the funding of her postdoctoral research in Croatia by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES CITED

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1986. *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Belaj, Vitomir. 1989a. *Etnološki atlas Jugoslavije: Karte s komentarima, svezak 1*. Zagreb: Centar za etnološku kartografiju.
- Belaj, Vitomir. 1989b. "Plaidoyer za etnologiju kao historijsku znanost o etničkim skupinama". *Studia ethnologica* 1:9-17.
- Bonifačić, Vjera 1996. *Ethnological research and canonization of autochthonous folk textiles in Croatia, 1896 to 1940: A Polysystem study*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Canada.
- Bonifačić, Vjera. 1997. "Ethnological research in Croatia: 1919 to 1940". *Narodna umjetnost* 33/2:239-264.
- Bošković-Stulli, Maja. 1971. "O folklorizmu". *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena* 45:165-186.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press. (Original work published in 1980).
- Braudel, Fernand. 1981. *The structures of everyday life: The limits of the possible*. New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published in 1979).
- Braudel, Fernand. 1982. *The wheels of commerce*. New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published in 1979).
- Braudel, Fernand. 1984. *The perspective of the world*. New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published in 1979).
- Ceribašić, Naila. 1998. *Folklorna glazbena praksa i kulturna politika: Paradigma smotri folkloru u Hrvatskoj*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Zagreb.
- Čapo, Jasna. 1991. "Croatian ethnology, the science of peoples or the science of culture?". *Studia ethnologica* 3:7-25.
- Čapo Žmegač, Jasna. 1994. "Plaidoyer za proučavanje (nacionalnog) identiteta u hrvatskoj etnologiji". *Etnološka tribina* 17:7-24.
- Čapo Žmegač, Jasna [et al.]. 1998. *Etnografija: Svagdan i blagdan hrvatskoga puka*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Leček, Suzana. 1995. "Između izvornog i novog — 'Seljačka Sloga' do 1929. godine". *Etnološka tribina* 18:103-123.
- Radić, Antun. 1896. "Referati. Bibliografija". *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena* 1:315-363.
- Radić, Antun. 1897. "Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu". *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena* 2:1-88.
- Sremac, Stjepan. 1978. "Smotre folkloru nekad i danas". *Narodna umjetnost* 15:97-116.
- Wolf, Eric. 1982. *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

ETNOLOGIJA, ANTROPOLOGIJA I KULTURNA HISTORIJA MEDITERANA: UNUTARNJE I VANJSKE PERSPEKTIVE

SAŽETAK

Autorica komentira radove Jasne Čapo Žmegač, Henka Driessena, João Leala i Mojce Ravnik, koji su na konferenciji bili predstavljeni u okviru sesije "Kulturna antropologija I". Smatra da je vrijednost ovih radova u tome što svaki na svoj način propituje dosadašnja etnološka/kulturno-antropološka istraživanja Mediterana: Čapo Žmegač (Hrvatska), Ravnik (Slovenija) i Leal (Portugal) razmatraju odabrane aspekte istraživanja Mediterana unutar nacionalnih, geografskih, političkih, kulturnih i znanstvenih granica zemalja koje predstavljaju, dok Driessen (Nizozemska) propituje dosadašnje pristupe istraživanju Mediterana "izvana", posebno se dotičući radova sjevernoameričkih i francuskih kulturnih historičara i antropologa.

U prvome dijelu autorica povlači paralele i ukazuje na razlike u dosadašnjim istraživanjima Mediterana u Sloveniji, Portugalu i Hrvatskoj. Posebnu pozornost poklanja osebnosti i još uvijek poticajnoj ličnosti Antuna Radića kao osnivača etnološke znanosti u Hrvatskoj, te kasnijem razvoju etnološke znanosti u odnosu na političke mijene i uvjete u Hrvatskoj tijekom ovog stoljeća. U drugome dijelu, upućuje na aspekte teorijsko-metodoloških pristupa o kojima se u radovima raspravlja, a za koje smatra da su relevantni za sadašnja i daljnja istraživanja Mediterana. Zalaže se za povijesnu egzaktnost, kombinaciju makro i mikro perspektiva u sagledavanju dinamike povijesne zbilje, za model kulture kao otvorenog sistema podložnog povijesnim promjenama i sukladno tome za interdisciplinarni dijalog i suradnju u znanstvenim istraživanjima.