

MILOVAN GAVAZZI AND THE QUESTION ON THE ACTUALITY OF THE CROATIAN CULTURAL-HISTORICAL ETHNOLOGY

ŽARKO ŠPANIČEK

Državna uprava za zaštitu kulturne i prirodne baštine
Sjedište u Osijeku
31000 Osijek, F. Kuhača 27

UDK 39.001(091)

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Original scientific paper
Priljeno: 21. 11. 1995.

The work is an attempt to shed light on relation between traditional and contemporary ethnology in Croatia. Taking Gavazzi's theoretical statements as a starting point the author tries to reply to the criticism which newer Croatian ethnology has directed to the older one. Attention is called to the need of redefining the relation between two maior ethnological tendencies in order to pave the new way to the development of this science in Croatia.

This treatise is not supposed to give a complete evaluation of M.Gavazzi's opus nor to give an evaluation of his contribution to the cultural and historic approach to ethnology. It represents the attempt to put M.Gavazzi into the context of the discussions on the theory basis of the ethnology science in Croatia. Such an approach can, at first sight, appear theoretically doubtful as M.Gavazzi was not primarily interested in the theory and methodology questions but was directing his attention to re-searching on the contents of the culture, i.e. of the cultural elements. However, as the contents of the culture cannot be researched without a clear concept of the methodology, I have considered connecting M.Gavazzi's work with the theory questions justifiable. In doing this I am taking M.Gavazzi as one of several possible starting points for the critical illustration of the relationship of the traditional and modern Croatian ethnology. Up to the present moment the relationship appears to have been in one direction only, i.e. the critique has been moving from the modern ethnological approach to the traditional cultural-historical one. I will, therefore, attempt to establish the reverse relation, or, I will be trying to show what the answer to the modern Croatian ethnology could be given from the standpoint of the cultural-historical ethnology, or, more precisely, from the standpoint close to the cultural-historical ethnology.

Starting on such a serious task, the complexity of which greatly exceeds the attention and time I could dedicate to it at the present moment, I will begin with two significant determinants of M.Gavazzi's approach to ethnology: I will start with his method of approach and his understanding of culture.

In his article on the cultural movements in the Danube area, M.Gavazzi has succinctly formulated his research approach, which is characteristic for his complete scientific work. He is pleading for two interrelated directions of researching to be made on sufficiently large basis. "One of the directions consists of collecting data on particular cultural elements with regards to their geographic range of spread, while the

other one consists of applying the extensive linguistic (particularly lexicologic) research which includes the geography of the range of spread of cultural elements termed - both by analysing the origins of particular terms and their destiny" (Gavazzi, 1978: 158). The author emphasises that with the support of other research means (historical data from the sources, archaeological finds and the like) those two particular directions very often offer the most important proofs (and the counter-proofs) to bring **the final ethnological knowledge**" (emphasised by Ž.Š.). Particular attention should be given to the manner M. Gavazzi used to stress that the two mentioned directions of research would represent the level of significance in the studying of the cultural changes, as the cultural penetration and the issuing consequences appear, in various change forms, often in the processes of cultural movements that cover particularly ethnographic (even geographic) border expanses. Explicit emphasising of cultural change and of the processes of cultural movements is of great importance for the critical disclosing of the relationship of the traditional and modern Croatian ethnology and is the matter I will be attempting to clarify later in the text. Collecting of the data on particular cultural elements regarding their geographic range of spread has been directing M. Gavazzi's work to the path of induction, to the interest for individual in order to reach the answer to the question on origins, by ways of the spreading, impacts and associating as well as relative chronology of particular cultural treasures. In doing this, M. Gavazzi is interested in studying Slav culture, i.e. in following particular cultural elements among different Slav people, this being done under the influence of Kazimierz Moszynski. In the same way M. Gavazzi is interested in the reconstruction of the old Slav culture before their migrations, which again is the result of the influence of his teacher Lubor Niederle.¹ The interest has been conditioned by his intentions to find the main source of the origins of recent peasant cultures of Slav people, primarily of the Croats.

The second research direction leading to the comprehensive linguistic, particularly lexicologic, research which is used to reach the knowledge about the culture, specially with regard to the origins of particular cultural elements, has been developed by M. Gavazzi under the strong influence of the European linguistics of 19th c. Studying the common traits in different languages, the linguistic science had reduced the similarities to the common basis or to the common primeval people (ancestors) calling them IndoEuropeans or IndoGermans because the east branch is represented by the Indian languages and the west branch by the German languages. All the languages belonging to the IndoEuropean linguistic family have common directions in grammatical build up, in forming of the word, in linguistic treasures and syntax, which all led to the conclusion on IndoEuropean original language as well as to the assumptions on single people with one language and one culture. Though some contemporaneous scientists reject such a procedure and consider the IndoEuropeans and Indo-European language

¹ The whole series of works has been united in the book "Vrela i sudbina narodnih tradicija" (Wells and fates of the folk traditions) in the chapter "Kroz život i kulturu Slavena u davnini" (Through life and culture of the Slavs in ancient times) and has been dedicated to the reconstruction of the Old Slav culture.

as only the linguistic hypothesis of 19th c², M. Gavazzi has basically applied the same approach to the Slav linguistic and ethnographic material. The procedure could be summarised by the formula: the same or similar terms for the same cultural treasures or their parts in different Slav languages talk of the common Slav origin of the particular cultural treasure. The similar procedure is being applied for the foreign cultural influences on Slav peasant culture and M. Gavazzi is trying to identify them and follow them according to their names (terms). However, it should be stressed that he does not use this procedure mechanically, he is trying to fill it with data from other sources wherever it might be necessary, giving precedence sometimes to other data, though the terms might be suggesting other conclusions.

The most significant connector of these two directions of studying - geographical spread of cultural elements and their terminology - is represented in the comparative method. By the comparative study of space distribution and terms of the cultural elements M. Gavazzi is trying to penetrate the genetic survey of traditional national culture so that all the components be explaining on their genesis, age and origins (Gavazzi, 1991:7). The very attitude leads us to M. Gavazzi's understanding of the traditional culture, comprehension which is essentially connected with his research principles. His understanding being characteristically partial appears quite obvious from the following attitude: "If one wants to give a complete picture of a culture and demonstrate how the culture came into existence, which stages it had been passing through in its development, one should first get to know or make research of **every particular cultural treasure to the last one**: what is the age of culture, whether it had originated in the culture and when, or whether it has been taken over and when; further on, what had happened *to each one cultural treasure* (emphasised by Ž.Š.) through centuries and whether it had been developing, in what connection or relations it had been with other elements of the studied culture, how long it had lasted, i.e. whether it had already disappeared and been forgotten or whether it still remains in the people, etc." (Gavazzi, 1942:639). To the remark that it means M. Gavazzi's atomising the traditional culture one could reply that it is not the matter of his understanding of the national culture but of the ways theresearching should be made and disclosed. There is no doubt that M. Gavazzi basically acknowledges the entirety of the traditional culture, in this case the Croatian one, and that he emphasises the fact clearly (Gavazzi, 1991: 108 and elsewhere), considering the basic traditional stratum of primeval Croatian cultural treasures, the one which is dominating in the traditional peasant culture and which "connects everything into entity" (the same). M. Gavazzi identifies the primeval Croatian with primeval Slav. However, in his research procedure the

² "Velika ilustrirana povijest svijeta" (Big illustrated history of the world) 2, Otokar Keršovani, Rijeka, 1974, pages 527 and 908.

entireness has to crumble because the basis of the procedure is made of the comparative analysis of the space distribution and terminology of particular cultural treasures and cultural spheres, which includes groups of cultural phenomena.³

The emphasised entireness of the traditional culture is lost in M. Gavazzi's comparative analyses, classification by the cultural strata and areas, and in enumerations of cultural inventory of this or that ethnographic region or cultural sphere. Even though the titles of his works ("Pregled etnografije Hrvata" (Survey of Ethnography of Croats), "Godina dana hrvatskih narodnih običaja" (A year of the Croatian Folk Customs) and the contents universality of "Kulturna analiza etnografije Hrvata" (Cultural Analysis of the Ethnology of Croats), and "Sadržaj kulture i života Hrvata u prošlosti i sadašnjosti" (Contents of the Culture and Life of Croats in the Past and Present) speak of the entireness, they are not really reaching the level as the traditional culture is not a sum total of particular cultural elements or strata, so much so that the works continue to be on the level of analytical surveys and ethnographic surveys, but never of synthetic studies.

Here, it should be emphasised that M. Gavazzi has been trying to overcome, not only in principle but also theoretically, the partiality of studying and the comprehending of the culture as a totality of cultural elements. The attempt is leading him into the formulation of the cultural areas, the concept he had taken from Jovan Cvijić (as well as from A. Haberlandt) and then further redefined it. It seems opportune to mention here that M. Gavazzi had taken from J. Cvijić the doubtful term "Balkan" and "the Balkan Peninsula" which is hardly acceptable even as the geographical concept, and even less as the cultural category (i.e. as the expanse frame for grouping and classifying of particular cultural occurrences). Though M. Gavazzi does not understand the cultural areas overmuch strictly or immovably schematisedly, he still comprehends them as the space entities in which the particular cultural elements had been amassed in relatively large numbers and with a relatively significant role in the life of particular population (or both) which are defining the expanse of the areas in reference to the different surrounding (and distant) areas (Gavazzi, 1978: 185). His defining of the areas of the traditional culture of southeastern Europe as cultural and geographical entities, as a group of cultural elements characteristic for the area, prove that M. Gavazzi here also stops at partial comprehending of the entireness as a sum total of particular. The thinking includes the division of the culture in three fields: on material, social and spiritual ones, the idea M. Gavazzi unquestionably represents without clearly stating whether they are only the parts of a connected entity which are separated only for heuristic purposes.

³ M. Gavazzi is determining the cultural strata (spheres) of the traditional culture of the Croats according to the origins, mingling the geographic and ethnic terms, which is characteristic for him otherwise as well (thus e.g. he uses the terms "Balkan" and "Balkan peninsula" as geographic concepts but also as the cultural categories (which is very debatable). The strata are: Old Balkan cultural stratum, the Adriatic (Mediterranean) stratum, Roman, Alpine, Danubian, Turkish-oriental, Romance speaking (Vlachs) and the stratum of the higher European civilisation.

The author's comprehending of the culture, in his research practice, as something partial, atomised, could be connected with the volume of his research. M. Gavazzi has always been founding the scientific study problems largely. He is interested in the distant cultural parallels and farreaching cultural influences. In his trying to prove and follow the cultural links on a larger European and nonEuropean expanse and in the large time extensiveness (of several centuries and sometimes of a thousand of years) M. Gavazzi often finds himself short of data and firm "fulcrums" for such a largely posed questions and very distant cultural relations. Therefore his scientific conclusions are often sparing and the author has to use assumptions or instructions for further research; instead of conclusions he often has to propose expectations.⁴ He often emphasises that his conclusions, systematisation and attitudes are but temporary and that further research and more data would then change the cultural image and ethnological knowledge on particular occurrences and processes. M. Gavazzi had kept all the basic determinants of his scientific approach till the end, rejecting the modern movements in the ethnology as fashionable and of peripheral significance (Gavazzi, 1989).

I think that the statement on frequent lack and scarcity of concrete conclusions does not lessen much the scientific value of the author's ethnological opus. Even the opposite could be said. Because he attempted to pose the problems of the peasant culture and comprehend them on a very large space, time and scientific plane, M. Gavazzi could really discern the farreaching cultural connections and common cultural occurrences linking different and very distant peoples and cultures, while becoming aware of the particular areas of special, characteristic elements forming the areas of traditional culture. M. Gavazzi's attempting to follow particular cultural phenomena from the present time to the primeval Slav past, and even more to the large European and non-European expanse is a scientific effort which calls for more than admiration. By such a volume of research M. Gavazzi has succeeded to prove the complexity of the traditional culture with numerous influences, takings over, remodelling farreaching cultural borrowing, as well as relentless continuing of preserving the particular cultural elements. Establishing all the complexity of folk culture, M. Gavazzi had established also the science which is dealing with it, i.e. ethnology and particularly cultural-historic ethnology⁵, showing directly and indirectly that without the knowledge of the cultural history of the peasant societies, general history remains incomplete. By his ethnological capability, capability which no other scientist possesses in such a measure

⁴ Seven works united under the title "Iz davne europske kulturne baštine" (From ancient European cultural heritage) from the book "Vrela i sudbine narodnih tradicija" (Wells and fates of the folk traditions) can be used as the example for this evaluation.

⁵ It should be mentioned that M. Gavazzi does not use the concept "cultural-historical ethnology". Above all, the term is appearing in the critique of the traditional Croatian ethnology. The term is applied as something understandable and well known by itself. However, such an unquestionable use of the term brings certain theoretical difficulties and misunderstandings. In the cultural-historical orientation of the European ethnology there are different approaches from Ratzel, over Frobenius and Graebner to the "Viennese school of cultural circles" of Wilhelm Schmidt. Thus it does not seem clear whether the critics are ranging the older Croatian ethnology among one of the schools or whether they are considering it an independent movement.

- to be recognising the significant cultural occurrences by such small details as spool/bobbin, distaff, reclining objects, simple instruments, aprons with fringes, back veils, M. Gavazzi has confirmed his scientific greatness, which is more important than the concrete ethnological conclusions he might be lacking sometimes.

In the same way, the previous objection regarding the partiality of comprehending and studying of traditional peasant culture is not only the critique of M. Gavazzi, it is also the attitude which is to open new perspectives. M. Gavazzi, and other cultural-historic directed Croatian ethnologists, have given a solid basis - analysis of folk culture. What is lacking is the synthesis on Croatian folk culture which should be given the form of lexicon or monography. While doing that, one should pay attention to the totality of the problems, which naturally, among others, comprehends that the lexicon is rather inadequate for the survey of the culture as a complete system in occurrences and processes and relations which are connected and interconditioning, and is more suggesting M. Gavazzi's solution to show the folk culture as a group of particular phenomena. However, until the work of cultural-historic ethnology is finished and the synthesis of Croatian traditional culture is given, the Croatian traditional ethnology remains actual which should be differentiated from the concept contemporaneous.⁶ It should be stressed here that it is not a question of finalising in the sense of final, for ever valid results, but of finalising in the sense of comprehensiveness of one scientific research. The incompleteness of the work of cultural-historic ethnology is not the only aspect in which its actuality is proven. The question can be considered from the perspective of critical relation of the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology towards the traditional one and towards the answer that could be offered for such a critique.

In general, the terminology problems in Croatian ethnology seem to be insufficiently brought to light. Thus the attributes as "older" and "traditional" implicate a long duration, which is hard to connect with the fact that the study of ethnology in Croatia has been founded in 1927 only with the arrival of Milovan Gavazzi to the Zagreb University, making the development of the ethnological science in Croatia a recent occurrence. Apart from that, even the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology has the tradition of some three decades only. Even the concept "ethnology of (our) everyday" used by some critically minded ethnologists as a sign of their approach does not appear to be a fortunate solution. The older Croatian ethnology has been studying the everyday as well, or at least individual elements of the everyday of traditional peasant societies (primarily the Slavs and Croats). It should be added here that the scientific interest for the everyday life of particular cultures has not been a recent attitude. The historians before the World War II have started publishing books on everyday life of different social strata/classes in ancient civilisations of Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Greece and Rome. The works have been translated in our language and published by the publishing house "Naprijed" in the special library termed "Svakodnevní život" (Everyday Life). In my opinion the cultural-historic ethnology is every ethnology making the research of the history of cultural phenomena, processes and relations between particular ethnic groups. Thus the cultural-historical approach is not the only one of possible approaches to researching of ethnos, considered so by Jasna Čapo Žmegač and Zoran Čiča, but any complete, systematic research of ethnic groups worthy of the name should be including the cultural-historical component. It seems clear that within so largely defined concept "cultural-historic ethnology" very different research concepts and methods are possible. The concepts "cultural-historical", "older" and "traditional" Croatian ethnology are used in my work in the above sense primarily for the reasons of style in order to avoid excessive repetition.

⁶ It is wrong to think that only the concept "contemporaneous" should be given the attribute "scientifically relevant".

II

The critique of the cultural-historical ethnology in Croatia has started in 60s and 70s in the works of Dunja Rihtman Auguštin, Olga Supek and Zorica Rajković, and is continuing to this day in the works of Jasna Čapo-Žmegač and Zoran Čiča.

I naturally cannot start on a comprehensive analysis of the critique of the traditional Croatian ethnology so I will restrain to making the analysis of some crucial attitudes, essential for the question posed in the title of the treatise. My intention is to present the attitudes in connection with my own evaluation of them.

I consider the complete critique of the Croatian cultural-historical ethnology to be portrayed by two characteristics: conceptual stereotype and theoretical understatement, the understatement in double sense. Let's start in the following order. The conceptual stereotype is the consequence of the way the critique of the traditional ethnology is constituted, and the procedure could be described in the following way: the critics are first formulating the paradigms on the cultural-historical ethnology, and then they are criticising the paradigms, imagining to be criticising directly the cultural-historical ethnology. Thus, e.g. Dunja Rihtman Auguštin sees the traditional Croatian ethnology as the science of a romantically envisaged folk culture which is relying on the cannon folk-source-antiquities (concepts of Martin Scharfe), and is studying the field by compiling factual material, mainly not dated, without or without sufficient theoretical generalising, while dealing with objects and phenomena and not with people (creating thus "ethnology without people"). All the critics of the cultural-historical ethnology are dealing with the paradigms, though they may not always be the same. The paradigms are not inaccurate, as then they would be theoretically irrelevant, but they represent the reduction or simplification of the cultural-historical approach in Croatian ethnology with regards to the how it has theoretically been envisaged and then applied in the researching. Thus the critiques of the cultural-historical ethnology are correct as much as the paradigms of the authors correspond to the traditional ethnology, and they correspond only partly, being sometimes more sometimes less adequate.⁷ With such a procedure the recent Croatian ethnology falls into dichotomy of the "imagined" and "realised" (concepts of Levi-Strauss), the dichotomy existing on several levels: within the folk culture, within the ethnological study of the folk culture and finally within the critique of the ethnological study of the folk culture. The theoretical understating, as had been said, is visible in two ways.

First, the goal of the critique is not put clearly, i.e. it is not clear whether it intends to, theoretically, lay foundations for own research position, pointing to the need of different studying of the culture, affirming thus its own approach, or whether it wants to show that the cultural-historical ethnology is obsolete and cannot, scientifically, be bearing fruit any more.

⁷ It would be possible to show on more works that they do not fit into the paradigms. The important voice here was that of M.Gavazzi who has publicly been proclaiming, in several occasions, his attitude against the stereotypes and unfounded generalisations (e.g. when writing on schematised understanding of the *zadrugas*). We could equally cite here the attitude of Bratanić in his article "Regionalna ili nacionalna i opća etnologija" (Regional or national and general ethnology), *Slovenski Etnograf* X, Ljubljana 1957, page 14.

I will start with the attitudes of Dunja Rihtman Auguštin as the leading representative of the recent Croatian ethnology having the most elaborated theoretical concepts excelling in preciseness and clarity. The author is critically outlining the question of actuality of the cultural-historical ethnology in the series of her works while radicalising her attitudes to be stating, in the article "Kultura grupe i usmena komunikacija" (Culture of a group and oral communication) published in 1982, that the cultural-historical ethnology in these areas has long ceased to give real answers to essential questions on the culture in these expanses (page 70). The older Croatian ethnology has lost the subject, for the industrial and social development had destroyed the favoured social basis of the ethnology - patriarchal peasant class and its economic structure, thus influencing strongly the change of culture (also page 70). This has made the author, and all the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology, abandon the concept people and folk culture as the fundamental concepts of the ethnology (the same page, 71 and in other places). Dunja Rihtman Auguštin has kept her critical fundamentalism even in the book "Etnologija naše svakodnevice" (Ethnology of Our Everyday) (1988), stating in the foreword that the traditional ethnology had largely lost the subject - peasant folk culture, having lost the firm ground as well (the same, 3-4), i.e. its own theoretical assumptions. If the cultural-historical ethnology has long ceased giving answers to the essential problems of culture, if it has mainly lost its subject (traditional culture) and its theoretical basis, then there is no doubt that the attitudes have proclaimed death of the traditional ethnology. Quite consequentially, the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology has comprehended its role in the Messianic way: ethnologic science could be saved only if it began to occupy itself with something different (not folk culture any more) and in a different way (not the cultural-historical way). Dunja Rihtman Auguštin expresses the Messianic comprehension of the new ethnologic approach in a syntagm "salvation of ethnology" in the same foreword (page 4). The contemporaneous Croatian ethnology and particularly its main representative, Dunja Rihtman Auguštin, have looked for the salvation by attempting to build her ethnologic approach on new research concepts of modern European and American humanistic sciences, primarily on the concepts of sociology and history. The attempt has resulted in another understatement about which I will say a few words about further on.

Dunja Rihtman Auguštin suggests that, within the new orientation, the ethnologic research introduces groups of the orally communicating persons instead of the peoples and folk cultures (Rihtman Auguštin, 1982: 71). She understands this not as a new subject of researching, as ethnology is not engaged with a **subject**, no matter what name it be given, but "the ethnology studies a definite kind of relations (we can even call them structures) and processes" (Rihtman Auguštin, 1988: 5). Two things are overlooked: firstly, that in the new concept the relations and processes are becoming new subjects of ethnologic science and secondly, that the Croatian traditional ethnology was studying processes and particularly relations. Thus, one of the most important Gavazzi's subjects and one of the most significant themes of the older Croatian ethnology, the peasant joint family (*zadruga*) is naught but one complex relation (structure) or, even better, one intertwined relation of blood and marriage connections

among the family members, and their relation to the economy, property, expenditure etc. The conclusion could be made upon all this: its not being the critical understatement but the clear rejection of cultural-historical ethnology. However, I will be trying to show that it is not so and that the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology accepts some basic principles of the older ethnology and that the authors have not evaluated it theoretically enough. Similar understatement is remarked in the works of younger Croatian ethnologists critically disposed towards the traditional ethnology. Thus, e.g. Jasna Čapo Žmegač takes the traditional standpoint - the basic determinant of the ethnology being ethnos, it should be approached in a different way, for example by making researches on Croatian cultural identity upon the researches on the distinctive cultural features (Čapo Žmegač, 1994). It seems interesting to mention here that the author is not primarily researching ethnos, or the culture of definite ethnic groups, she is more occupied with other topics from theoretical, economic and demographic ones to the themes within the frame of the so-called ethnologic everyday. On the other side, Zoran Čiča thinks that the basic determinant, or the subject of our science, is not ethnos but culture, and he is offering a very acceptable analysis which results with the conclusion on the scientific relevance of different approaches, even the cultural-historical one, in researching the culture. He gives a very questionable thesis on two ethnologies in Croatia: a traditional and a contemporaneous one, the latter being the ethnology only formally, as our researches on culture are possible primarily on that common denominator (Čiča, 1993: 51). The thesis on two ethnologies (of which one is only formally this) is suggesting clearly the complete rift between the traditional and contemporaneous Croatian ethnologies. The thesis is not easily compatible with the author's attitude regarding the legitimacy of different approaches in researches on culture, and is bringing the far-reaching theoretical problems.

The part of the contemporaneous ethnological critique, based on the assumption that the subject of the older ethnology (peasant folk culture) has largely disappeared, this being the significant thesis. It is interesting to mention that this represents the belief acceptable to a part of the cultural-historical oriented ethnologists who have been caught in a kind of reasearch spasm - to record quickly as many phenomena of the traditional culture as possible as it is on the verge of disappearing. M. Gavazzi also contributed to the creation of the spasm, as he used to give warnings regarding the occurrences on the verge of disappearance and requiring quick and thorough description as *primum necessarium* (Gavazzi, 1978: 113). There is no doubt that particular cultural forms and relations are disappearing and should be recorded and research made on them in the same way the biologists and environmentalists are recording and researching on the threatened flora and fauna kinds. But it does not mean that the folk culture itself is disappearing. Many traditions are still alive, from the folk costumes and ways of building, over different customs, forms of sociability to the numerous aspects of spiritual life. The peasant joint families are still appearing, living and disappearing as well as similar family communities; the thousand year old characters of common folk demonology are still alive in the folk consciousness - fairies and witches ("invisible world"); different forms of magic are still being practiced; the wax is being poured, the

sorcery is practiced over water, spells are thrown and recalled; different forms of common beliefs and devotion rituals are still alive and are flourishing; the concept "people" is still alive in the people, among the common folk. From the personal research experience (my experience referring only to Slavonia, and not even the whole of it) I dare say that it is almost impossible to come to an area without discovering something new and starting on immediate description and researching, with new phenomena surfacing one after the other as if threaded on a string, showing that everything is interconnected and that the folk culture is an entity, a complex system, and not a group of cultural elements or spheres as in the work of Gavazzi.

The hypothesis of the contemporaneous ethnology on the disappearance of the traditional culture does not represent statement of the end of the folk culture, but it is stating the lack of the interest for it and for the research which would study it. The paradox that arose from the situation is very interesting: parallelly to the rejection of the concepts, as e.g. people and folk culture, as well as of the loss of interest for studying them in interest have experienced the full affirmation in another science in modern history science under the influence of ethnology, i.e. cultural anthropology. The modern Croatian ethnology will have to look for the holds in some directions of the new European history which makes the paradox even greater.

Thus we seem to arrive to another understatement, announced in advance, of the contemporaneous ethnological critique which consists of unidentified relation of the traditional and modern critique. Just as the ethnological critique had not defined clearly its directions, whether towards the affirmation of itself or to the complete rejection of culturalhistorical ethnology, thus the common connection had not specified as to whether and in what way the contemporaneous ethnology had been the continuation onto the traditional one, in order to either critically surpass it or make a complete break with it, or perhaps pass it by, to be theoretically based on modern anthropological, sociological and historical directions.

I will again start with the attitudes of Dunja Rihtman Auguštin which appear to be crucial for the consideration of the problem. In a short, but theoretically very significant, foreword to her book "Etnologija naše svakodnevice" (Ethnology of Our Everyday) the author is clearly emphasising very strong sociological and historiographic incentives for her ethnologic work which she will term "ethnology of everyday", the syntagm which will extend to the complete contemporaneous Croatian ethnology. She emphasises that she is interested in our present everyday life, all its aspects including the ones bearing the stigma of banality (the same, 5). She adds, in the form of rhetorical question, that, here, it is the matter of the ethnology as the science which is researching on the **history of everyday** (pointed by Ž.Š.), of our present everyday, past as well, with the domestic ethnic, regional and confessional as well as social connotations, but also researching on the implications of the relations of power, all from the angle of historic movements and development of the European civilisation (the same, 6). Closing thus the circle, by her own words, Dunja Rihtman Auguštin is returning from the critique of the cultural-historical ethnology to the historic approach in ethnology,

and she intends to find the foundations of the approach in the social history. That is the reason why she ends her foreword with the attitude: "Though the contact between the social history and ethnology could be called the latest fashion outcry of the two sciences, the relationship of the scientist towards the fashion should be a careful one, I can't, at present, see a better challenge and **more productive** chance. For the road from the cultural-historical approach towards the one which may be closer to the social history is not closing the circle of ethnology, it is opening the future developmental spiral" (the same, 6).

These attitudes of the author disclose several dilemmas which will take us into critical investigation of the relation - older and recent Croatian ethnology.

As it is known, the social history has been created in France, between two world wars, the main protagonists having been Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre who had founded, in 1929, the famous magazine for history "Annales d'histoire économique et sociale". They had defied the traditional political history occupied with great personalities and fought for the historical research of the social processes and structures, and Dunja Rithman Auguštin takes after them.

The fact that it was one historical direction, developing immediately after the World War I with its avantgarde aspect continuing to be interesting up to some 20 years ago, can hardly make us think it is the latest fashion. It is also questionable whether it can represent the best challenge and offer the most productive chance for our ethnology. The doubt is strengthened by the fact that in the recent historical directions the almost "classical" or "traditional" social history has been exposed to hard critique mainly for its insistence on studying social structures and processes; Mirjana Gross is writing about the matter in the second issue of the magazine "Otium" for 1994. If we are talking of the fashionable, then the latest fashion in the historical science is represented by something completely different: this scientific season the most sought after and most preferred is the microhistory, in the German speaking areas it is called "Alltagsgeschichte", in fact the "history of everyday". The similarity with the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology and modern history is immediately catching the eye. Thus it is not quite understandable why Dunja Rihman Auguštin did not attempt to theoretically define herself towards the modern history of everyday, more so as there is no doubt that she is well acquainted with the works (she has even translated one - Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*), her interest for the modern movements in humanistic sciences also being well known. The research concepts of microhistory, or, better to say, the research concepts of different microhistoric orientations are of the exceptional significance for the theoretical questions of ethnology, thus a few words should be said of them.

In the centre of attention of the microhistory is the life of "ordinary people" and what seems more important, it is often studied on the basis of experience, whether narrated to the researchers or perhaps recorded by these ordinary people. The history is to be researched not only from what had been written down and seen through the eyes of dominant social groups, but also through the perception and subjective experience

of the oppressed and marginalised strata. That is the reason why the microhistory is always the history from “down under”, “from the bottom to the top” or “on the ground level”. Its interest lies in the “microscopic” everyday experience of the people on the defined narrow space (Gross, 1994: 29). Microhistorians often focus their interest on the concrete individuals. Researching on the relation between the global social structures and individual fates these historians give the survey of larger historical situation in order to explain the events around the individuals and are not analysing the individual fates in order to explain the social and historic relations. The best examples are the books as : “Cheese and Worms” by Carl Ginsburgh on the perspective of a modest north-Italian miller Menocchi from 16th c. and “Immodest Acts. The Life Of A Lesbian Nun In Renaissance Italy” of Judith C. Brown on the life of one lesbian Teatin nun in renaissance Italy, also in 16th c.

The large assortment of topics of the microhistory is very interesting: food, clothing, lodging; childhood, youthhood and old age, love and sexual behaviour; work and spare time with festivities; illness and death, body and conduct towards the body, gestures; family and life in small communities; folk riots, carnevals, witches and magic. The microhistorians are also researching on the feeling, experiences, notions, the imaginary (fictitious presentation of the reality), ideology, the unconscious, folk culture, popular piety, experience of love, honour, superstition and fear. It should be emphasised that frequent topics of the history of everyday are folk culture, popular piety and carnevals. If one should add that the focus of the research interest is centred on the culture, and those marginal, oppressed groups and classes are understood exclusively on the basis of their own explanations given in the form of narrations or biographies (the occupation of the “oral” history, or the popular autobiography as an important branch of the history of everyday), then it appears obvious that the ethnology, or cultural anthropology has made a strong, and in some movements even crucial, influence on the contemporaneous history. This is admitted by the historian themselves, thus apart from the terms historical microhistory and history of everyday they are using the terms historical anthropology and some others when describing their approach: intellectual history, history of the mentality, cultural or “new” cultural history.

Ethnology and cultural anthropology have the reason to be proud of such an echo of their basic principles and results, but they also have the reason, if not for worry, for caution certainly. We have drawn earlier the scheme of intermingling of contemporaneous Croatian ethnology with sociology and history while, here, we have seen intermingling of the contemporaneous history with ethnology and anthropology. If we bear in mind that the history and sociology have bridged the gap which had them separated for a long time, the history through social history, and sociology through historical sociology, then we have recorded one very significant process which has undoubtedly enveloped contemporaneous humanistic sciences - the process of their approaching. The occurrence hides the danger of the sciences pouring into one amalgamated social science. If the folk culture, folk piety, magic, customs, beliefs, carnevals are not any more typical ethnologic or anthropologic topics, if their subject as a whole is not culture, if the narrators as a source of data are not ethnological

specificum par excellence, if they are not any more only attempts to explain the historic and social reality from the human experience, and if all this is characteristic for contemporaneous history where does then the ethnology start and the history end? Their amalgamation would make them lose scientific identity and with it the possibility of the specific scientific contribution. However, I consider that such amalgamation will not take place and that the decisive role will be played by the scientific tradition of each of the sciences as much as the wish for the specific.

That is the reason why I consider that it is necessary that the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology be redefined and its critical relation with the traditional ethnology be filled so that the relation would not be exhausted in contradictions. The cultural-historical ethnology can be overcome from within only if it is the starting point and not if one tries to pass it by. And that is why the recent Croatian ethnology is still in the understatement. On one side it takes over the crucial values of the older Croatian ethnology (historical approach in researching, interest for small, by the appearance trivial cultural phenomena), and on the other side it is trying to ignore and to go round the cultural-historical ethnology thus falling into the same condition of lack it had fallen into itself, and that is partiality. Just as the cultural-historical ethnology had not succeeded to give the synthesis of the traditional peasant culture, so that there is still no complete scientific view of our everyday. That is why I think that if the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology does form its relation to the traditional one, its own scientific heritage, fruitful results could be expected from the contact with other humanistic sciences. Thus, the cultural-historical ethnology is not actual only for those who wish to make the research in that way or in a similar one, but also for the contemporaneous Croatian ethnology.

Translated by Beatrice Mićunović

Literatura

- BRAUDEL, FERNAND: Historija i sociologija. U G. Gurwitsch (ed.): *Sociologija*, I. Zagreb, Naprijed, 1958 (1966).
- BROWN, C. JUDITH: *Nedolični čini, život jedne lezbijske opatice u renesansnoj Italiji*, Grafički zavod Hrvatske, Zagreb, 1990.
- ČAPO, JASNA: Hrvatska etnologija, znanost o narodu ili o kulturi? *Studia ethnologica* 3, Zagreb, 1991, 7 - 15.
- ČAPO ŽMEGAČ, JASNA: Etnologija i/ili (socio)kulturalna antropologija. *Studia Ethnologica Croatica* 5, Zagreb, 1993, 11 - 25.
- ČAPO ŽMEGAČ, JASNA: Plaidoyer za istraživanje (nacionalnog) identiteta u hrvatskoj etnologiji. *Etnološka tribina* 17, Zagreb, 1994, 7 - 21.
- ČIČA, ZORAN: Etnologija, antropologije. *Etnološka tribina* 16, Zagreb, 1993, 47 - 55.
- GAVAZZI, MILOVAN: Etnografski sastav hrvatskoga sela. u: *Zemljopis Hrvatske II*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1942, 639 - 674

- GAVAZZI, MILOVAN: Novije činjenice za dokaz opstojanja zadruga u doba slavenske zajednice. *Etnološki pregled*, Beograd, 1963, 23 - 32.
- GAVAZZI, MILOVAN: *Vrela i sudbine narodnih tradicija*. Sveučilišna naklada Liber, Zagreb, 1978.
- GAVAZZI, MILOVAN: Ein wissenschaftlicher Werdegang - Gedanken, Arbeitmethoden und Erfahrungen. Problemy metodologiczne etnografii, PAN, Warszawa, 1989, 151 - 156.
- GAVAZZI, MILOVAN: *Baština hrvatskoga sela*. Otvoreno sveučilište, Zagreb, 1991.
- GINZBURG, CARLO: *Sir i crvi: Kozmos jednog mlinara iz 16. stoljeća*, Zagreb, 1989.
- GROSS, MIRJANA: Mikrohistorija, dopuna ili suprotnost makrohistoriji? *Otium 2*, Zagreb, 1994, 36 - 47.
- KATUNARIĆ, VJERAN: Od "dijaloga gluhih" do historijske sociologije. *Revija za sociologiju 3-4*, Zagreb, 1994, 163- 175.
- MITTERAUER, MICHAEL: "Ja u povijesti... povijest u Ja". Popularna autobiografika i obrazovni rad. *Otium 2*, Zagreb, 1994, 36 - 47
- RIHTMAN-AUGUŠTIN, DUNJA: O nekim metodološkim problemima etnološkog istraživanja sadašnjosti. *Etnološki pregled 12*, Ljubljana, 1974, 121 - 127.
- RIHTMAN-AUGUŠTIN, DUNJA: Pretpostavke suvremenog etnološkog istraživanja. *Narodna umjetnost XIII*, Zagreb, 1976, 1 - 25.
- RIHTMAN-AUGUŠTIN, DUNJA: Kultura grupe i usmena komunikacija. *Narodna umjetnost 19*, Zagreb, 1982, 65 - 74.
- RIHTMAN-AUGUŠTIN, DUNJA: *Etnologija naše svakodnevice*. Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1988.
- Velika ilustrirana povijest svijeta 2, Otokar Keršovani, Rijeka, 1974.

MILOVAN GAVAZZI I PITANJE AKTUALNOSTI KULTURNOPOVIJESNE ETNOLOGIJE U HRVATSKOJ

Sažetak

Ovaj rad predstavlja pokušaj da se Milovan Gavazzi stavi u kontekst rasprava o teorijskim osnovama etnološke znanosti u Hrvatskoj. Pri tome se Gavazzi uzima samo kao jedno od više mogućih polazišta u kritičkom rasvjetljavanju odnosa između tradicionalne i suvremene hrvatske etnologije. Do sada je taj odnos bio uglavnom jednosmjernan. Kritika se kretala od suvremenog etnološkog pristupa prema tradicionalnom koji su kritičari najčešće označavali kao kulturnopovijesnu etnologiju. Pri tome su propustili točnije odrediti što je zapravo kulturnopovijesna etnologija i koliko je opravdana primjena tog pojma za stariju hrvatsku etnologiju. Ta se odredba u kritičara koristila kao nešto samo po sebi razumljivo i poznato. U ovom se radu pokušava uspostaviti povratna relacija, odnosno nastoji se pokazati što se suvremenoj hrvatskoj etnologiji može odgovoriti s pozicije starije, uvjetno rečeno kulturnopovijesne etnologije. Rasprava nije formulirana kao obrana jedne ili kao napad na drugu etnološku koncepciju, već nastoji upozoriti na teorijske nedorečenosti koje postoje u odnosu između starije i novije etnologije u Hrvatskoj kako bi se uklonile zapreke razvoju ove znanosti.

Rad je podijeljen na dva dijela. U prvom se dijelu razmatraju dvije značajne odrednice Gavazzijeva etnološkog pristupa: njegov metodički postupak i njegovo shvaćanje kulture.

Gavazzijev metodički postupak temelji se na nastojanju da se do konačne etnološke spoznaje dospije preko prikupljanja podataka o prostornoj raširenosti pojedinih kulturnih elemenata te na temelju opsežnih jezičnih, osobito leksikografskih istraživanja. Ova dva pravca istraživanja povezuju se u komparativnoj metodi. Poredbenim proučavanjem prostornog razmještaja i nazivlja kulturnih elemenata Gavazzi se nastoji probiti do genetičkog prikaza tradicijske narodne kulture tako da se svi njezini sastavni dijelovi objasne prema njihovom postanku, starini i podrijetlu.

Na Gavazzijev istraživački pristup nastavlja se njegovo shvaćanje tradicijske kulture, a karakterizira ga parcijalnost. U analizi se pokazuje kako Gavazzi, unatoč načelno istaknutoj cjelovitosti kulture, ne uspijeva prevladati shvaćanje kulture kao zbroja pojedinačnih kulturnih elemenata i kulturnih slojeva (sfera). To će imati presudan utjecaj na njegov ukupan etnološki rad u kojem dominiraju analitički prikazi i etnografski pregledi, a manjkaju sintetičke studije tradicijske kulture Hrvata. Stoga prvi dio rasprave završava stavom da starija (uvjetno rečeno kulturnopovijesna) etnologija ostaje aktualna sve dok se ta znanstvena sinteza ne realizira.

Ostali aspekti aktualnosti tradicionalne hrvatske etnologije razmatraju se u drugom dijelu rasprave. U njemu se ukazuje na pojmovnu šabloniziranost i teorijsku nedorečenost koja postoji u kritici tradicionalne hrvatske etnologije. Upozorava se na potrebu da suvremena hrvatska etnologija redefinira svoj odnos prema kulturnopovijesnom pristupu kao vlastitoj znanstvenoj baštini kako bi otvorila nove razvojne perspektive.