

SRĐAN RADOVIĆ

Institute of Ethnography SASA, Belgrade

srdjan.radovic@ei.sanu.ac.rs

Dynamics and Transformations in Small Disciplinary Communities: Some Remarks on Institutional and Paradigm Shifts in Ethnology/ Anthropology in Post-Yugoslav States

The paper presents an overview of some major paradigmatic and thematic currents developing in ethnology (or ethnologies) in what used to be Yugoslavia and after the breakup of this country; these processes are discussed also by monitoring the evolution of institutions and through dynamics in numerous small disciplinary communities of ethnologists/anthropologists. After almost a hundred years of relatively slow paradigmatic, yet intensive institutional development, ethnological communities in this part of Europe accelerated their uplift in the last quarter of the 20th century with their theoretical modernization (sometimes also coined 'anthropologization'), which is in the most recent times followed by acceleration in overall scholarly production (bordering on proliferation), of research topics and outputs (which can also be dubbed as 'projectification'), much in line with trends enveloping in the global scientific markets. The paper calls upon a renewed collaboration between academic and museological anthropology as a potential impetus for increasing the discipline's local relevance and for the creation of new research areas.

Key words: history of ethnology, (cultural) anthropology, former Yugoslavia, 'anthropologization', 'projectification', small disciplinary communities

Динамика и трансформације у малим дисциплинарним заједницама: неколико опажања о институционалним и парадигматским променама у етнологији/антропологији у постјугословенским земљама

У овом раду даје се преглед значајнијих парадигматских и тематских токова који су се развијали у етнологији (односно етнологијама) у бившој Југославији, те након распада ове земље. Ови процеси се разматрају и посматрањем развоја установа и динамике у бројчано малим заједницама етнолога/антрополога. Након готово стотину година релативно успореног парадигматског, а истовремено интензивног институционалног развоја, етнолошке заједнице у овом делу Европе убрзале су своје напредовање у задњој четвртини двадесетог века посредством теоријске модернизације (често означаване као „антропологизација“). На ово се у најрецентнијем добу надодало убрзање и у свеукупној научној производњи (готово пролиферацији) истраживачких тема и уопште научних резултата (што се може означити и као „пројектификација“), сасвим у складу са трендовима на глобалним научним тржиштима. На овом месту указује се на обновљену сарадњу између академске и музејске антропологије као потенцијални импулс за увећавање локалне релевантности дисциплине и за стварање нових истраживачких поља.

Кључне речи: историја етнологије, (културна) антропологија, бивша Југославија, антропологизација, пројектификација, мале дисциплинарне заједнице

ETHNOLOGY IN TWO YUGOSLAVIAS

The discipline researching culture (in Western academies usually known as social or cultural anthropology) was traditionally designated as ethnology in former Yugoslavia and was from its beginnings heavily influenced by research paradigms originating from Central European countries, thus mostly focusing on cultural issues of the domestic peasantry

and folklife.¹ By the end of the 19th century, interest in numerous aspects of folk culture, customs, vernacular language, and oral literature was pursued mostly by 'native' researchers, who represented a quite mobile network of practicing proto-ethnographers. Such research and national 'renaissance' efforts were thus closely knitted with dominant cultural concepts of the Central European academia of the time, and research of folk culture and language would be closely influenced by cultural and scientific concepts coming from this part of Europe for a long time, being rooted in romanticist worldviews,² and ethnology as a discipline in lands that were to become Yugoslavia after World War I, laid its formal foundations at the turn of the century.³ Unlike some other European ethnologies/anthropologies which showed interest towards the 'outside' (indigenous and 'exotic' communities of the overseas), Balkan ethnologies mostly gazed to the 'inside', to its own local 'other' (or its 'own') – peasant and rural population. The founding fathers of academic ethnology in Croatia (Antun Radić), Slovenia (Karel Štrekelj and Matija Murko), and Serbia (Jovan Cvijić) had set up dominant fields of interest in the newly formed disciplines, together with basic methodological and research outlines. Romanticist roots were theoretically upgraded by paradigms from Slavic studies in Slovenia, the anthropogeography of Cvijić, and the two-cultures theory by Radić, creating research programs that collected and presented cultural traits with the aim of understanding (and defining) the ethnos (and sometimes also advancing the living circumstances of peasant communities). Such circumstances turned ethnology into a sort of a '(ethno)national' discipline, a (self)designation that would dominate the discipline in decades to come.

¹ This paper is a result of research pursued at the Institute of Ethnography SASA through the contract with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (contract no. 451-03-68/2022-14/200173). I would like to thank my distinguished colleagues Ines Prica and Mladena Prelić for their comments on the draft versions of this paper.

² On the romanticist inception of ethnology in Serbia, and its initial detachment from the Enlightenment concepts of the era, see Kovačević (2015), and for similar controversies in Croatia – Prica (2001).

³ In this paper, I am following in the footsteps of many ethnologists/anthropologists who have researched the history of ethnology in former Yugoslavia. Among the studies on the history and politics of ethnology/anthropology in this part of Europe, one could mention the works of Jasna Čapo Žmegač (2001, 2002), Ines Prica (2001, 2004, 2004a, 2004–2005, 2005), and Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin (1992, 2001, 2004) in Croatia, Ivan Kovačević (2006, 2015), Slobodan Naumović (1998, 2002, 2005, 2008) and Mirjana Prošić-Dvornić (1990, 1996, 2008) in Serbia, and in Slovenia, a seminal study on the history of Slovenian ethnology by Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik (2000; also Slavec Gradišnik 2013).

With the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later renamed Yugoslavia) in the aftermath of the Great War, previous ethnological trends continued. The existing ethnological academic and cultural infrastructure inherited from the pre-war era (Ethnological Department at the Belgrade University, the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade, the Ethnological Committee of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb, etc.) was further developed by the establishment of specialized ethnographic museums in Zagreb (1919) and Ljubljana (1923), ethnological departments at universities in Zagreb (1924) and Ljubljana (1940) and at the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje (1921), creation of ethnographic collections at some larger museums, and establishment of new ethnological scientific periodicals (see Radojičić 2019). At the same time, followers of the turn-of-the-century ethnological founding fathers didn't bring any substantial novelties to the ethnological pursuit, both in terms of the research topics or theory and methodology. By this time relatively established (national) discipline(s) petrified itself into institutions and previously laid tracks, not producing any new theoretical views (or substantially implementing new paradigms from foreign scientific communities), and a theoretical and methodological standstill occurred: collecting of data remained in the hands of semiprofessional amateurs living in scrutinized localities, while academic ethnologists only occasionally pursued (methodologically outdated) field research (Kovačević 2006, 49). At the same time, some professional ethnologists and other scholars researching the local 'other' (or 'cultural differences' in this region) sometimes employed academically fruitful positions of epistemological eclecticism (combining the approaches of both 'anthropology at home' and 'anthropology abroad'), and this dual interpretative discourse, which also stemmed from the local ambiguity in defining the 'other' in terms of nationhood and modernity (see Brković 2018), will occasionally be present in ethnological research till the end of the century.

The beginning of the socialist epoch after 1945 brought the previous standstill to an end, at the institutional level at least. A new extended network of ethnological institutions emerged: research institutes in Belgrade (1947), Sarajevo (1947), Zagreb (1948), Skopje (1950), and Ljubljana (1951), specialized ethnographic museums in Skopje, Cetinje, Split and other cities, creation of ethnographic collections in many museums throughout the country (including numerous newly founded museums), and establishment of new ethnological scientific journals. These new developments were also characterized by gradual devolution of ethnologic infrastructure (be it scientific or museological) throughout

constituent Republics and Autonomous Provinces of the socialist federation, which slowly spread out the research effort and cultural heritage planning from traditional centers of academic ethnology. Hence, all Yugoslav constituent states had (by the end of the socialist era) their ethnographic museums, professional ethnologic societies, scientific periodicals dealing with issues of ethnology, etc.⁴ This way, the old tradition of separate ethnologic centers and schools continued in the socialist period (with the gradual formation of new hubs for ethnologic research), so the Yugoslav ethnology of the era could be referred to in plural terms too, as Yugoslav ethnologies, since the discipline still operated as a sort of (ethno)national science. This (surviving) perception and organization of ethnology as a national discipline was in this period mostly formal though – while the infrastructure and organization of ethnology/ethnologies were ‘national’ (spread throughout constituent Yugoslav republics, later on, sovereign states), the disciplines’ goals and aspirations were not that anymore. The romanticist twist that was keeping ethnology on the tracks of age-old peasant traditions made the discipline appear somewhat marginal to the future-bound doctrinaires of the socialist society (Naumović 2008, 217). Thus, earlier ethnology’s national goals were put aside (with other social sciences, such as sociology, folklore studies, and modern history, receiving greater attention from official circles), and the, now mostly de-politicized, discipline was left on the side-tracks of public and political interest together with its old research object(s) – rural dwellers, which were no longer seen as exclusive bearers of the ‘national spirit’.

And if the prewar aura of ethnology as a national science has evaporated, together with previous political uses of the discipline (which were less frequent already after the First World War), one other tradition of ethnology was jealously held on to until at least the 1970s. Theoretical and methodological autarky of the early 20th century, together with a firm attachment to the *Volkskunde* concept of ethnology, remained the prevailing paradigm in Yugoslav ethnologies for most of the socialist era. In Croatia, ethnology adhered to its cultural-historical paradigm which overwhelmingly stemmed from the tradition of A. Radić and Central Eu-

⁴ On the development of ethnology during socialist Yugoslavia outside of older centers (Belgrade, Ljubljana, Zagreb) of academic ethnology see Kurtović (2013) for Bosnia-Hezegovina, Risteski & Dimova (2013) for Macedonia, and Vujačić (2005; 2013) for Montenegro. In time, infrastructure has further developed in then autonomous provinces of Kosovo and Vojvodina as well (see Damjanović et al. 1983; Dushi 2014; Halili 2017).

ropean academia: cultural circles theories were further developed at this time by Milovan Gavazzi with his research platform of 'culture areas' in southeastern Europe. In Serbia, ethnological research was for decades characterized by, what Lukić-Krstanović (2012) coins as 'anthropogeographization' and 'ethnogeographization', and prevailing empiricism where collecting ethnographic data and material was seen as the most important task – the more 'original', 'authentic' and older that data was, the better (Pavković 1988, 7). Slovenian ethnology also initially stayed true to the tradition of theoretical standstill, with the prevailing opinion being that "there is not much place for theory in such practical work as the collection, analysis, and comparison of material" (Slavec 1988, 43). Other ethnologic centers followed suit (with most of the practicing ethnologists in Bosnia, Macedonia, and Montenegro being educated in Belgrade, Ljubljana, and Zagreb), adhering to the cultural-historical and empiricist ethnological paradigms (naturally with some exceptions).⁵ At the same time, Yugoslav ethnologies (at that time perceived as marginal and antiquated by dominant ideology) were mostly left untouched by the tidal wave of Marxist theoretic concepts which overwhelmed many other social sciences.⁶ Never would Marxist paradigms be prevalent in any of the Yugoslav ethnologies, and in cases when advanced and theoretically developed concepts would be implemented, they would usually originate from Western Marxist schools, rather than those from the USSR and Eastern Europe.⁷

The independent position of socialist Yugoslavia in the Cold War, and the increasing openness of the country towards the outside, enabled the flow of ideas and people over Yugoslav borders, which usually resulted

⁵ It should be noted that ethnological production resulting from such paradigms was not, as sometimes is simplistically stated in some contemporary overviews of 'socialist' ethnologies, automatically banal or sometimes even nationalist – a substantial number of studies from this period show high-quality writing, collection, and interpretation of data.

⁶ Before the 1970s, dialectic materialism was only rudimentarily present in ethnology, through either banal implementation of basic Marxist concepts or somewhat more elaborated research designs based on historical materialism (Špiro Kulišić – see Gorunović 2007). This 'streak' in ethnology would sometimes be dubbed as (pseudo-) Marxism, 'evolutionary-Marxist' theory, or simply evolutionism (Gorunović 2008, 307).

⁷ For example, Gramscian concepts in the works of Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin, the Marxist anthropology of Maurice Godelier in Serbian ethnology, etc. Reception of Soviet scientists in Yugoslav ethnology remained relatively weak and superficial – e.g., no paper by the leading Soviet ethnologist/ethnographer Julian Bromley has ever been translated in Yugoslavia (Prelić 2008, 267), while translations of Western ethnologists/anthropologists were becoming ever more frequent since at least the 1960s.

in increased cultural transfer with the 'West', more often than with the 'East'. This also entailed a greater influence of Western social sciences and their contemporary paradigms on related disciplines in Yugoslavia, through either the growing number of translations at home or the fluctuation of academics to the West (and back). This trend could not miss ethnology in Yugoslavia either. Modern anthropological paradigms from western countries initially caught the attention of some Yugoslav sociologists and philosophers (Supek, Golubović, Gluščević et al.) who presented research platforms for constituting a new anthropological discipline, independent from existing ethnology entrenched in its decades-old empiricist limitations.⁸ The 1970s inaugurated the beginning of much more interesting times (Naumović 2008) in Yugoslav ethnology with a gradual shift, both thematic and theoretical, within ethnological communities in Yugoslavia where contemporary ethno-anthropological paradigms would gradually be developed. By this time, new research areas have been located, moving further from peasant communities and pursuit of ancient cultural traits in folk culture toward other social groups in contemporary Yugoslav society and their culture and lifestyles. The local 'other' (or one's 'own') turned out not to be only domestic peasantry, but also other numerous social strata and communities in ethnologists' nearest vicinity. That way, research of the culture of the working class was inaugurated in Slovenia, "ethnology of everyday culture" became prominent in Croatia, fieldwork in urban and suburban communities in Serbia became systematic, and so on. A theoretical breakthrough initially occurred in the Belgrade and Zagreb academic communities. In the late 1970s and 1980s Serbian ethnology experienced massive implementation of research concepts from British, American, and French anthropologies (especially structuralism and semiotics), producing a new corpus of studies interpreting both contemporary and traditional cultures (Naumović 2008, 237). Simultaneously, Croatian authors only sporadically used Structuralist and Marxist methodologies, but folk and modern culture were now more often scrutinized via concepts of Bakhtin and Gramsci, and German critical ethnology (Prica 2004, 27). Sloveni-

⁸ It was noted that "if anthropology were to develop in Eastern Europe, it would develop first in Yugoslavia", since, from at least the late 1950s, Yugoslav social scientists were exposed to continual contact with their Western colleagues, including American anthropologists doing fieldwork in Yugoslavia (Denitch 1980, 431). The most prominent foreign anthropologists doing continuous fieldwork in Yugoslavia were Joel Halpern and Eugene Hammel, and they also wrote a valuable contribution to ethnologic history in Yugoslavia (Halpern & Hammel 1969).

an ethnology somewhat lagged in this 'innovation' process (apart from the research of the culture of the working class), and the 1990s saw the formation of Slovenian 'would-be-anthropology' (Bošković 2005; Slavec Gradišnik 2000, 509–524). Other Yugoslav ethnologies gradually also received the echo of disciplinary changes, and things were becoming ever more interesting in the newly shaken science. However, even more 'interesting' things were about to happen in Yugoslavia at the beginning of the 1990s.

SHAKE-UPS AND BREAKUPS

(Ex)Yugoslav ethnologies thus began, and by the turn of the century mostly completed, the process of "anthropologization" (Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin 2001, 275; Kovačević 2015, 18), a paradigm shift that was also typical for many other Central European ethnologies in differing periods of the 20th century. It could be argued that it wasn't merely a matter of simple imports of newer anthropological concepts from the West, but of general paradigmatic alignment taking place in many continental ethnologies determined by the free flow of scholars, concepts, and literature within most of Europe. As Ines Prica (2004–2005, 13) points out, the ethnological 'modernism' of the second half of the 20th century (which represented the antithesis of 'traditional' 'national(ist)' ethnologies) in Central and East European academies, was inherent for the 'times of socialism', and, if scrutinized in detail, not always (sometimes not at all) exclusively rooted in mainstream Western anthropological theory. Local circumstances that gave way to such processes were the 'dethroning' of ethnology as a 'national science' since the 1940s (with ethnology usually 'left in peace' by political and official circles) and the dynamic social development of Yugoslav society undergoing rapid modernization (which led to the social demise of the 'original' research object of ethnology – domestic peasantry and folk culture). Together with generational shifts in Yugoslav ethnologies, all this naturally led to a gradual transformation of ethnology into '(cultural) anthropology'.⁹ In that way, the transformation in Yugoslav ethnologies was occurring and preceded the political transformations that were to substantially reshape the societal landscape in Central

⁹ Which will also be followed by the renaming of ethnologic departments at universities: Department for Ethnology and Anthropology in Belgrade, Institute for Ethnology and Anthropology in Skopje, Department for Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology in Zagreb and Ljubljana, and so on.

and Eastern Europe from 1989. The 'fall of communism' in Europe was accompanied by the dissolution of the country and the establishment of new nation-states in what was soon to become former Yugoslavia, ravaged by a series of wars from 1991 to 1999. These paramount processes inevitably influenced the scientific sphere, post-Yugoslav ethnologies (anthropologies) included.

The first impact of the break-up of Yugoslavia was that Yugoslav ethnologies were not Yugoslav anymore – together with the federal country, the federation of ethnologic societies of constituent states (*Savez etnoloških društava Jugoslavije*) ceased to exist. Already loosely coordinated ethnological communities now became formally separate (very often divided also by war fronts), and their future development was decisively determined by the wider political context during the 1990s. In countries that only briefly experienced war, academic and museological ethnology was only slightly affected in its development course, while ethnology/anthropology in states deeply involved in the Yugoslav wars underwent profound changes, both in terms of ethnologic infrastructure and thematically. Following the short Slovenian Independence War of 1991, the ethnologic community continued its already begun transformative path, with the climax of discussions between proponents of 'traditional' and 'modern' ethnology (anthropology) happening at the congress of the Slovenian Ethnological Society in 1995 (Brumen 2001, 12). In Macedonia, ethnological uplift, also facilitated by the reopening of the ethnological department at Skopje University in the 1980s, was somewhat slowed due to economic hardships caused by the Greek blockade, the beginning of the transition, and the floating status of the new-born state, but the academic and museological effort was continued (see Risteski & Jakimovska 2014). Contrary to this, in Bosnia-Herzegovina ethnology faced almost near collapse because of the savage war inflicted on this country. Not only had the research stopped due to the Bosnian war, but many ethnologists were to become war victims, refugees, or resettled, and after the war, the bulk of anthropological research was undertaken by foreign anthropologists working in Bosnia (Kurtović 2014). In Croatia, another war-torn country, trends occurring from back in the 1970s (the emergence of the so-called 'new paradigm') continued, with further adoptions of contemporary theoretical views from European ethnologies/anthropologies (and to a lesser extent from American postmodern anthropology and cultural studies). The new political situation also determined novel foci of research interests: on one hand, new writings and interpretations of previously cumulated eth-

nographic material and writing of monograph studies on folk culture, and on the other, investigation and writings on war, refugees, symbolism, and rituals in contemporary politics, sometimes designated as 'war ethnography' (Prica 2005, 32; Rihtman-Auguštin 1998, 113, 114). At the same time, in Serbia under UN sanctions, the new political climate also profoundly influenced the ethnological/anthropological academia. Slobodan Naumović (2005, 36) distinguishes three major tracks in Serbian ethnology/anthropology from the beginning of the 1990s: 'ethnological traditionalism' (mostly based on century-old traditions of Serbian ethnology), 'ethnological modernism' (resulting from the Serbian 'new paradigm' emerging in 1970s and 1980s), and 'critically oriented political anthropology' (which was largely the result of the novel political circumstances in Serbia and surrounding countries). In Montenegro (which was to initially stick together with Serbia in a joint commonwealth), UN sanctions, deteriorating economy, and war in surrounding countries somewhat slowed down ethnological research, which is to this day institutionally most developed through the Ethnological Committee of the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts and Ethnographic Museum in Cetinje (see Đukić et al. 2014).

The political overturn and ongoing wars of the 1990s in former Yugoslavia influenced organization and research interests in most ethnological (from this time on, very often designated also as anthropological) communities in this part of Europe. Yugoslav wars, new political landscapes, and contemporary nation-building directly determined the emergence of the so-called war ethnography in Croatia, and political anthropology in Serbia, and studies stemming from these thematic fields would also receive prominent reception in international academia. However, even the newest research topics and approaches were not the mere result of a 'sudden event' or researchers' 'revelation' of new theories and paradigms: it could be argued that they represented the continuation of previous ethno-anthropological trends in (post)Yugoslav academiae. Thus, Croatian ethnography of war leaned on earlier research of everyday life and culture, only in the 1990s, that same everyday culture was defined by the war and intensive nation-building and their effects. In the same way, emerging political ethnology/anthropology in Serbia for example was rooted in already developed semiotic paradigms which were now implemented on issues of nationalism, political symbols, folklore, rituals etc. New theoretic approaches also emerged (such as postmodern paradigms, feminist anthropology, reflexive writing, and so on), but they also represented the continuation

of gradual inclusion of novel methodologies and ethno-anthropological discourses occurring since at least the late 1970s. It could be said that following the fall of communism, and the break-up of Yugoslavia, most post-Yugoslav ethnologies/anthropologies continued their cumulative development and paradigmatic enhancement initiated already in the 1970s and 1980s, with no spectacular theoretical and paradigmatic 'leaps forward' till the end of the century.¹⁰ The fall of the Iron curtain did not facilitate some new, special openness to foreign scientific paradigms, since the intellectual flow over Yugoslav borders had been almost unmediated in the latter part of the socialist period.¹¹ The downfall of Yugoslavia on the other hand profoundly influenced most ethnological/anthropological communities in this part of Europe, not by delivering some especially novel scientific paradigms, but by delivering new research issues to ethnologies that were already quite oriented toward the question of the contemporary and the quotidian.

ETHNOLOGY OF POST-SOCIALISM AND ONWARDS¹²

Post-socialist development of post-Yugoslav ethnologies/anthropologies is therefore characterized by continual diversification of research paradigms and research topics that had begun in the late socialist period. This ongoing 'democratization' of ethno-anthropological research was also enabled by the demise of strict 'ethnological schools' at most institutions. What Mirjana Prošić-Dvornić (2008, 375) states for Serbian ethnology could stand true for most other Balkan anthropologies, the fact that being redefined in the last quarter of the twentieth century, they have developed an incredible diversity of styles and topics, preventing the discipline from falling into the trap of 'movements' and 'schools', a general circumstance stemming from intradisciplinary democratizations of the 1970s and 1980s (and not the political democratization of the early 1990s). One other new development was profoundly de-

¹⁰ At the same time, the 1990s witnessed a certain 'slowdown' in paradigmatic innovations in Western anthropology (in some cases even a return to positivism), and for ethnologists in this part of Europe there often were no new 'theoretical bandwagons' to jump on at this time.

¹¹ Paradoxically, in the initial phases of the post-socialist transition, many ethno-anthropological communities of former Yugoslavia experienced a decline in the mobility of scholars and a decrease in the number of translations and publishing of foreign scientific literature due to the harsh economic situation or war.

¹² Paraphrased from Prica (2004–2005).

terminated by political changes of the late 20th century though. Many post-socialist countries became the new 'exotic', 'other' for some European and American anthropologists (with a significant increase in the number of scholars doing research in these countries compared to the Cold War era), and former Yugoslav countries recovering from war and undergoing intensive nation-building were that more interesting. With post-socialist social scientific research (sometimes called transitionology or transitology) becoming increasingly popular in foreign academia, an inpour of international anthropologists researching both contemporary and historic topics occurred, and local researchers were at times even outnumbered by their visiting colleagues. In time, a respectable corpus of studies and thorough ethnographies on post-Yugoslav issues from European and North American anthropologists emerged, which gradually started to define and interpret the 'post-socialist' (and sometimes also the historic) state of things, usually in journals and volumes published abroad. With increasing online accessibility of foreign literature (mostly in English), these anthropological studies on former Yugoslavia became prevalent not only in foreign academies but in local ones too, for reasons ranging from the high quality of many of those studies to the perceived prestige of literature published in Western journals and publishing houses.¹³ Sometimes uncritical and non-conditional embracing of both Western theoretical paradigms and research findings on post-Yugoslav space was occasionally the result of "the aspiration to move away from the own unadorned tradition which becomes one of the necessary conditions for the intellectual self-fashioning, forming a more acceptable model of 'contemporary European expert', distanced from the fate of the place which marks him 'by default'" (Prica 2007, 171).

Eventually, global scientific/anthropological interest for this part of Europe formed local research interests to a significant degree, with some researchers defining both their theoretical framework and research top-

¹³ This knowledge transfer is very often only one-way though since Western anthropological publications on Central and East Europe can sometimes "show a remarkable shortage of references to local ethnographies, not to mention theories" (Buchowski 2004, 6). An observation by Michał Bukowski (2004, 12) could still sometimes stand valid: "The subaltern status of scholars living in postsocialist countries in relation to their Western colleagues seems to be a fact of life that has various historical, psychological and, last but not least, material grounds (access to grants, equipment, disparities in salaries). It leads to an intellectual domination of the West, the perpetuation of hierarchies of knowledge, and creates a one-way street in the flow of ideas".

ics as to fit the 'global demand' for certain types of studies.¹⁴ Such alignment with 'global' anthropological trends on 'local' anthropological issues (also often present in some other 'small' anthropologies in Central and East Europe) further diversified research in post-Yugoslav ethnologies/anthropologies, but also found local researchers in a position that not only has their 'own', local 'other' become increasingly popular 'other' for foreign anthropologists, but that the readership of their studies is also increasingly international. Quite opposite from the times of their inception, when national ethnologies interpreted local 'own' for one's 'own' sake or perceived interest, post-Yugoslav post-national anthropologies are often creating research fields (still very much local in geographic terms) having in mind both the domestic academia and readership, and the global research community interested in those same issues. This can also be the case in instances of international research projects which are becoming ever more frequent – domestic anthropological research communities never before were this well integrated into the global scientific community, which comes as a result of the recent (postmodern) formation of the international scientific 'market', which is regionally best epitomized by the establishment of the European Research Area (whose member almost all post-Yugoslav academies are currently part of). Besides the by now obvious, and somewhat expected hierarchies established in such forms of cooperation (with academics and teams from larger and more affluent, usually West European universities and research centers being on the top of the pyramid), an additional issue arises in the field of humanities and social sciences. The perceived local thematic scope of research by (South) East European social scientists (anthropologists included), pushes them more closely into the orbit of the area and regional studies departments abroad, rather than towards strict disciplinary academic hubs in other countries. With anthropological research in the West still largely oriented towards overseas communities (paired with the slight decrease in international academic interest in post-socialist issues over time), this is also somewhat more prominent with Balkan ethnologies/anthropologies. More anthropologically focused interest and research of this part of Europe is facilitated more through European and

¹⁴ Which is also paired with an increasing number of local anthropologists receiving their degrees abroad and returning to their home countries, and frequent guidelines by scientific managerial authorities to researchers to publish in English, preferably in foreign publications (for reasons such as bigger prominence in the global academic market, advancement of universities in generic competitive lists, local and global scientometric competition etc.).

regional ethnological and anthropological associations, but they inevitably lack resources for mid and long-term academic research compared to academic and other institutions.

Such slight dilution of the disciplinary (and theoretical) axis of some anthropological research (in favor of its local/regional thematic orientation) can become evident in international interdisciplinary projects when ethnology/anthropology is primarily represented by the symbolic capital of the ethnographic method. In circumstances of such 'project interdisciplinarity' (Prca 2019), ethnography, ethnographic method, and fieldwork research have been often inaugurated as an independent methodological domain radiating to the entire interdisciplinary field, while ethnological and anthropological interpretative positions randomly find their place in such 'mosaic' research agendas (Prca 2019, 17, 22). In the regional context, detachment of the ethnographic/anthropological method from theories and interpretations partially also has its determinants in the modernist backlash against all-prevailing empiricism of the traditional Yugoslav ethnologies, where extensive ethnographic fieldwork was perceived as a bulk, if not an entirety of ethnologists' pursuits. Since at least the 1980s, a visible decline in interest for traditionally understood fieldwork occurred – in ethnology/anthropology itself the importance of fieldwork is reconsidered, and the interests of a new generation of scientists are best articulated by the statement that "the field is everywhere around us" (Prelić 2008, 279). That way, once regular multi-sited fieldwork usually pursued by groups of ethnologists (classic individual stationary fieldwork was not prevalent in Yugoslav ethnologies of the 20th century) is becoming less frequent, and ethnographic research is increasingly becoming very much 'individualized', with researchers (even those affiliated with established institutions) mostly relying on sporadic and irregular grants. The funding for ethno-anthropological research is regularly fluctuating (especially from public research authorities who often do not straightforwardly recognize ethnographic fieldwork as an evident methodological tool) which also affects the organization of extensive field research. Thus, when pursued, longer individual stationary ethnographic work is mostly undertaken by Ph.D. candidates, while later-stage researchers usually do not have such opportunities. More brief ethnographic research is enabled by project grants (international, and in recent years also domestic, with the establishment of national agencies and funds for scientific research), but such frameworks mostly do not provide for even a mid-term inquiry into a specific locale or community even for individual researchers, let alone research groups.

Contrary to circumstances in the second half of the 20th century in what used to be Yugoslav ethnologies, an 'atomization' of anthropological pursuit enveloped, both in terms of the thematic scope of the research and in terms of timeframes for it, when decreasing numbers of either individuals or institutions at best form relatively small research teams working on particular issues. Once prevalent long-term researches formulated and led by institutions and employing most of the academic staff (often adjoined by fellows from other institutions, including ethnologists from museums), are by now almost forgotten, and project-based and goal-oriented pursuits with swift result returns have become commonplace. The overall frame of 'projectification' (Prca 2019, 16) has become widespread even when not pursuing research on a particular project, since a dominantly project-oriented academic environment has produced a mindset focused on if not immediate, then a relatively speedy procurement of research results. Such an environment of dynamic proliferation of academic results (primarily research papers) is encouraged by governing public authorities in the scientific domain in most post-Yugoslav countries, but in time has also become self-induced by many academic anthropologists due to the hectic rhythm of provisioning of research results, with 'publish or perish' academic culture making its late, but nevertheless grand entry into the academic communities of Southeast Europe in the 21st century. The quantity of published research results becoming the prime norm of scientific evaluation has further diminished the long-term and greater thematic ambitions of many practicing anthropologists, thus increasing the number of researches with limited theoretic and thematic aspirations that can produce academic results in less time. Furthermore, the growing threat of citation metrics becoming the essential criteria for (external) evaluation of produced anthropological knowledge (see Milenković 2010; Bašić & Pavićević 2017), can also influence the creation of research fields, since strictly local topics can appear disadvantageous with regard to the potential outreach, and consequently future citations. The perfect storm consisting of global and national scientific markets, projectification, and citation metrics is steadily erasing the remnants of the 20th-century culture of 'slow science' (Prca 2019, 17) which was widespread in regional ethnologies just a few decades ago.

'SLOW DEATH' OF 'SLOW SCIENCE'

The previously mentioned 'slow death' of 'slow science' is (slowly) coming as a more or less expected echo of such trends from the more affluent academic communities in the West, which are currently also expe-

riencing worrying neglect and closures of social science and humanities departments at some universities. In the former Yugoslav space, ethnological institutions have thus far managed to preserve their formal integrity and existence (except in Bosnia-Herzegovina which came as a result of postwar general devastation of institutions in this country). Since the beginning of the millennium, the number of ethnological and anthropological institutions even increased with the opening of new departments at public universities in Koper, Priština, and Zadar, and several anthropological research centers. In general, the post-socialist period saw an increase in the number of practicing academic ethnologists/anthropologists in most countries in this part of Europe, including the establishment of new anthropological journals and student associations. However, this additional 'manpower' in research and university teaching is usually facing precarious working conditions and constraints of the work overload stemming from the general circumstances of the 'fast' science. On the other hand, the number of ethnologists and anthropologists working in museums has not significantly increased compared to the socialist period when the vast majority of practicing ethnologists were employed in museums and other cultural institutions. With the creation of the extensive network of specialized and especially local and regional museums in the aftermath of World War II, the majority of these museums catered for at least one ethnological collection and graduated ethnologists were employed as curators of these numerous collections. The transitional period has not witnessed a significant increase of new museums (especially public ones with ethnological collections), and hence the more or less same numbers of ethno-anthropological professionals engaged in museum institutions. However, unlike their peers at universities and institutes subjected to the ever 'faster' science, ethnologists and anthropologists in museums, for now, are somewhat less exposed to grant/project dynamics and pressures in their work, and are still frequently managing to produce 'slow' culture. With exhibitions also receiving regular media coverage, their impact on the general public is inevitably also bigger than the one from academic ethno-anthropologists, also with social capillary effects which can stretch to local communities with permanent and temporary exhibitions presented in local museums.

During socialism, a network of practicing ethnologists working in museums outside of state and regional capitals of then Yugoslavia was one of the backbones of the general ethnological pursuit which did not radically differentiate between academic and museum ethnology. The

gradual formation of the scientific markets and fast-tracking of science (ethnology included) in post-socialism loosened this previously strong bond. Divergence of museological and academic ethnology/anthropology also came as a result of what was perceived as slower 'anthropologization' of museum ethnology compared to academic ethnology, decreasing number of joint ethnographic field research and mutual projects, and growing numbers of practicing anthropologists at universities and research institutes. In countries that have not experienced a significant increase in the number of academic anthropologists, formal and institutional connections and joint endeavors of museological and academic ethnologists/anthropologists are still present (e.g. in Montenegro). Closer connections between ethnologists/anthropologists working in the cultural and scholarly sector can be, and sometimes are facilitated through national professional ethnological associations, while the duration and content of such collaborations vary depending on fluctuating finances and official policy frameworks that usually do not facilitate or recognize a crossover bridge between science and culture. A revival of such a bridge despite the hectic circumstances of marketization of science could prove fruitful for academic ethnology/anthropology in small disciplinary communities such as the ones in this part of Europe – still dominantly oriented toward the domestic cultural area, cultural production of museum ethnologists and anthropologists can be very relevant for scholars in creating common anthropological research areas that would not necessarily align just with other disciplinary fields and other anthropological academic communities, but also with the domestic cultural sector and the wider public. Additional public relevance of academic anthropology could be facilitated in such a manner, and some authors point out such potential avenues of the discipline's development on the home front (e.g. see Milenković 2016), with heritage being a possible framework that could enhance anthropology's societal impact. Indeed, museological and academic anthropologists have begun to jointly dwell on particular issues related to the intangible cultural heritage (driven by the UNESCO's global cultural initiative), but additional mutual research and creative anthropological areas (that do not necessarily need to be policy or practically oriented) could arise with tighter cooperation between ethnologists/anthropologists working in either culture or academia, in what still are numerically relatively small disciplinary communities.

In conclusion, we should also be reminded that modernizing processes in the Yugoslav ethnologies of late socialism occurred in even less nu-

merous disciplinary communities which encompassed ethnologists from both the academic and cultural sector, and that paradigmatic changes occurred without some significant defining impetus from the outside, but were initiated and then followed through from within the local ethnological circles. Thus synergy of two anthropologies, academic and museological, potentially can lead to paradigmatic and thematic innovations even in a 'small' domestic disciplinary community, regardless of official national politics of science and culture, or international theoretical and methodological currents in the discipline. The creation of substantially new approaches and research fields is somewhat hindered by current circumstances of 'fast' and 'projectified' science and similar trends in the cultural sector, but the evident resilience of most institutions in this region could potentially counterbalance the 'post-scientific' and 'post-cultural' trends developing around us.

References

- Bašić, Ivana & Aleksandra Pavićević. 2017. „Između politike, istorije i ideologija: humanistika u okrilju kargo kulta.“ In *Zbornik za percepciju naučnog rada i poznavanje rekvizita njegove ocene*, eds. Jovan Ćirić & Luka Breneselović, 99–116. Beograd: Institut za uporedno pravo.
- Bošković, Aleksandar. 2005. „Distinguishing 'self' and 'other'. Anthropology and national identity in former Yugoslavia.“ *Anthropology Today* 21 (2): 8–13.
- Brković, Čarna. 2018. „Epistemological eclecticism: Difference and the 'Other' in the Balkans and beyond.“ *Anthropological Theory* 18 (1): 106–128.
- Buchowski, Michał. 2004. „Hierarchies of Knowledge in Central-Eastern European Anthropology.“ *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 22 (2): 5–14.
- Brumen, Borut. 2001. „'Refolucija' slovenske etnologije in kulturne antropologije.“ *Glasnik Slovenskega etnološkega društva* 41 (1–2): 8–16.
- Čapo Žmegač, Jasna, Reinhard Johler, Sanja Kalapos, Herbert Nikitsch, Ines Prica, & Vitomir Belaj, eds. 2001. *Kroatische Volkskunde/Ethnologie in den Neunzigern*. Wien: Institut für Europäische Ethnologie.
- Čapo Žmegač, Jasna. 2002. „Petriified models and (Dis)Continuities: Croatian Ethnology in the 1990s.“ In *Die Wende als Wende? Orientierungen Europäischer Ethnologien nach 1989*, eds. Konrad Köstlin, Peter Niedermüller & Herbert Nikitsch, 94–109. Wien: Institut für Europäische Ethnologie.
- Damjanović-Kadić, Gordana, Nice Fracile, Zoja Karanović, Erne Kiralj, Marija Kleut, Martin Kmeć, Ljubomir Medješi, Jovan Mihajlović, Olga Penavin &

- Magdalena Veselinović-Šulc. 1983. "Razvoj etnologije i folkloristike u Vojvodini od 1945." In *Zbornik Prvog kongresa jugoslovenskih etnologov in folkloristov*, eds. Janez Bogataj & Mirko Terseglav, 138–146. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo.
- Denitch, Bogdan. 1980. „Yugoslavia: the practical critique of ideological Marxism.“ In *Anthropology: Ancestors and Heirs*, ed. Stanley Diamond, 431–454. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Dushi, Arbnora. 2014. "Talking to Ourselves: Albanian Folklore Studies in Kosovo and the Challenges They Face Today." *Ethnologia Balkanica* 17: 163–176.
- Đukić, Danijela, Ana Popović & Vesna Vučinić Nešković. 2014. "Ethnology in Montenegro: an Overview from 1990 to the Present." *Ethnologia Balkanica* 17: 199–208.
- Gorunović, Gordana. 2007. *Srpska etnologija i marksizam: naučno delo Špire Kulišića*. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar.
- Gorunović, Gordana. 2008. "On a Not So Well Tempered Marxism. Ideological Criticism, Historical Reconstructions, and a Late Return to Ethnogenesis in the Work of Špiro Kulišić." In *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II*, eds. Vintila Mihailescu, Iliia Iliev & Slobodan Naumović, 307–335. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Halili, Rigels. 2017. „Albanian folkloristics and ethnography (Albania and Kosovo 1945–1991).“ *Ethnologie Francaise* 66 (2): 203–212.
- Halpern, Joel & Eugene Hammel. 1969. „Observations on the Intellectual History of Ethnology and other Social Sciences in Yugoslavia.“ *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11: 17–26.
- Kovačević, Ivan. 2006. *Tradicija modernog: prilozi istoriji savremene antropologije*. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar.
- Kovačević, Ivan. 2010. *Antropologija između scijentizma i disolucije*. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar – Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Kovačević, Ivan. 2015. *Istorija srpske etnologije I–II*. Beograd: Srpski genealoški centar.
- Kurtović, Larisa. 2013. „Cataloguing Tradition in a Socialist Republic: Ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1945–1990.“ In *The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe 1945–1991*, eds. Aleksandar Bošković & Chris Hahn, 305–340. Vienna–Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Kurtović, Larisa. 2014. „Conundrums of Ethnological and Anthropological Research in Bosnia-Herzegovina.“ *Ethnologia Balkanica* 17: 45–54.
- Lukić-Krstanović, Miroslava. 2012. „Ethnology of Socialism: New and Old Paradigms of Institute of Ethnography SASA.“ *Ethnologia Slovaca et Slavica* 35: 7–20.
- Milenković, Miloš. 2010. *Ka politici srpske antropologije za XXI vek*. Beograd:

Srpski genealoški centar – Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta.

- Milenković, Miloš. 2016. *Povratak nasleđu: ogled iz primenjene humanistike*. Beograd: Filozofski fakultet – Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju – Centar za antropologiju javnih i praktičnih politika.
- Naumović, Slobodan. 1998. „Romanticists or Double Insiders? An Essay on the Origins of Ideologised Discourses in Balkan Ethnology.“ *Ethnologia Balkanica* 2: 101–120.
- Naumović, Slobodan. 2002. „The Ethnology of Transformation as Transformed Ethnology: The Serbian Case.“ *Ethnologia Balkanica* 6: 7–37.
- Naumović, Slobodan. 2005. „Nacionalizacija nacionalne nauke? Politika etnologije/antropologije u Srbiji i Hrvatskoj tokom prve polovine devedesetih godina dvadesetog veka.“ In *Problemi kulturnog identiteta stanovništva savremene Srbije*, ed. Senka Kovač, 17–60. Beograd: Odeljenje za etnologiju i antropologiju Filozofskog fakulteta.
- Naumović, Slobodan. 2008. „Dangerous Liaisons and Never-Ending Stories: The Politics of Serbian Ethnology and Anthropology in the Interesting Times of Yugoslav Socialism.“ In *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II*, eds. Vintila Mihailescu, Ilia Iliev & Slobodan Naumović, 211–260. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Pavković, Nikola, Dušan Bandić & Ivan Kovačević. 1988. “Aspirations and Directions of the Development of Ethnology in the Socialist Republic of Serbia (1945–1983).” *Etnološki pregled* 23–24: 5–16.
- Prelić, Mladena. 2008. “Ethnographical Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SASA) in Search of the Lost Subject of Serbian Ethnology: From Ethnos to Ethnic Identity.” In *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II*, eds. Vintila Mihailescu, Ilia Iliev & Slobodan Naumović, 261–284. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Prica, Ines. 2001. *Mala europska etnologija*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.
- Prica, Ines. 2004. „Na tlu trivijalnog: pismo iz tranzicije.“ *Narodna umjetnost* 41 (2): 141–157.
- Prica, Ines. 2004a. „Nasleđe jugoslavenskih etnologija i suvremeno istraživanje postsocijalizma.“ *Traditiones* 33 (1): 19–35.
- Prica, Ines. 2004–2005. „Etnologija postocijalizma i prije ili: Dvanaest godina nakon 'Etnologije socijalizma i poslije.“ *Etnološka tribina* 27–28/34–35: 9–22.
- Prica, Ines. 2005. „Autori, zastupnici, presuditelji – hrvatska etnologija u paralelizmima postsocijalističkog konteksta.“ In *Etnologija i antropologija: stanje i perspektive*, ed. Ljiljana Gavrilović, 29–44. Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU.
- Prica, Ines. 2007. „In Search of Post-Socialist Subject.“ *Narodna umjetnost* 44 (1): 163–186.

- Prica, Ines. 2019. „Delivery of Ethnographic Material. The Work of Ethnologists in the Conditions of ‘Project Interdisciplinarity.’“ In *Prospects for Anthropological Research in South-East Europe*, eds. Marina Martinova & Ivana Bašić, 15–25. Moscow – Belgrade: N. N. Miklouho-Maklay Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology RAS – Institute of Ethnography SASA.
- Prošić-Dvornić, Mirjana. 1990. „Etnos i strategija.“ *Etno-antropološki problemi* 7: 23–36.
- Prošić-Dvornić, Mirjana. 1996. „Reconstruction of Identity and the Role of National Ethnology: Detached Observation or Active Participation.“ *Narodna umjetnost* 33 (2): 121–137.
- Prošić-Dvornić, Mirjana. 2008. „Serbian Village Culture: The Meeting Point of American Anthropology and Serbian Ethnology.“ In *Studying Peoples in the People’s Democracies II*, eds. Vintila Mihailescu, Ilia Iliev & Slobodan Naumović, 353–380. Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Radojičić, Dragana. 2019. „Ethnography and Ethnology in Yugoslavia between 1918 and 1941.“ *Národopisný věstník* 36 (1): 83–98.
- Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. 1992. „Etnologija socijalizma i poslije.“ *Etnološka tribina* 15: 81–89.
- Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. 2001. *Etnologija i etnomit*. Zagreb: Naklada Publica.
- Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. 2004. *Ethnology, Myth and Politics. Anthropologizing Croatian Ethnology*. Progress in European Ethnology Series, ed. Jasna Čapo Žmegač. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja & Aleksandra Muraj. 1998. „Prvih pedeset godina etnološke misli u Institutu.“ *Narodna umjetnost* 35 (2): 103–124.
- Risteski, Ljupčo & Rozita Dimova. 2013. „Between Folklore, Geography and Ethno-Nationalism: Ethnology in Macedonia during and after Socialism.“ In *The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe 1945–1991*, eds. Aleksandar Bošković & Chris Hahn, 273–292. Vienna–Berlin: LIT Verlag.
- Risteski, Ljupčo & Ilina Jakimovska. 2014. „Against All Odds: Auto-Reflexive Reconstructions of the Development of Ethnology and Anthropology as Academic Disciplines in the Republic of Macedonia (since 1990).“ *Ethnologia Balkanica* 17: 177–190.
- Slavec, Ingrid. 1988. „Slovenian Ethnology between the Past and the Present.“ *Etnološki pregled* 23–24: 37–59.
- Slavec Gradišnik, Ingrid. 2000. *Etnologija na Slovenskem: med čermi narodopisja in antropologije*. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- Slavec Gradišnik, Ingrid. 2013. „Disciplinary Continuities and Breaches: Contested Issues in Slovenian Ethnology in the Socialist Era.“ In *The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe 1945–1991*, eds. Aleksandar Bošković & Chris Hahn, 191–222. Vienna–Berlin: LIT Verlag.

- Vujačić, Lidija. 2005. „Etnologija i antropologija u Crnoj Gori – institucionalni i profesionalni okviri.“ In *Etnologija i antropologija: stanje i perspektive*, ed. Ljiljana Gavrilović, 45–54. Beograd: EI SANU.
- Vujačić, Lidija. 2013. „'Croquis' of Ethnology in Montenegro.“ In *The Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe 1945–1991*, eds. Aleksandar Bošković & Chris Hahn, 293–304. Vienna–Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Примљено / Received: 23. 02. 2022.

Прихваћено / Accepted: 06. 09. 2022.