

Ivan Šestan
Ethnographic Museum
Zagreb
Croatia
isestan@etnografski-muzej.hr

UDK 39.01:303
069(497.5 Zagreb).02:39
001.8:39
Professional paper/Stručni rad
Received/Primljeno: 20.06.2002

Three Research Projects of the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb

Based on the experience of three research projects conducted by the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb, the author formulates questions that may arise in relation to fieldwork of groups of ethnologists who engage in simultaneous research of a given area. He deals with the issues of dividing culture "by topics", of a homogenous and consistent implementation of a set research methodology, of the influence of the "subjective" aspect on the final research results and the possibilities to apply the research results. The author argues in favour of an application of the research results in the everyday practice on the researched area, with the objective of raising the population's awareness of the values of the local identity.

Key words: Ethnographic museum (Zagreb), ethnographic investigations, fieldwork (ethnography), methodology of ethnographic research

At the beginning of this paper, the intention of which is to deal with some problems of field research, I consider it important to remind ourselves of the, hopefully finally superseded division of the traditional heritage into the material one (which is the matter of interest of museums) and the spiritual one (dealt with by institutes). It is precisely this division that characterized the general fieldwork practice for a long time. Admittedly, this division was anyway caused more by practical reasons and the need for specialist training of experts than by deeper theoretical reasons. It could be even assumed that the need for experts to specialize for particular areas of traditional culture also resulted in the unintended consequence that some of the experts began dividing the heritage itself, thereby denying the "spiritual" character of the material culture and

vice versa. Unfortunately, this division has considerably marked for quite a long time the work of Croatian ethnologists, especially regarding field research. The activities of the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb have shown, however, that this fact was not the dominant characteristic of the overall work of this institution, even though the organization of the institution could be discussed in that sense. This is also supported by the fact that the *Folk Music Department*, an active part of the Museum since 1920, was separated from this institution in 1948, as a consequence of the understanding of the need for specialized institutions at that time, which enabled the establishment of today's *Institute for Ethnology and Folkloristics*. (Gjetvaj; 58).

Since its early days, the Museum has cultivated fieldwork as one of the methods of collecting material. Observing only this segment of the Museum's activities, we will notice, as one of its characteristics, that it is mainly comprised of research conducted on a relatively small geographic area, according to plans of individual curators, with the purpose of acquiring, collecting material for exhibitions or written studies, or, as the case may be, documenting a phenomenon considered valuable. In that sense, the ethnographic research in the region of Pokuplje by navigating down the Kupa river from Karlovac to Sisak stands out as the single exception from this practice in the early days of the Museum. This research is, as opposed to most of the research projects conducted by the Museum's experts, characterized by a larger area encompassed, a numerous team and a relatively widely conceived research task. Although only two of the ten-member team were museum professionals (Vladimir Tkalčić and Milovan Gavazzi), they were all related by...*being rooted in the country soil, with a keen interest and affection for the Croatian village and its cultural tradition; but at the same time inhabitants of urban metropolitan environments, broad-minded, educated and civilized Europeans* (Muraj; 15). In this early period of the Croatian ethnology, which was still lacking many educated ethnologists, this connection provided also the rest of team with certain "research legitimacy".

The research task had been defined earlier in the *Travel document* for the years 1923/24 (Muraj; 8): 1. study of general and specific ethnological issues; 2. exploring ethnological material in the field in order to determine objects of the existing holdings, 3. acquisition of objects to complete collections, 4. promoting interests of the museum and identifying field commissioners. However, in the museum problem area, in the context of which I intend to analyse three research projects that were conducted much later, the research of Pokuplje has posed a fourth research task, ...*the promotion of museum interests and identification of field commissioners*. It is evident that the museums nowadays also deal to a great extent with the same set of issues as they had in the early 20th century, only that it is formulated differently today. It is nothing but understandable that in 1923, professionals of a relatively young institution (the Museum is operative since 1919) felt the need to establish its reputation and consequently the recognition of traditional heritage in local communities. Much later, after the Museum has carried out three major research projects, which are in some segments comparable to the Pokuplje research, the question of the relevance of the results is still equally present and the need to earn recognition of the tradi-

tional heritage with the local population is still a live issue. However, the way to accomplish this objective is, due to a different social situation, completely different from what was in the mind of the researchers of the year 1923.

All of the three more recent projects were carried out in the immediate vicinity of Croatia's capital and instigated by an "*urgent need to register traditional forms of culture which are disappearing in this area due to the strong influence of Zagreb and suburban areas*".¹

The first project started in the late sixties and was finished in 1985. Since it could not be foreseen at that time that two more projects were to follow, this first project is today still colloquially referred to as "*the research of the surroundings of Zagreb*". For that purpose, the term "surroundings of Zagreb" was geographically delimited by the southern hillsides of the mountain Medvednica in the north, the Turopolje plain in the south, the locality Podsused in the west and the locality Šćitarjevo in the east.

The other two research projects were carried out in the nineties.

The 1995/96 research project was conducted in the region Žumberak, geographically defined as a upland region west of Zagreb bordering to Slovenia, stretching from the river Krka in the north and the river Kupa in the south. Administratively, the region is registered as the Sošice district.

Finally, the third field research was conducted south of Žumberak, to the southwest of Zagreb in the district of Pisarovina, encompassing the villages along the river Kupa and on the hillsides of the mountain range Vukomeričke gorice.²

All three projects stand out from the current practice by the fact that a relatively developed thematic plan, involving a multi-member team, was applied to one region. Such synchronized performance enabled a wider insight into the status of the traditional heritage than provided by sporadic individual researches conducted to that point.

Based on these three projects, I wish to address the problems I observed in the course of the work, which influenced the results. In addition, I intend give a short analysis of the current relationship of the tradition towards the contemporary, in order to explain my own relationship towards a possible application of the research results.

Description

The first research, today known as the "Research of the Surroundings of Zagreb" was conducted in a region that is, to a great extent, physically endangered by the expansion of Zagreb and smaller urban centres (Velika Gorica, Samobor and Sesvete). Unlike the other two projects, this one was carried out by ethnologists only, part by part, so that every researcher was free to use ten days a year to work on the

¹Based on the 1976 explanation of the then *Zagreb Branch of the Ethnological Society of Yugoslavia*, which initiated the idea of exploring the traditional culture of the surroundings of Zagreb

²The first financing agreement signed between the EM and the Zagreb County specified the researched region as "*...ethnographic research of Žumberak*", while the second agreement refers to "*...research of Pokuplje (former Pisarovina district)*".

part of the terrain agreed for this year. The researched area being quite large, there are considerable differences between its segments in terms of the current status of traditional heritage.

The traditional heritage is, naturally, endangered in the entire area: partly "swallowed" by the expansion of the new city precincts and population, while other parts have undergone a drastic change of the existential base. Still, this area is less threatened by the emigration of the population to the city due to relatively good communications and the possibilities to combine income sources, such as agriculture, cattle breeding and employment in economy. Truly, this is a subjective assessment based on equally subjective estimations provided by informants in the course of research, while statistical immigration and emigration data do not exist for the Zagrebačka county (Župančić: 24)

Even though traditional culture is vanishing, its traces are still very much visible. There are still numerous examples of the characteristic wooden architecture, folk costumes, fairs where the tradition can be felt in the ways of trade and the selection of hand-made items needed in a country household, parish fairs, and practices of annual and life customs. Nevertheless, social processes have caused this culture to become inevitably, part by part, confined to memories. In this context, the destructions brought about by the recent war also need to be regarded as a historical episode to be taken into account and impossible to avoid in any society. What could have been avoided is the "destruction by reconstruction" after the war. Željka Čorak's syntagm "one's own Chetnik*" provides a caricature, but also vivid illustration of not only the scope of destruction but also the gloomy fact that we are ourselves devastating our own tradition. (Kušen, 31).

Simultaneously to the research conducted by the Museum's ethnologists, the area covered by the second two research projects was investigated by a team of sociologists³, which enabled a more thorough status analysis. The assessments made during

* (trans. rem.) militant Serbian nationalist forces responsible for destructions in some parts of Croatia during the Croatian War of Independence (1991-1995) war.

³The results of research conducted in the Žumberak region are published in the book "Žumberak - heritage and future challenges", 1996, including the following content: The monument heritage of Žumberak, Population - migration and status, Housing and home inventory, Food, Fundamentals of traditional husbandry, Crafts, Transport, Trade and measurements, Textile handicrafts, Folk costumes, Folk medicine, Games and entertainment, Living customs, Annual customs, Population, Families and households, Social and economic characteristics of country households and the agriculture of Žumberak, Opinions of the people of Žumberak about development problems and advantages of their region, General overview of the economic status and development possibilities of Žumberak, Environmental approach to Žumberak. In addition to the sociological research, dialect characteristics were also researched in the Žumberak region. The results of the purely ethnological research and speech research were published in the magazine Ethnological research 6, Zagreb 1999, with the following content: Pisarovina - space, time, people, On the speech of Pisarovina, Housing, On husbandry, Food, Folk medicine, Contemporary perception of traditional crafts, Transportation and means of transport, Textile handicrafts, Folk costumes, On measurements and trade, Life customs (from birth to death), Games and entertainment.

the project "Research of the Surroundings of Zagreb" can be widely applied to the status of traditional heritage in the district of Pisarovina: the danger of emigration is not too overtly expressed, although some parts have suffered devastations during the recent war. The negative demographic trend is most prominent in the area of Žumberak, where radical changes would be required to ensure quality living conditions, due to the autarchic economy and the mountain configuration. This is the reason why many houses are abandoned or inhabited by people of advanced age.

Problems

1. Division into topics

Research conducted by a multi-member team with purpose of gaining an as comprehensive as possible insight into the traditional heritage of a certain region, indisputably offers considerable advantages compared to the research conducted by individuals focusing their interest on one or several selected topics. It is a fact, however, that in this case problems generally typical for field research manifest themselves more distinctively and ultimately result in disparity and uneven quality of dealing with individual topics.

Since large complexes are unsuitable for a comprehensive study, they need to be divided into smaller units to which our interest is focused on a temporary or permanent basis. Thus the complex of heritage is divided, on higher levels, according to scientific principles or institutions, further according to ownership, material, size, etc. (Šola: 2000, 108). This fragmentation, indispensable for the efficiency of a multi-member team engaged in field research, is on lower levels referred to as division into "topics". Unfortunately, it is impossible to make a satisfactory synthesis after the research is finished, and therefore the picture of the traditional heritage remains fragmented. This problem is especially evident in research conducted by multi-member teams.

2. Defining the topic boundaries

When researching a certain topical area, we often reach boundaries where we ask ourselves whether we are still in the domain of one topic, or already on the territory of another topic. This, of course, makes sense because we are researching the life of a human community, who were not concerned in the course of their life, to which topic their activities belong: whether the growing of cereal crops belongs to "*agriculture*", while the grinding of grain in a mill belongs to "*crafts*" or "*architecture*", whether the cattle breeding belongs to "*animal husbandry*" and the sale of cattle to "*trade*", whether the shepherd's bag is covered by the topic "*animal husbandry*" or "*textile*"...Dilemmas within one and the same topic are also caused by the different contents ascribed to a term today as compared to its content in the recent or older past. For instance, cart-wrights, carpenters and coopers will be studied as separate professions within the "*crafts*" topic. However, such distinction is, as a rule, applica-

ble to the more recent segment of traditional crafts, practiced by the so-called "*trained, qualified, skilled craftsmen*", while it is difficult to determine the "description of the profession" for skilful, self-taught individuals. If we went looking for e.g. "*cartwrights*", according to the "*more recent division*", in the surroundings of Zagreb, we would actually find a craftsman who used to make and repair parts of peasant wagons. But, soon we would find out that we have actually found a craftsman who is skilled in a whole range (or just a part of the range) of woodworking activities, and that he deals with wagons, leading-reins, yokes, wooden part of ploughs and construction of timer houses. The work of such craftsman therefore stretches over various topics: crafts, husbandry, transportation and building. According to the "folk classification", he is classified as "woodworking craftsman".

In case of team field research, the crossing over to "*somebody else's*" topic (due to a different perception of the application of the agreed methodology, subjectivity and varying capacities of the researcher, different assessment of the informant's quality...) often results in contradictoriness of data collected by two (ore several) researchers dealing with the same phenomenon. It happens frequently that, for instance, one researcher will claim that a certain phenomenon does not exist in a certain area, while another researcher (with more skill or luck?) working on an "overlapping" topic, will record this phenomenon. If such two studies are published without supervision in the same book, they will cause confusion and distrust of the thoroughness and seriousness of the research.

3. Subjectivity and lack of uniformity in the application of the accepted methodology

Every research project involving a multi-member team should necessarily start with determining a uniform methodology. However, if the project is carried out in an insufficiently known area, the agreed methodology will necessarily have to be adjusted in the course of the research. On the other hand, despite the researcher's efforts to be objective, it is not possible to avoid subjectivity regarding the research subject and the research method, which is especially evident in *ad-hoc* adaptations. Therefore, the mosaic of traditional heritage of a certain area, which we attempt to compose after research, often reflects various personalities of the researchers, various capacities for specific aspects of fieldwork and, especially, various perceptions of methods and objectives.

These problems might be, if not eliminated altogether, at least reduced to a reasonable level, by conducting preliminary researched with the purpose of establishing a uniform research methodology, by constant controls and parallel or simultaneous work adjustments in individual phases of the project, and especially by subsequent control and complementation of the material after all topics have been dealt with. These measures, however, require more time and, naturally, a more substantial funding.

When talking about tradition, we often hear - a maybe even talk ourselves - about the need of its "*preservation*". What is often forgotten is that this term is taken to mean

"recall", so that we sometimes encounter the literal interpretation of this term in the efforts to bring back "good old times", which would add quality to human life in the physical as well as the ethical sense. The ones who understand this term in such simplified way can be grouped into two opposite poles: one advocating rigid measures in the effort to petrify whatever tradition was preserved to date and to reanimate and establish it as a contemporary concept, if possible, while the other group would prefer to get rid of all this as a ballast that could cause globalisation processes, if integration proves to be impossible, to bypass us. It is a paradox that such extreme standpoints are mainly not expressed in discussions, but in practice⁴, where it should be demonstrated on a given example that we understand the principle that traditional patterns should be adapted to contemporary use and that "tradition in a contemporary context" implies the preservation of the recognizable traits and traditional spirit. Tradition is, however, a changeable category and, in order to apply its patterns, we cannot use only results of research carried out long time ago. On the contrary, constant research is indispensable both in areas that have been researched poorly or not investigated at all, and in areas already researched.

Looking back at the development of ethnological research up to date, it may seem that the only objective of our involvement with the issues of cultural heritage was the achievement of a professional and scientific results in one's own or a related profession. Of course, this is also one of the tasks, but how to answer the question about the application of such results? How could they be used in the contemporary life of the immediate and broad community, who should decide how and by whom they could be applied?

The need to protect tradition has been mentioned recently in the context of the need to preserve one's own cultural identity, threatened by globalisation processes. Despite the frequently reported positive examples from developed countries and the belittling of the danger the identity is exposed to, it seems that tradition nevertheless comes off distinctively second-best; it is a fact that concrete examples of the application of traditional patterns in the contemporary context are still few and mainly poorly executed. I believe the problem can partly be ascribed to the tradition being perceived as a cultural complex belonging exclusively to the past, and thereby to the "museum" sphere. Precisely this is the reason why the more or less successfully implemented projects in this area up to date are actually open-air museums (Old village Kumrovec, Donja Kupčina, Ozalj). Paradoxically, one of the rare projects involving a generally successful modernization of the traditional patterns was

⁴The contemporary rural architecture is commonly mentioned as one the most frequent examples of such perception and the lack of understanding and care for the tradition. The devastation of the village started before the Croatian War of Independence and was continued through ravages of war and the post-war reconstruction. But how can the architects (experts) be expected to show sensitivity for traditional architecture, if rurism was abolished on the architecture department of the Faculty of Architecture, Geology and Construction as far back as in the fifties, at a time when about 74% of the population lived in rural areas (Živković, 23).

carried out by foreigners in the construction of the Children's village Ladimirevci. Respecting the basic characteristics of the Panonian village, they managed to preserve the spirit of the regional architecture and settlement organization combined with a contemporary housing culture.⁵ It is difficult to explain why this is only an isolated example. First, it would be necessary to answer the question whether ethnologists need to take part in projects involving, for instance, urban planning, tourist, designer, agriculture and other projects?⁷ It seems that this is where the problem lies: ethnologists are not architects, designers, tourist experts, agronomists, and they in turn are not ethnologists. Thus, our results, with some positive exceptions, remain in the strict area of the profession, even though the society in general has demonstrated a considerable interest for its own traditional heritage.

Conclusion

The field research conducted by the Ethnological Museum of Zagreb (and the research by other institutions) represent a potential that could serve as a guideline for interventions with a potentially positive effect on the current situation in the researched area, marked by a difficult economic situation and negative demographic trends. The basic condition for this is that this fact is recognized with a sincere wish that the analysis of material is respected in development plans both on the local and the state level.⁶

The projects discussed here have been implemented in areas that administratively belong to a lesser degree to the City of Zagreb and predominantly to the Zagreb County. These areas are mainly rural areas, where the possession of agricultural land forms the base of existence and the average size of such land is, at least in the County, above the Croatian average level (Štambuk, Župančić, Kelebuš; 87). This needs to be definitely borne in mind when evaluating the relevance of the folk heritage for the rural environment.

In order to explain the potential that is, in my opinion, inherent to the traditional heritage, I must emphasize that the difficult situation of the village is the result of the overall economic but also a specific demographic situation. The average age of the rural population is in constant growth. These two problems are closely interlinked: in order to stop the migration of younger population to urban centres, the village life

⁵ I am grateful for this information to my colleague Zdravko Živković.

⁶ After the devastation of villages caused by the Croatian War of Independence, Croatia did not take the chance to use the vast material owned by institutions dealing with the research of traditional heritage, not even the comprehensive material of the *Department for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of culture* in the reconstruction. As early as in 1992, the Croatian Folklorist Society tried to draw the attention to problems about to emerge in the course of the expected reconstruction by organizing an expert conference. Works of Zdravko Živković and Eduard Kušen, precisely suggesting the principles to be respected in the reconstruction of the villages, are published in the Proceedings of the conference.

should improve to reach contemporary standards and the perception that life in the village is of equivalent value to the life in the cities should be strengthened.

The researched area is delimited by the administrative boundaries of the Zagreb County. With respect to this county, sociologists have established the following: *The purpose of emphasizing individual specifics of this region is to show the complexity of the interrelation between the city of Zagreb and the surrounding area and to plead for a qualitatively different approach to the analysis of interdependence and correlation between these two environments. This means at the same time that the activity of the population, as well as the purpose and the future of the Zagreb County is not necessarily to become a mechanical extension of a big city and to exist in "the shadow of a metropolis", but to become, based on its specific natural characteristics and creative efforts of the inhabitants, an equal segment of the broader region and partake in the collective efforts to reach a higher level of civilisation and culture of the region as a whole.* (Štambuk, Župančić: 11)

The basis for ensuring the equality of life in the broader region, defined in such way, must at any rate involve, in addition to *the specific natural characteristics and creative efforts of the inhabitants*, also the features of cultural heritage. This ethnological research (as well as its possible and welcome continuation) can make an important contribution to this ... *plea for a qualitatively different approach to the analysis of interdependence and correlation* between the city and its surroundings.

The heritage of the researched area contains some features that would fit well into the strategy of economic recovery based on the "*stimulation of small and middle enterprises*". Provided politicians did not deprive this syntagma of its credibility through incessant repetitions without real effects, it could really give a chance to traditional heritage. In Croatia, agriculture and stockbreeding still function within small farms, which may be treated as small entrepreneurial units. While sociologists maintain that farms in this area are *generally affected by depopulation and are in an evident decomposition stage* (Štambuk, 1994: 24), it seems that neither the establishment of better communications with the metropolis nor providing better employability in a non-agriculture branch in the immediate vicinity are sufficient to stop this trend. One the other hand, it should not be forgotten that one third of the settlements in the area of the Zagreb county has less than hundred inhabitants, which is considered insufficient for development without any additional assistance (Štambuk, 1994: 16). In a situation when the term "subventions" is predominantly understood as the credit funding of individual initiatives under various conditions, it is clearly very important to optimally use all available resources and by doing so, not neglect in any case the traditional heritage. In such cases, especially regarding the development of the so-called "rural tourism", which has the potential of converting the cultural wealth of the village into material wealth (Kušen, 33) or the production of "healthy food", funding activities in such small communities could also prove to be profitable.

These research projects in the analysed area have registered activities with a long-standing tradition, and it should be therefore assumed that the support of these activities could be best accepted by the population.

In the lowland area of the Pisarovina district, the breeding of dairy cows, pigs and geese for sale were registered as the traditional activities; therefore it would be logical to stimulate and modernize precisely these activities, which would be based on the market and processing capacities of close cities. Similarly, areas to the north and northeast of the city cherish the old tradition of vegetable production for city markets. On the other hand, the economy of Žumberak is marked by an expressive autarchy, as well as a hilly landscape and pedological characteristics, which have not provided a basis for a relevant production directed to big markets. In relation to the attractive countryside and the closeness to the city, the tradition of this area provides good conditions for the development of the so-called rural tourism, with individual farms would function as catering establishments, where the autarchy as part of the offer would become a trademark ("*See for yourself how the food we offer was grown...*"). Ten years back, a catering establishment was built in this area, attempting to combine traditional values with business thinking. Although the ethnological component of this project could be considered a failure⁷, numerous visitors on nice spring, summer and autumn days demonstrated how a systematically simulated part of the tradition of Žumberak could become the source of income and motivate young people to stay at the country.

The stimulation of modernized traditional branches of economy should be accompanied by efforts to re-establish the dignity of country life, education on the characteristics of the local traditional culture and renewed consciousness about its values, because good earning conditions and a higher life standard are no longer sufficient to keep the working-age and fertile population in the village. After World War II, the socialist strategy of economic development was based on basic industry in the cities, which required large numbers of workers. At the same time, the village was increasingly perceived as a culturally backward environment and remnant of the superseded stages of cultural development. Although this system is not dominating today, it nevertheless seems that we can talk about a loss of respect towards the local cultural identity. In a situation like this, the gathering of population around projects that bear witness to and educate about belonging to a characteristic cultural identity can play an important role in the re-establishment of dignity and pride for being part of a local culture.

In that sense, the research results based on data collected in the community and from its members could become the backbone of the project to be implemented by

⁷This catering establishment was conceived as the reconstruction of a *Žumberak village* and constructed from houses purchased in the surrounding area and relocated. At the time, the owner had ambitions to offer to tourists, in cooperation with experts for the heritage preservation, local specialties and various programs related to the tradition of Žumberak. After he had realized that the "cooperation with experts" involved an unnecessarily time-consuming and equally unnecessarily expensive projects preparation, he mounted wooden houses according to his own idea. However, the form of the houses does not correspond to the typical houses of Žumberak and the organization of the village does not reflect the one of a traditional Žumberak village. The settlement has been lately called the "Žumberak eco-village".

local communities and population, under the auspices of experts (both the Ethnologic Museum of Zagreb and other institutions). The projects should not be oriented solely towards the revelation of unknown historical facts to the contemporary population, but moreover to the affirmation of everything valuable that characterizes local culture. In that sense, the suggestiveness/impact exerted by the reputation of respected urban cultural institutions on the population could be very useful.

The project should encompass a range of ongoing actions on an as small as possible geographic area, aligned with the local infrastructure: local museums, school, folk dancers and singers⁸, private museum collection, an industrial or manufacture plan typical for this particular area. At regular intervals, small-scale local actions should become part of larger-scale actions organized in a wider area of the surroundings of Zagreb, in order to make every small community get an idea of the relevance of their culture in a wider context.

This project is not about presenting a certain area and its heritage to a foreigner, but above all to members of a particular community in its entirety, i.e. the presentation of the entire territory, of everything that was valorised and registered as relevant (buildings, urban units, outbuildings, typical landscape characteristics, ensembles, events, individuals, etc. (Šola: 1990, 22).

Through exhibitions, workshops, celebrations of important dates for the community, but also through active participation of its members in the collection of data and documentation of the local culture, such project would function as an "*identity factory*", with the purpose of forming the awareness of a local cultural identity (Kolbas: 104). If the local community is situated close to a big city such as Zagreb, the rural characteristics of the local identity are under a strong pressure of globalisation processes, which used to be called "*the influence of the city on the village*" at the time when they were still insignificant. But nowadays, when this area is becoming part of the city or a suburb, the main task of the "*identity factory*" in the formative process of a new identity should be to secure an equal role to the rural characteristics that once used to be dominant. It needs to be emphasized that this does not mean a need to impose revalorised superseded values, but to establish continuity between the past and the present cultural identity. It is well known that traditional culture is often perceived one-dimensionally: either idealised or disparaged for various reasons. Recently, the meaning of the word *rurbansim*, a pejorative for the introduction of rural values into urban culture, is applied in this meaning to the entire traditional culture, thus opposing the urban culture (as something to be aspired to) to the rural

⁸What is required here is not only a direct participation in scenic performance or the use of older villagers as mentors, but the participation of the entire local population and all generations in tradition-based events. It does not have to be a reanimation of some historical events, they can be also staged in a modernized form. It is important that they provide an opportunity and a motive for learning about one's own tradition (celebrating traditional dates related to a religious or other occasion).

culture (as superseded). Not so long ago, the term "folklorism" was attributed not the identical, but still quite a similar meaning, which was common until the sixties when Herman Bausinger introduced the terms "positive and negative folklorism" (Rihtman-Auguštin: 81). On the background of this perception of the formation of a "new identity", the Ethnological Museum could take an important place, which is valorised here from the perspective of its field research. Naturally, this does not mean that its position is above the ones of other institutions. In such projects in this area, an important role could be taken by other museums of Zagreb, as "*identity factories par excellence*", but also the ethnographic collection in the Sošice abbey, the open-air museum in Donja Kupčina, complex museums in Samobor, Velika Gorica and Sesvete, local schools, the archaeological park Šćitarjevo at Zagreb, mineral springs in Jamnica and other sites.

As a conclusion to this text, I wish to point out that my intention in describing the possibilities of using research results of the Ethnological Museum of Zagreb was to present these possibilities in the widest possible scope. I am aware that the realization of the specified projects would require a financial support which is not probable to be provided at this point and that the results of these research projects will find their most frequent application in the expert and scientific works in the domain of ethnology and related sciences. I still hope that at least a part of the potentials will be used within regular activities of local institutions (schools, amateur culture societies, small museums and individuals), at least in segments that do not require extensive funding.

Prevela: Sanja Novak