

Irena Kolbas

Etnografski muzej Zagreb

ikolbas@etnografski-muzej.hr

Istra: različiti pogledi

Izložba u Etnografskom muzeju Zagreb,
9. travnja do 12. listopada 2003.

Od proljeća do jeseni 2003. u Etnografskom je muzeju u Zagrebu bila postavljena izložba *Istra: različiti pogledi*. Bila je to gostujuća izložba Etnografskog muzeja Istre, nastala u suradnji s Austrijskim etnografskim muzejom iz Beča i pripadajućim mu muzejem Schloss Kitsee.

Čime se bavila ova izložba?

Njezin prvi dio bavio se "uzrokom" zbog kojeg je Istra, kao rubni dio Austro-ugarske, uopće postala zanimljiva Beču, Monarhiji i pripadajućoj joj kulturi. Istra, kao austrijsko primorje, bila je zanimljiva ponajprije kao klimatsko lječilište i kao turistička destinacija tadašnjih austrijskih turista. Tijekom boravka u Istri, turisti i rekonvalescenti otkrili su i posebnosti njezine kuhinje. I odatle je krenuo prvi interes za "etnografiju" Istre. Bečki je etnografski muzej počeo sakupljati uporabne predmete istarske kuhinje, što je na izložbi prezentirano "istarskim ognjištem" koje je postalo sinonimom za cijelu Istru i ocakljenu keramiku koja zapravo nije bila izrađena na području Istre ali se tamo koristila. Vjerojatno je glazirana, šarena keramika bila odabrana iz estetskih razloga i zasigurno je sakupljačima bila atraktivnija od neglazirane i čadave, prave istarske keramike. Iz istog razloga nisu sakupljeni ni predmeti vezani uz gospodarstvo (vinogradarstvo, maslinarstvo, ribarstvo i drugo).

Atraktivnost predmeta velik je problem pri odabiru građe za muzejski fundus, posebno izražen u etnografiji, gdje se predmeti većinom odabiru prema nekim sasvim nejasnim estetskim kriterijima kustosa, pri čemu je kriterij relevantnosti predmeta često manje važan. To je bio problem u prošlosti, ali to je problem i danas. No ta tema zahtijeva poseban rad, a ovdje ju je nepohodno samo spomenuti.

Drugi dio izložbe bavi se onim što je intrigiralo etnografe Monarhije, a to je jezična i kulturna raznolikost Istre. Za njih je Istra značila putovanje u prošlost. "Zaostalost" Istre smatrana je dobrim "materijalom" za pravo etnografsko istraživanje. Takav je pristup i danas često prisutan. Što se područje smatra zaostalijim, to se pretpostavlja da je etnografski vrednije za istraživanje. Što je život seljaka bio jadniji i bjedniji, to se u njemu mogla bolje očitovati prava "narodna umjetnost". Zahvalan primjer za ta-

kav pristup etnografiji Monarhije našli su u Ćićima. Etnografima je tada velik problem predstavljala diferencijacija brojnih etničkih skupina na temelju uobičajenih kategorija kao što su jezik, nošnja, fizionomija i drugo. No, etnografi i lingvisti i dan-danas se spore oko tih istih pitanja, pa i u Istri: tko su Istrorumunji i kamo pripada istrorumunjski jezik, gdje je u tome istriotski i kakve su njegove veze s prije spomenutim ...¹. Od nošnji, koje se obično smatraju prvorazrednim predstavnikom etnografije pojedinog naroda, pokazane su skromne i "siromašnije" istarske nošnje među koje je "upala" i jedna s otoka Krka. To možda i nije slučajno jer su se Rumunji, koje su Frankopani naselili na Krku, kasnije preselili pod Učku i u Ćićariju.

Treći dio izložbe bavi se utjecajem željeznice, kojom si je Monarhija približila istarsko primorje, na život naroda u Istri. Mnogi su tako dobili posao, a željezo je u većim količinama došlo i u svakodnevni život (npr., od tračnica su se izrađivali prijekladi za ognjišta, a od kočnica nakovnji).

Nakon Prvoga svjetskog rata Istrom je zavladała Italija pa je naglašavano "talijanstvo" istarskog naroda. Nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata naglašavale su se slavenske karakteristike tog istog naroda. Interes je etnologa primarno bio usmjeren na selo i njegovu prošlost.

Od izdvajanja Hrvatske iz Jugoslavije do današnjih dana, Istra se nastoji definirati kao multikulturalna sredina, što je oduvijek i bila, a ne samo talijanska, hrvatska, slovenska, istrorumunjska ili neka druga "jedinstvena" cjelina. Ta se multikulturalnost prezentira suvenirima koji su "univerzalno" istarski: *kažuni*, *boškarini*, koze i razni predmeti u obliku Istre iskaz su suvremene istarske kulture.

Ova vrlo dobra izložba problematizira etnološki i muzeološki rad, što je razmjerno rijetko, barem u ovim našim krajevima, gdje se etnografske izložbe najčešće svode na etnografske slikovnice. Izložba donosi "različite poglede" intrigantne stručnjacima etnologima i muzealcima, a istodobno je razumljiva i posjetiteljima. Uz to, uspijeva sačuvati objektivnost na skliskom terenu političke povijesti, političke etnografije i, može se reći, političke muzeografije.



12.01



12.02



12.03

¹ Situaciju još više zamućuje *Ethnologue*, najvažniji i najcitiraniji popis jezika svijeta, koji se, navodno, osobito bavi "manjim" jezicima, a i dan-danas navodi, npr., da Gradišćanski Hrvati govore srpskohrvatski (v.: www.ethnologue.com).

Irena Kolbas

Ethnographic museum

Zagreb

Croatia

ikolbas@etnografski-muzej.hr

Istria: Different Perspectives

Exhibition at the Ethnographic Museum
in Zagreb, April 9 to October 12, 2003

From spring to autumn 2003 the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb staged the exhibition *Istria: Different Perspectives*. It was a visiting exhibition of the Ethnographic Museum of Istria, created in cooperation with the Austrian Ethnographic Museum of Vienna and its associated Schloss Kitsee Museum.

What was the main theme of this exhibition?

The first part of the exhibition dealt with the reason why Istria, as a marginal region of Austria-Hungary, became interesting at all to Vienna, the Monarchy and its culture. Istria, as the Austrian littoral, was primarily attractive as a climatic health resort and a travel destination for the Austrian tourists of the time. During their stay in Istria, tourists and convalescents discovered also the distinctive quality of its cuisine. This is how the "ethnographic" interest in Istria came to life. The Viennese Ethnographic Museum started collecting objects of utility in the Istrian cuisine. The collected objects were exhibited as "the Istrian fireplace", a term that became synonymous with the whole of Istria and with glazed pottery, which was actually not Istrian. The richly coloured glazed pottery was probably chosen for aesthetic reasons: collectors found it certainly more attractive than the non-glazed, soot-stained real Istrian ceramic. This also explains why no objects related to husbandry (wine-growing, olive-growing, fishery and other activities) were collected.

The attractiveness of the objects is a big problem in selecting material for museum holdings. It is especially pronounced in ethnography, where objects are mainly selected according to some completely obscure aesthetic criteria of the curators, whereas the relevance of the object is often a criterion of lesser importance. This was a problem in the past, and still is a problem in the present days. Although this topic would require a separate paper, it should be at least mentioned in this context.

The second part of the exhibition deals with what intrigued the ethnographers of the Monarchy, namely the linguistic and cultural variety of Istria. To them, Istria meant

a journey to the past. The "backwardness" of Istria was considered to be "good material" for real ethnographic research. The same approach is often still present today. The lesser developed a region is considered to be, the more valuable it is assumed in terms ethnographic research. The more wretched and destitute the life of the peasant was, the better it could reflect the real "folk lore". A rewarding example for this kind of approach was found by the ethnographers of the Monarchy in the people of Čići. A significant problem faced by the ethnographers of that time was the differentiation of numerous ethnic groups based on customary categories such as language, costume, physiognomy etc. Contemporary ethnographers and linguists still fight over the same issues in view of many regions, including Istria: who are the Istro-Romanians and to which group does the Istro-Romanian language belong, what place in the system is occupied by the Istriot language and what are its relations to the previously mentioned language ...¹. Among folk costumes, which are usually considered to be first-class representatives of a nation's ethnography, the exhibition presents the modest and "poorer" Istrian folk garments, which happened to include also one from the island of Krk. This is perhaps no accident, since the Romanians, who were settled by the Frankopan family on the island of Krk, later moved to the region of Čićarija or settled at the foot of the Učka mountain.

The third part of the exhibition deals with the influence of the railway, which brought the Istrian coastland closer to the Monarchy, on the life of the Istrian population. Thanks to the railway, many people could get employed and iron was increasingly used for everyday life purposes (e.g., railway tracks were used as andirons for hearths while train brakes were turned into anvils).

After World War I, Istria came under the rule of Italy, so that emphasis was placed on the Italian characteristics of the Istrian people. After World War II, stress was laid on the Slavic characteristics of the same population. The interest of ethnologists was primarily directed to the village and its history.

Since Croatia gained its independence from Yugoslavia, Istra has tried to define itself as a multicultural environment, which it always has been, and not just an Italian, Croatian, Slovenian, Istro-Rumanian or another "homogenous" entity. This multiculturalism is presented through souvenirs which are "universally" Istrian, such as *kažun* (Istrian field stone shelter), *boškarin* (autochthonous Istrian cattle breed), goats and various objects inspired by the shape of Istria are an expression of the contemporary Istrian culture.

This very good exhibition problematizes the ethnological and museological work. Such approach which is extremely rare, at least in Croatia, where ethnographic exhibitions usually come down to ethnographic picture-books. The exhibition presents "different perspectives" intriguing to expert ethnologists and museologists,

¹ The situation is additionally obscured by *Ethnologue*, the most relevant and quoted listing of languages of the worlds, which allegedly focuses especially on "lesser-known" languages, but still carries for instance the incorrect information that Croatian minority in Austria speaks Serbo-Croatian (see.: www.ethnologue.com).

being at the same time understandable to other visitors. In addition, it has managed to remain objective on the slippery ground of political history, political ethnography and, it could be said, political museography.

Translated by Sanja Novak