

Neke etnološke dileme u koncipiranju prezentacije hrvatske tradicije¹

Sadašnjost zagrebačkog Etnografskog muzeja obilježena je radom na detaljnoj razradi koncepcije novoga stalnog postava. Tim povodom, želim ovdje u skraćenom obliku iznijeti svoja razmišljanja i dileme.

Ključne riječi: muzejski postavi, stalni postavi, Etnografski muzej Zagreb

Sadašnji je stalni postav osmišljen krajem šezdesetih i početkom sedamdesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća, a realizacija je tekla paralelno s građevinskom rekonstrukcijom zgrade. Intenzivan rad rezultirao je izložbom visokih estetskih vrijednosti, temeljenom na etnološkim postavkama prve polovice dvadesetog stoljeća.

S obzirom na to da je praksa pokazala neke nedostatke u koncipiranju rasporeda sadržaja unutar obnovljene zgrade, današnji se stalni postav donekle razlikuje od izvornog. U stvari, promjena se odnosi samo na prizemlje, u kojem su bile obrađene teme gospodarstva, tekstilnog ruktovorstva, keramike i košaraštva. Danas se prostor prizemlja uglavnom koristi za povremene izložbe budući da je višegodišnja praksa postavljanja povremenih izložbi, u za to projektom predviđenim prostorima četvrtog kata, pokazala znatne nedostatke.

Ipak, osnovna ideja koncepcije izvornog postava vidljiva je i danas, a temelji se na:

- podjeli Hrvatske na kulturne zone,
- pretežnoj zastupljenosti tekstila, tj. narodne nošnje i
- predstavljanju isključivo reprezentativnih primjeraka.

¹ Rad je izlaganje sa skupa: *3rd International Conference of Ethnographic Museum in Central-and South East Europe*, Etnografické Muzeum, Martin, Slovacka, održan od 15. do 17. listopada 2003.

Kada je nakon višegodišnjih nastojanja konačno na pomolu mogućnost realizacije novoga stalnog postava, u ovom bih radu želio obrazložiti svoj odnos prema još uvijek aktualnome stalnom postavu i formulirati neke od problema za koje smatram da bi se mogli pojaviti u detaljnoj razradi koncepcije novoga stalnog postava. Prije svega, smatram neophodnim osvrnuti se na na trodjelnu podjelu Hrvatske na kulturne zone, koju je dio hrvatskih etnologa već 1972. godine u vrijeme otvaranja aktualnog postava smatrao prevladanom. Pretežna zastupljenost narodnih nošnji opravdavala se time da taj materijal čini veći dio fundusa Muzeja. No, to nas dovodi do pitanja: je li zadatak središnjega hrvatskog etnografskog muzeja prezentirati vlastiti fundus ili prikazati kulturnu sliku područja? Napokon, koliko je ispravno graditi idealiziranu sliku vlastite kulture predstavljanjem isključivo reprezentativnih izložaka, te u njezinu objektivnost uvjeravati sebe i druge?

Podjelu Hrvatske na tri kulturne zone - panonsku, dinarsku i jadransku, još je tridesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća utvrdio doajen hrvatske etnologije Milovan Gavazzi. U to je vrijeme područje etnologije bilo ograničeno na istraživanje ruralne kulture predindustrijskog doba, tj. na razdoblje od druge polovice 19. st. do polovice 20. st.

Da bih ilustrirao ovu podjelu, za svaku ću zonu navesti samo nekoliko primjera:

Panonska zona

Kuće su na ovom području okrenute ulici užom stranom. Namještaj je visok (tzv. "namještaj visokog horizonta"). Grožđe se nakon berbe preraduje u posebnim zgradama u vinogradu, gdje se i čuva vino. Temelj stočarstva stajsko je govedarstvo i uzgoj svinja slobodnom ispašom u šumi, u krdima (100-200 komada). U odijevanju prevladavaju tkanine od materijala biljnog podrijetla.

Jadranska zona

Osnovni je građevni materijal kamen. Na kat kuće ide se vanjskim stubištem koje završava kamenom terasom. Karike lanca na kojem visi lonac na otvorenom ognjištu imaju oblik kruga. U ograđivanju zemljišta koristi se suhozid (zid od naslaganog kamena bez veziva). U gospodarstvu su važni ribolov, moreplovstvo te uzgoj loze i maslina. Vino i ulje čuvaju se u konobama u prizemlju kuća. Za stočarstvo je karakterističan uzgoj magaraca i mula. U odijevanju muškaraca su karakteristične relativno kratke hlače, straga široke (Krk, Konavle). Nosi se i vunena kapa s dugačkim tuljcem koja je mogla dopirati do ramena.

Dinarska zona

Osnovni je građevinski materijal drvo. Krov je pokriven tesanim daščicama. Karike lanca na kojem visi lonac na otvorenom ognjištu imaju oblik broja 8. Namještaj je nizak (tzv. "namještaj niskog horizonta"). Značajno je obilježje gospodarstva transhu-

mantno ovčarstvo. U odijevanju prevladava upotreba vunениh materijala. Karakteristična je kapa ravnog tjemena.

Osnovna je zamjerka ovakvoj podjeli što se ona odnosi na točno određeno razdoblje, i to kraj 19. i početak 20. stoljeća: "zone tradicijske kulture" imale su ta obilježja samo u tom razdoblju. Situacija je, kako povijesna i društvena tako i kulturna, prije i nakon tog razdoblja sasvim drugačija.

U drugoj se polovici 20. st. javljaju shvaćanja etnologije kao znanosti koja se bavi pučkom kulturom uopće, kako ruralnom tako i urbanom, u svim njezinim vremenskim fazama, sve do suvremenosti.

No, bez obzira na to što se trodjelna podjela uglavnom smatra prevladanom, u praksi je u stručnim krugovima ona i danas prisutna. Osnovnim razlogom podvojenosti teorije i prakse smatram činjenicu što je takav način promišljanja i prezentacije tradicijske kulture jednostavan i praktičan: područje rada jasno je određeno, kako u vremenu tako i u prostoru. Na deskriptivnoj razini obrađuje se određeno zemljopisno područje i traže karakteristike predindustrijske ruralne kulture. Izlet u znanost realizira se analizama isto tako određene ruralne kulture susjednog (ili udaljenog) područja, pa se usporedbama donose zaključci o međusobnim utjecajima i eventualnim migracijama. Osim toga, čini se da mnogi koriste ovu podjelu jer nema bolje, ne razmišljajući da bi se kulturom mogli baviti i bez zemljopisne podjele na područja. Doduše, zemljopisno odnosno političko ograničenje postoji u djelovanju ustanove. Tako je, primjerice, područje djelovanja zagrebačkog Etnografskog muzeja najvećim dijelom omeđeno granicama Republike Hrvatske.

Kakav bi trebao biti stalni postav muzeja koji prezentira stanoviti kulturno heterogeni prostor? Kao alternativa njegovoj podjeli na kulturne zone, ostaje nam prezentacija koja obrađuje neku temu, npr., ciklus godišnjih ili životnih običaja, monografsko prikazivanje manjih kulturnih cjelina, monografski prikaz cijelog područja Republike Hrvatske koji bi odabranim kulturnim elementima prezentirao cjelinu narodnog života na njezinu prostoru.

Smatram da je svaki od navednih načina u načelu podjednako dobar i da u konačnici njegova kvaliteta zavisi od kvalitete realizacije. Svaki bi, međutim, prezentirani kulturni element trebao pružiti više od pukih podataka o svojoj funkciji, provenijenciji (mjesto izrade, upotrebe, nabave) i sl. On nas treba podučiti i o širem društvenom kontekstu u kojem je funkcionirao i vezama s drugim kulturama o kojima svjedoči. Iz takva bi postava posjetilac trebao saznati o vezama dotične kulture s drugima, shvatiti da ta (naročito ako se radi o njegovoj vlastitoj kulturi) ne postoji sama za sebe niti da je nastala sama po sebi. Učeći ga o bogatstvu kulturne slike i kulturnim vezama među kulturama, učimo ga toleranciji.

Na takvim pretpostavkama, kapa ravnog tjemena i poluloptasta keramička naprava za pečenje na otvorenoj vatri ("peka") bile bi prezentirane kao paleobalkanski elementi, a ne kao elementi dinarske kulturne zone, hlače s Krka kao predmet koji pripada širemu mediteranskom prostoru, a ne kao predmet "jadranske zone", oglavlje s Paga ("rub") kao slavenski kulturni element.

U dosadašnjemu stalnom postavu zamjećujem još jedan nedostatak koji je prisutan i na izložbama mnogih drugih muzeja. Radi se o fragmentaciji prošlosti na segmente kojima se bave određene struke. Dakako, takva je fragmentacija potrebna kako bismo se mogli što temeljitije baviti problematikom. Čini mi se, ipak, da posjetitelji najčešće stječu dojam kako su ljudi prošlosti živjeli različite "struke" (a ne da su živjeli u različitim uvjetima). Tako su posebno živjeli umjetnost (što se vidi iz umjetničkih galerija), posebno etnografiju (prikazanu u etnografskim muzejima), posebno povijest (prikazanu u povijesnim muzejima) itd. Tome često pridonosi i nedostatna datacija etnografskih predmeta, tj. određivanje vremena u kojem su nastali i u kojem su korišteni. Imam dojam da zainteresirani posjetilac sve te predmete doživljava kao predmete koji pripadaju prošlosti, ali mu nije sasvim jasno kojem razdoblju pripadaju. Ne zna niti pripadaju li svi ti predmeti istom ili različitim razdobljima. Još je manje svjestan toga što se u svijetu ili u njegovoj okolini događalo kada je neki seljak kopao izloženom motikom, ili kada je na određenom području napuštena izrada nošnje od domaćeg materijala, kako su se različiti politički događaji odražavali na situaciju i život sela.

Radi se, naravno, o potrebi multidisciplinarnе prezentacije u kojoj bi etnografska građa morala dominirati, dok bi ostala trebala imati ulogu orijentira. Kao ilustraciju, navest ću nekoliko primjera iz zagrebačkog Etnografskog muzeja koji bi, po mojem mišljenju, trebali biti takvi povijesni orijentiri. To je ponajprije vladavina Austrije i Austrougarske kada su panonska sela uređena kao ulični tip naselja ili kada je organiziranje Vojne krajine značajno utjecalo na način života na granici s Osmanskim carstvom. Osim toga, svakako bi jedan od takvih orijentira trebalo biti i djelovanje Hrvatske seljačke stranke Stjepana Radića koja je u prvoj polovici 20. st. imala snažan utjecaj na hrvatsko selo, zatim kolektivizacija seljačkih imanja osnivanjem "seljačkih radnih zadruga" dolaskom socijalizma na vlast i sl.

Uz to, svakako bi trebalo i narodno oblikovanje i ukrašavanje dovesti u odnos prema europskim umjetničkim stilovima koji su snažno, poglavito barok, utjecali na narodnu umjetnost.

Po čemu ćemo, međutim, procjenjivati kvalitetu te realizacije? Ako nam je cilj postavom muzejske izložbe poučiti o kulturi određenog područja, tada bi odgovor na pitanje o kvaliteti bio u stvari odgovor na sljedeća pitanja:

- pruža li nam izložba samo uvid u inventar kulturnih pojava (je li ona samo deskriptivna) ili nas uči o smislu tih pojava, njihovu podrijetlu, načinu na koji su postale dio upravo dotične kulture, širem kontekstu u kojem su funkcionirale, i

- je li prezentacija prilagođena (stručno i tehnički) različitim razinama mogućnosti i interesa posjetioca, tj. pruža li svakome zainteresiranom količinu i vrstu podataka prilagođenu njegovu obrazovanju i mogućnostima recepcije.

Namjerno ne koristim inače u ovom kontekstu čest termin "prosječno obrazovan posjetilac" jer smatram da bi izložba trebala biti edukativna kako za potprosječno, tako i za natprosječno obrazovana posjetioca. Smatram da muzeji upravo u tom pravcu trebaju poboljšati svoje metode djelovanja, i da je upravo to njihov pedagoški i andragoški zadatak.

Zaključno, želim reći kako smatram da bi kvalitetan stalni postav bilo koje etnografske muzejske ustanove etnografsku građu trebao prezentirati u kontekstu u kojem su pojedini kulturni elementi nastali, djelovali i nestali iz svakodnevice. Sistematizirano, ti su konteksti sljedeći:

- politički kontekst (npr., utjecaj politike na pučku kulturu, upotreba folkloru i njegovih simbola u političke svrhe),
- ekonomski kontekst (npr., utjecaj pojave filoksere krajem 19. st. na život sela),
- društveni kontekst (npr., razmjena kulturnih elemenata između društvenih slojeva, raspad seoskih obiteljskih zadruga), i
- povijesni kontekst (utjecaj različitih povijesnih događaja: Prvi i Drugi svjetski rat, uspostava socijalizma - osnivanje "seoskih radnih zajednica").

Some Ethnological Dilemmas Regarding the Presentation Concept of the Croatian Tradition¹

Present activities of the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb are characterized by the efforts to develop a detailed concept of the new permanent exhibition. This paper intends to present my considerations and dilemmas on this issue.

Key Words: museum exhibitons, permanent exhibitons, Ethnographic Museum Zagreb

The current permanent exhibition has been designed in the late sixties and early seventies of the 20th century and was implemented simultaneously with the reconstruction of the building. Intensive work resulted in an exhibition of high aesthetic value, based on ethnological tenets of the first half of the 20th century.

The concept of content distribution in the reconstructed building showed certain disadvantages in practice, which is why today's permanent exhibition differs to a certain extent from the original one. Modifications were actually limited to the ground floor, which was used to present themes from the domains of economy, textile handicrafts, ceramics and basket weaving. The ground floor premises are now mainly used for temporary exhibitions, since the longstanding practice of staging exhibitions on the fourth floor, as originally projected, proved to have considerable shortcomings.

¹ Paper is presented as report under title: *3rd International Conference of Ethnographic Museum in Central-and South East Europe*, Ethnographic Museum, Martin, Slovakia, held from 15th to 17th october 2003

The basic concept of the original exhibition nevertheless remained visible to the present. It is based on:

- a division of Croatia into cultural zones
- a predominance of textile, i.e. the folk costume
- the exclusive presentation of representative exhibits

Now that it finally seems to be possible to realize the new permanent exhibition after years of efforts, I would like to explain in this paper my attitude towards the current permanent exhibition and formulate some problems I believe could arise in the detailed development of the concept of the new permanent exhibition. First of all, I consider it necessary to comment on the division of Croatia into three culture zones, which was considered by some Croatian ethnologists outdated even as far back as in 1972, when the current exhibition was staged. The dominance of folk costumes was justified by the fact that this material comprised the major part of the Museum's holdings. However, this leads us to the question: is the main role of the central Croatian ethnographic museum to present its own holdings, or the culture of a region? Finally, to what extent is it right to create an idealised picture of our own culture by presenting only representative exhibits, trying to convince others and ourselves of its objectivity?

The division of Croatia into three cultural zones - the Pannonic, the Dinaric and the Adriatic - was established in the 30s of the 20th century by the doyen of Croatian ethnology, Milovan Gavazzi. At that time, the field of ethnology was limited to the research of rural culture of the pre-industrial age, i.e. to the period of the second half of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century.

To illustrate this division, I will give just a few examples for each zone:

Pannonic zone:

The houses in this region face the street with their narrower side. The furniture is high (the so-called "high-horizon furniture"). After the harvest, the grapes are processed in special buildings in the vineyard, used also to store the wine. Animal husbandry is based on stable breeding and pig breeding in herds (100 - 200 pigs) grazing freely in woods. Clothing is dominated by textile of plant origin.

Adriatic zone:

The basic construction material is stone. The upper floor of the house is accessed over out-doors stairs ending in a stone terrace. The links of the chain holding the pot over an open hearth are circular. Land is fenced off by drystone walls (walls made of stone without binding material). Economy relies on fishery, seafaring as well as the growing of wine grape and olives. Wine and oil is kept in typical cellars in house basements. The breeding of donkeys and mules is typical for animal husbandry. Men's clothing is characterized by relatively short pants with wide back parts

(on the island of Krk and in the region of Konavle), as well as woollen caps with long, sometimes shoulder-long cones.

Dinaric zone:

The basic construction material is wood. Roofs of houses are covered by trimmed shingles. The links of the chain holding the pot over an open hearth are wrought in the shape of number "8". The furniture is low, the so-called "low horizon furniture". An important characteristic of the economy is transhumant sheep breeding. Clothing is made mainly of woollen materials. The use of caps with flat tops is characteristic for this zone.

The basic objection to this division is that it refers to a precisely defined period, i.e. the period of the late 19th and early 20th century: the described characteristics of "traditional culture zones" were typical only for this period. The historical, social and cultural situation before and after this period is completely different.

In the second half of the 20th century, ethnology starts being perceived as a science dealing with folk culture in general, both rural and urban, over various periods to the present time.

Although the tripartite division is mainly regarded in expert circles as outdated, it is still present in practice in professional circles. I see the main reason for such dichotomy between theory and practice in the fact that this way of considering and presenting traditional culture is simple and practical: the scope of work is clearly delimited, both in terms of time and space. A certain geographic area is dealt with on a descriptive level, focusing on characteristics of the pre-industrial rural culture. Links with science are established through analyses of an equally precisely determined rural culture of a neighbouring (or distant) area, and comparisons are used to draw conclusions about mutual influences and possible migrations. In addition, many ethnologists seem to use this division because there is no better alternative, without considering that culture could be researched also without the geographical division into areas. Geographical and political limitations, however, apply the activity of a certain institution. The scope of activity of the Zagreb Ethnographic Museum, for instance, is mainly limited by the borders of the Republic of Croatia.

How should then a permanent exhibition of a museum presenting a certain culturally heterogeneous space look like? Alternatively to its division into cultural zones, we could present the material through the analysis of certain themes, such as the cycle of annual or life customs, the monographic presentation of smaller cultural units or the monographic presentation of the Republic of Croatia as a whole, by using selected elements of culture to present the entirety of folk life on its territory.

I believe that each of these approaches is in principle equally good and that its quality in the end depends on the quality of realization. However, every presented element of culture should offer more than bare information about its function, provenience (place of origin, use or purchase) etc. It should teach us also about the wider social context in which this element functioned and about intercultural associations

to which it bears witness. A visitor of such an exhibition should learn about the links of the referenced culture with other cultures and understand (especially in case of his/her own culture) that it does not exist on its own and that it did not emerge by itself. By teaching the visitors about the richness of culture and intercultural links, we are teaching them tolerance.

On such assumptions, the flat-topped cap and the hemispherical ceramic device for roasting food on open fire ("peka") would be presented as Paleobalkan elements rather than elements of the Dinaric culture zone, the pants from the island Krk as an element belonging to the wider Mediterranean area rather than as an "Adriatic zone" object, while the headgear from the island of Pag ("rub") would be presented as a Slavic cultural element.

I have observed another shortcoming of the current permanent exhibition, which also appears in the exhibitions of many other museums: the fragmentation of the past into segments associated to certain professions. Of course, such fragmentation is necessary to enable more thorough analyses of the problems. However, it seems to me that the visitor mainly gets the impression that the people of the past lived various "professions" (rather than living in various circumstances). The artistic aspect of their life (as shown in art galleries) seems to be separated from the ethnographic aspect (as shown in ethnographic museums), which is in turn separated from the historical aspect (as shown in history museums)...etc. This is often contributed by the imprecise dating of ethnographic objects, i.e. the fixing of the time of their origin and use. I have the impression that the interested visitors perceive such exhibits as objects belonging to the past, but without a clear understanding which period they belong to. The visitors also do not know whether all these objects belong to the same or to different periods. They are even less aware of what was happening in the world or in the surroundings of the peasant who was using the hoe exhibited here, or at what time the production of the folk costumes from home-made materials was abandoned, or how the situation and the life in villages were affected by various political events.

What is necessary is, naturally, a multidisciplinary presentation, in which the ethnographic material would dominate, while material from other domains would be used for orientation purposes. To take the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb as illustration, I will mention only some examples that I believe should be used as historical landmarks. This is, firstly, the Austrian and Austro-Hungarian rule, under which the Pannonian villages took the shape of settlements organized along a main street and when the organisation of the Croatian Military Frontier (Vojna krajina) had a considerable influence on the way of life at the border with the Ottoman Empire. Another historical landmark would be the activity of the "Croatian Peasant Party" and its leader Stjepan Radić which strongly influenced the Croatian village in the first half of the 20th century. An important historical influence was also the collectivisation of farms through the establishment of the "peasant work cooperation societies" with the rise of socialism, etc.

In addition, folk design and decoration should be placed in relation to European art styles, especially the Baroque, which had a strong influence on folk art.

However, how will we evaluate the quality of this realization? If our objective is a museum exhibition that would educate about the culture of a certain region, then the answer about the quality would be actually the answer to the following questions:

- does the exhibition provide only an insight into the inventory of cultural phenomena (is it only descriptive) or does it teach us about the meaning of such phenomena, their origin, how they became a part of the referenced culture, the wider context in which they functioned, and

- is the presentation adapted (professionally and technically) to various levels of interest and capabilities of the visitors, i.e. does it offer every interested visitor the type and quantity of information corresponding to his education and reception abilities.

I have intentionally avoided here the term "visitor of average education", otherwise frequently used in this context, because I believe that the exhibition should be educative both for the undereducated and the overeducated visitor. In my view, the museums should take this direction to improve their methods. Precisely this is their task in terms of children and adult education.

Finally, I would like to express my belief that a high-quality exhibition of any ethnographic museum institution should present the ethnographic material in the context in which individual cultural elements were created, functioned in and disappeared from everyday life. Presented in a systematized way, this would include the following contexts:

- the political context (e.g. influence of politics on folk culture, the use of folklore and its symbols for political purposes...)

- the economic context (e.g. the influence of the phylloxera (vine pest) on rural life in the late 19th century)

- social context (e.g. the exchange of cultural elements between social classes, the breakdown of peasant extended families...)

- the historical context (influence of various historical events: World War I and II, the socialist rule - establishment of "peasant work cooperation societies" - *kolkhozes* /collective farms...)

Translated by Sanja Novak