HERITAGES: PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES

JURIJ FIKFAK

Traditiones is a journal that, succinctly and metaphorically stated, focuses on folk culture—or, rather, folk cultures—in the broadest possible sense. The felicitously plural name of the journal, founded fifty years ago by Niko Kuret and Milko Matičetov, largely explains the plurality of ideas and practices: namely, traditions, heritages, and legacies are concepts that denote the visual and invisible, and the tangible and intangible traces of past practices and ideas, or former ones that are still alive today. They are delineated as needed and assigned various meanings and nuances (Tunbridge, Aschworth, 1966; Hudales, Visočnik, 2005; Kockel, Nic Craith, 2007; Slavec Gradišnik, 2014); for example, with emphasis on cultural objectification or formation in heritage (cf. Kockel, 2007) and on process in tradition.

"The past is a foreign country," wrote David Lowenthal (1985), which is also reflected in the quandaries and problems associated with the strategies and practices of drawing closer to unknown, elusive, and entirely incomprehensible terrain. On the one hand, one attempt to achieve this is playing with the names of various concepts to conceptually capture a certain phenomenon once and for all, and on the other, often ambivalent usage, which may be most easily illustrated with the dynamics of the relationship between normativity and performativity (cf. Smith, 2006) or between the restrictive rudiment of remaining faithful to the largely reconstructed image and the potential of representation, which can be sensed and sought after in the past expression. However, already at this point there comes to the fore the pragmatic practice of folk culture, which is inclined to subject itself to procedural normativity (e.g., in the Register of Intangible Heritage) or express a desire to be included on the UNESCO Representative List of Intangible Cultural Heritage, while at the same time violating it immediately without considering it a particular problem. Evident from these practices and records is the conflict or contrast between allographic behaviors and acts (i.e., oriented toward experiencing an event or development) and autographic or ideally model records, which form the basis or starting point for any realization and the foundations for reflections and negotiations on what heritage is and is not. In any case, in its intangible form heritage is a "performative" cultural act, which can be transformed into a distinctively political asset (Brown, 2005). An important issue is also the differences in creating and re-creating heritage, where on the one hand there arises the question of the narcissism of minor differences (Freud, 1930), productive in forming our own identity, and on the other hand the issue of the ethics of cultural heritage (Mathes, 2018).

The intensive discussions on the content of the Institute of Slovenian Ethnology's 2022–2027 research program, in which heritage was considered a main or central point or research premise, primarily relied on research conducted to date, including the recent Slovenian–Hungarian project on protected areas along the Slovenian–Hungarian border (Fikfak, Meszaros, 2019; Bajuk Senčar, 2019; Munda Hirnök, Slavec Gradišnik, 2019), the Slovenian–Italian project *ZBORZBIRK* (zborzbirk.zrc-sazu.si), the project *ETNOFOLK* carried out as part of the Central Europe program (Bitušíkova, Koštialová, Luther, 2014), and the project *AlpFoodway* (www.alpfoodway.eu). In all these cases, heritage referred to borders, and crossing borders was one of the main research topics.

The conference *Borders and Boundaries of/in Heritage* scheduled for April 2020 was also thematically conceived along these lines in cooperation with the Cultural Heritage and Property Working Group and the Space-Lore and Place-Lore Working Group of the International Society for Ethnology and Folklore (SIEF). The invitation to the conference highlighted three problem areas. The first referred to territorial delimitations (local, regional, or national) that influence formation and presentation. The second topic referred to heritages, especially along borders, which usually form the basis for various identification strategies and practices. The third topic addressed various heritage actors and their social powers and agendas, from government institutions, museums, and institutes to experts and heritage re-creators. The conference thus aimed to explore the border practices associated with various forms of heritage that function as instruments of power, through which important actors define and cross a variety of borders: between cultural and natural heritage, tangible and intangible heritage, originals and reconstructions, and the roles of professionals and the general public.

The conference and discussion on these issues was cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In the new circumstances and through new discussions, the initial topics conceived in a very complex manner were redefined, which provided room for reflections on where we stand with heritage today: this formed the basis for the first issue of the fiftieth volume of *Traditiones*. In the second issue (Golež Kaučič, 2021), the authors reflect on how to think, speak, and sing folklore, and in the third (Bowman, 2021) they discuss vernacular religion and contemporary spiritualities. These three topics reflect an exceptionally extensive research field, in which, time and again, we are confronted with complexity, heterogeneity, lack of coherence, or, in short, a polyphony of voices. Within this sphere of the known and unknown, researchers function as listeners searching for and securing traces of both collective and individual events and behaviors of past dynamics—that is, a continuously unknown country that, according to Hannah Arendt, we seek to understand so that the Other, either a person or community or a person's artefacts, can draw closer to us. However, with every action and research intervention, when we enter the asymmetrical game, this Other that we draw closer to evades us again. By expanding or moving the research framework and vanishing point through a diverse range of research methods, we unveil new levels and new nuances. We used to be tangled up in a single technical term for one phenomenon,

but now we are no longer satisfied; due to a shortcoming in the concept and evasion of the research subject, in this new differentiation and dynamics we have to use three or four terms instead. We usually deem the old term an instance of essentialization that we then follow in journalistic discourse and later in general conversation. This also involves the constant naming dilemma within the discipline, which is best illustrated by intensive discussions in the German-speaking environment. However, in general discomfort is also associated with changes to the research object, where, according to Gisela Welz (1998), not only researchers but also research objects and (so to speak) subjects move.

Important for the reflection on heritage and tradition at our institute was also the first stage of the emerging Register of Intangible Heritage. On the one hand, there developed the rudiments and criteria for the list and the documentation of elements worthy of expert examination and documentation on video, and on the other hand meetings took place with local action groups, the media, journalists, and photographers, who all co-create the image of heritage. An important element in exploring heritage and tradition is thus the agenda of heritage creators and re-creators, who strive for the continuation of a specific practice. It turned out that, before the register was created, the main criterion for proving local importance within the wider regional or even national environment was a newspaper publication or appearance on TV, whereas now an important reference is an entry in the Register of Intangible Heritage with the ambition to be included on the UNESCO list. Inclusion in the register functions as affirmation of the local performative or local identity, in which ethnologists usually play the role of moderators—that is, those that turn the proposals into texts and descriptions with a character based on professional research, thus creating the basis for acceptance in the register.

While considering the content of the thematic issue on heritage, three aspects or approaches to thematizing heritage were decisive: an overview of research to date (Testa), a view forward (Fournier, Bendix), and concrete heritage practices (Peball and Schönberger, Ledinek Lozej and Pisk, Jezernik, Hristov, Koštialová and Murin, Ivančič Kutin and Kropej Telban) in various European contexts, especially in central Europe.

Alessandro Testa (2021) finds that the current anthropology of cultural heritage was formed and defined by a combination of various identity and methodological trends and empirical insights. The theorists that he mentions include Jeremy Boissevain, Daniel Fabre, Pierre Nora, Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, and Regina Bendix. Laurent Sébastien Fournier (2021) analyzes differences in heritage research approaches, the notions of "retrotopia" and "prospective", and the dilemmas caused by different connotations of heritage and various conceptions of temporality. Regina Bendix (2021) discusses the recent French sensory heritage law, which opens the path to a new understanding of heritage and a reacquaintance with habitus. Roland W. Peball and Klaus Schönberger (2021) analyze the thematization of linguistic and territorial demarcations in terms of the Carinthian *dispositif*, which involves a dispute that has lasted over a century between the German-nationalist-minded representatives of the German majority in Carinthia and the Slovenian-speaking minority

there. Špela Ledinek Lozej and Marjeta Pisk (2021) examine three Slovenian–Italian cross-border heritage initiatives, which provide an important source for the local and regional identification: *Zborzbirk* (a network of thirty-four collections), *Pot miru* (trails following the traces of the First World War), and *Brda/Collio* (branding a region). Over ten thousand Slovenians were imprisoned at the Italian concentration camp on the island of Rab (Jezernik, 2021) and slightly over a thousand died there. The internees organized a liberation movement, disarmed the Italian soldiers without causing any casualties, and established the first Jewish armed unit during the Second World War. In 1953, the Slovenian architect Edvard Ravnikar removed the crosses from the camp's cemetery, anonymizing the deceased through his new configuration of the graves. Petko Hristov (2021) analyzes contemporary rituals and pilgrimage practices related to local religious beliefs and cultural memory in the border area between Bulgaria, North Macedonia, and Serbia, and thematizes transborder religious tourism, which gives hope that the old ideological and national restrictions will finally be overcome. Katarína Koštialová and Ivan Murin (2021) explore the fujara, a wooden shepherd's flute, as an element of intangible cultural heritage, drawing attention to the changes in the contexts, bearers, and practice of playing that arose after its inclusion on the heritage list. Barbara Ivančič Kutin and Monika Kropej Telban (2021) present stories from ten locations in the Pohorje Mountains above Slovenska Bistrica, addressing the issue of converting literary folklore into literature.

DEDIŠČINE: PERSPEKTIVE IN PRAKSE

Traditiones so (v množini) znanstvena revija, ki se, zgoščeno, metaforično povedano, posveča najširše pojmovani ljudski kulturi ali natančneje, ljudskim kulturam. Posrečena množinska oblika naslova revije, ki sta jo pred petdesetimi leti zasnovala Niko Kuret in Milko Matičetov, v veliki meri pojasni pluralnost zamisli in praks: tradicije, dediščine, zapuščine so namreč pojmi, s katerimi označujemo vidne in nevidne, snovne in nesnovne odtise preteklega ali še danes žive nekdanje prakse in ideje. Razmejujemo jih po potrebi in jim dodeljujemo različne pomene in odtenke (Tunbridge, Aschworth, 1966; Hudales, Visočnik, 2005; Kockel, Nic Craith, 2007; Slavec Gradišnik, 2014), npr. s poudarkom na kulturni objektivaciji ali formaciji pri dediščini (prim. Kockel, 2007) in procesu pri tradiciji.

»Preteklost je tuja dežela,« je zapisal David Lowenthal (1985), in temu primerne so zadrega in težave strategij in praks približevanja neznanemu, izmakljivemu in v celoti nedojemljivemu terenu. Eden poskusov je na eni strani poimenovalna igra z različnimi pojmi, s katerimi bi radi dokončno pojmovno zaobjeli neki pojav, na drugi je velikokrat ambivalentna raba, ki bi jo mogoče najlažje ponazorili z dinamiko razmerja med normativnostjo in performativnostjo (prim. Smith, 2006), med omejevalnim zasnutkom »zvestobe« večinoma re-konstruirani podobi in med potencialom reprezentacije, ki ga slutimo in iščemo v preteklem izrazu. A že na tem mestu se pokaže pragmatična praksa ljudske kulture, ki se

na eni strani rada zapiše normativnosti postopkov, npr. v Registru nesnovne dediščine, ali izrazi željo, da bi jo uvrstili na Unescov reprezentativni seznam nesnovne dediščine, a ga na drugi strani takoj krši in v tem ne vidi posebnega problema. V teh praksah in zapisih lahko razbiramo spor, razliko med alografskimi, tj. na doživetje dogodka, izkušnjo dogajanja usmerjenimi ravnanji in dejanji, in avtografskim, idealno tipskim zapisom, ki je osnova, izhodišče vsakokratni realizaciji, podlaga za premislek in za pogajanja o tem, kaj je in kaj ni dediščina. Vsekakor pa je dediščina v nesnovnih oblikah »performativno« kulturno dejanje, ki je lahko preoblikovano v izrazito »politično dobrino« (Brown, 2005). Pomembno problemsko polje so tudi razlike v ustvarjanju in poustvarjanju dediščine, kjer se na eni strani odpira vprašanje narcisizma majhnih razlik (Freud, 1930), tvornega v oblikovanju lastne identitete, na drugi pa etike kulturne dediščine (Mathes, 2018).

Ko smo v intenzivnemu razpravljanju o vsebinah raziskovalnega programa Inštituta za slovensko narodopisje v letih 2022–2027 premišljali o dediščini kot eni glavnih, osrednjih točk ali raziskovalnih izhodišč, smo se najprej oprli na dosedanje raziskave, na nedavni slovensko-madžarski projekt o zavarovanih območjih ob slovensko-madžarski meji (Fikfak, Meszaros, 2019; Bajuk Senčar, 2019; Munda Hirnök, Slavec Gradišnik, 2019), na sloven-sko-italijanski projekt *ZBORZBIRK* (zborzbirk.zrc-sazu.si); projekt *ETNOFOLK* v okviru programa Central Europe (Bitušíkova, Koštialová, Luther, 2014) in projekt *AlpFoodway* (www.alpfoodway.eu). V vseh teh primerih so bile dediščine meje in prehajanje meje eno glavnih raziskovalnih vprašanj.

Tako smo zasnovali tudi temo konference *Borders and Boundaries of/in Heritage* (Meje in razmejitve dediščine in v dediščini) s sodelovanjem Komisije za kulturno dediščino in Komisijo o znanju prostorov in krajev pri Mednarodnem združenju za etnologijo in folkloristiko (SIEF), ki naj bi se zgodila aprila 2020. V vabilu na konferenco z razmeroma obsežnim programom smo želeli opozoriti na tri problemska polja. Prvo se je nanašalo na teritorialne razmejitve, naj gre za lokalne, regionalne ali državne, ki vplivajo na oblikovanje in prezentacijo; drugo na dediščine, še posebej ob mejah, ki so navadno osnova različnim identifikacijskim strategijam in praksam; tretje je tematiziralo številne dediščinske akterje in njihove socialne moči in agende, od vladnih ustanov, muzejev, inštitutov, do profesio-nalnih ekspertov in samih poustvarjalcev dediščine. Na konferenci naj bi torej premislili mejne prakse, povezane z različnimi oblikami dediščine, ki delujejo kot instrumenti moči, s pomočjo katerih pomembni akterji definirajo in prečkajo vrsto meja: med kulturno in naravno dediščino, med materialno in nematerialno dediščino, med izvirniki in rekon-strukcijami ter med vlogama strokovnjaka in laika.

Konferenco in diskusijo o teh vprašanjih je preprečila pandemija Covid-19. V novih okoliščinah in z novimi razpravami smo redefinirali prvotne, zelo kompleksno zastavljene teme in odprli prostor premisleku, kje smo pravzaprav z dediščino danes: na tej podlagi je nastal tudi prvi zvezek 50. letnika *Traditiones*. V drugem zvezku (Golež Kaučič, 2021) avtorji premišljajo o tem, kako misliti, govoriti in peti folkloro, v tretjem (Bowman, 2021) pa o vernakularni religiji in sodobnih duhovnostih. Tri tematike kažejo na izjemno široko

raziskovalno polje, v katerem smo vedno znova soočeni s kompleksnostjo, heterogenostjo, nekoherentnostjo, skratka s polifonijo glasov. Raziskovalci smo v tem obnebju neznanega in znanega prisluškovalci, ki iščemo in si zagotavljamo sledi dogodkov in ravnanj, skupinskih in individualnih dinamik iz preteklosti, to je vedno znova neznane dežele, ki jo po Hannah Arendt hočemo razumeti, da bi nam drugi, naj gre za človeka ali skupnost ali za njegove artefakte, postal blizu. A z vsakim dejanjem, slehernim raziskovalnim posegom, ko vstopamo v asimetrično igro približevanja, se nam ta približani znova izmakne. Ko s pisanim zbirom raziskovalnih metod širimo in ali premikamo raziskovalni okvir in očišče, se nam razpirajo nove ravni in nove tančine. In če smo bili včasih zapredeni z enim terminom za neki pojav, smo zdaj nezadovoljni; zaradi manka v pojmu in izmaknitve raziskovanega subjekta moramo v novi razplastenosti in dinamiki uporabiti tri, štiri; starega pa navadno označimo za esencializacijo, ki ji potem sledimo v novinarskem diskurzu in še pozneje v splošnem pogovoru. Gre tudi za stalno poimenovalno dilemo discipline, ki jo najbolje ilustrirajo intenzivne diskusije v nemškem govornem prostoru. Na splošno pa je nelagodje povezano tudi s spremenjenim objektom raziskovanja, kjer se, kot pravi Gisela Welz (1998), ne premikajo le raziskovalci, temveč se premikajo tudi objekti in (lahko rečemo) subjekti raziskave.

Za premislek o dediščini, tradiciji, je bila v našem inštitutu pomembna tudi prva faza nastajajočega Registra nesnovne dediščine. Na eni strani so nastajale zasnova in merila za seznam ter dokumentacija prvin, vrednih strokovne obdelave in videodokumentacije, na drugi pa srečanja z lokalnimi akcijskimi skupinami, mediji, novinarji in fotografi, ki so vsi so-tvorci podobe o dediščini. Eden pomembnih elementov pri raziskovanju dediščine in tradicije je torej agenda ustvarjalcev in poustvarjalcev dediščine, ki si prizadevajo za nadaljevanje določene prakse. Pokazalo se je, da je bilo pred pojavom registra merilo o lokalni pomembnosti v širšem regionalnem ali celo nacionalnem prostoru objava v časopisju ali na televiziji, zdaj pa je pomembna referenca vpis v Register nesnovne dediščine z željo po uvrstitvi na Unescov seznam. Vpis na seznam deluje kot afirmacija lokalnega performativa oz. lokalne identitete, pri tem pa so etnologi navadno moderatorji, torej tisti, ki uokvirijo predloge v strokovno podprto besedilo in opis ter ustvarijo podlago za sprejem v register.

Ob razmisleku o vsebini tematskega zvezka o dediščini pa so bili odločilni trije vidiki oz. pristopi k tematizaciji dediščine: to je pregled stanja raziskav (Testa), pogled naprej (Fournier; Bendix) in konkretne dediščinske prakse (Peball in Schönberger, Ledinek Lozej in Pisk, Jezernik, Hristov, Koštialová in Murin, Ivančič Kutin in Kropej Telban) v različnih evropskih okoljih, predvsem v srednji Evropi.

Alessandro Testa ugotavlja (2021), da je sedanjo antropologijo kulturne dediščine oblikovalo in definiralo prepletanje različnih identitetnih in metodoloških teženj ter empiričnih spoznanj. Med teoretiki omenja Jeremyja Boissevaina, Daniela Fabra, Pierra Noraja, Barbaro Kirshenblatt-Gimblett in Regino Bendix. Laurent Sébastien Fournier (2021) analizira razločke med pristopi v raziskavah dediščine, pojma »retrotopije« in »perspektivnosti«, in dileme, ki jih povzročajo različne konotacije dediščine in različni koncepti časovnosti. Regina Bendix

(2021) spregovori o novem francoskem zakonu o senzorični dediščini, ki odpira pot za novo dojemanje dediščine in za ponovno spoznavanje habitusa. Roland W. Peball in Klaus Schönberger (2021) analizirata tematizacijo jezikovnih in teritorialnih razmejitev z vidika dispozitiva Kärnten/Koroška, kjer gre za več kot stoletni spor med nemško nacionalistično usmerjenimi zastopniki nemške koroške večine in slovensko govorečimi. Špela Ledinek Lozej in Marjeta Pisk (2021) obravnavata tri slovensko-italijanske čezmejne dediščinske pobude, ki so pomemben vir lokalni in regionalni identifikaciji, to je *ZBORZBIRK* (mreža 34 zbirk), *Pot miru* (poti po sledeh 1. svetovne vojne) in *Brda / Collio* (znamčenje regije). V italijanskem koncentracijskem taborišču na Rabu (Jezernik, 2021) je od več kot 10.000 Slovencev umrlo nekaj nad 1000. Interniranci so organizirali Osvobodilno fronto, brez žrtev razorožili italijanske vojake in ustanovili prvo judovsko oboroženo vojaško enoto med 2. svetovno vojno. Leta 1953 je arhitekt Ravnikar odstranil križe, z novo konfiguracijo grobov pa je pokojne pravzaprav anonimiziral. Petko Hristov (2021) analizira sodobne obrede in prakse romarjev na tromeji (Bolgarija, Severna Makedonija, Srbija), povezane z lokalnimi verskimi prepričanji in kulturnim spominom ter tematizira čezmejni verski turizem, ki daje upanje, da bodo premagane stare ideološke in nacionalne omejitve. Katarína Koštialová in Ivan Murin (2021) razpravljata o *fujari,* leseni pastirski piščali, kot elementu nesnovne kulturne dediščine, in opozarjata na spremembe kontekstov, nosilcev in same prakse igranja, ki so se zgodile po vpisu na seznam dediščine. Barbara Ivančič Kutin in Monika Kropej Telban (2021) predstavljata pripovedi z desetih lokacij na območju Bistriškega Pohorja in načenjata vprašanja o postopku pretvarjanja slovstvene folklore v literaturo.

REFERENCES / REFERENCE

Bajuk Senčar, Tatiana. 2018. Cross-Border Cooperation and the Europeanization of the Slovenian-Hungarian Border Region. *Traditiones* 48 (1): 213–231. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2019480109.

Bendix, Regina. 2021. Life Itself: An Essay on the Sensory and the (Potential) End of Heritage Making. *Traditiones* 50 (1): 43–52. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500104.

Bowman, Marion. 2021. Vernacular Religion and Contemporary Spiritualities: Tribute to Leonard Norman Primiano (1957-2021). *Traditiones* 50 (3): 7–14. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500301.

Brown, Michael. 2005. Heritage Trouble: Recent Work on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Property, *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12: 40–61. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0940739105050010.

Fikfak, Jurij and/in Csaba Meszaros. 2018. Protected Areas on the Slovenian–Hungarian Border: A Place and Space of Nature and Culture. *Traditiones* 48 (1): 7–26. DOI: https://doi.org/Traditio2019480101.

Fournier, Laurent Sébastien. 2021. Current and Future Developments in Heritage Studies: From "Retrotopia" to "Prospective." *Traditiones* 50 (1): 29–42. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500103.

Freud, Sigmund. 1930. *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur.* Wien: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag.

Hristov, Petko. 2021. Sacred Places and Cultural Memory on a Triple Border: Revitalizing Veneration of the Hermit Saints at Osogovo Monastery. *Traditiones* 50 (1): 151–173. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500108.

Hudales, Jože and/in Nataša Visočnik, eds./ur. 2005. *Dediščina v očeh znanosti.* Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta, Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo.

Ivančič Kutin, Barbara and/in Monika Kropej Telban. 2021. Lokalne pripovedi z Bistriškega Pohorja med kulturno dediščino in literarizacijo. *Traditiones* 50 (1): 173–192. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500110.

Jezernik, Božidar. 2021. Remaking the Heritage of the Italian Concentration Camp on the Island of Rab. *Traditiones* 50 (1): 107–134. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500107.

Kockel, Ullrich. 2007. Refllexive Traditions and Heritage Production. In/V *Cultural Heritages and Reflexive Traditions,* eds./ur. Ullrich Kockel and/in Máiréad Nic Craith, 19–33. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kockel, Ullrich and/in Máiréad Nic Craith, eds./ur. 2007. *Cultural Heritages and Reflexive Traditions.* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Koštialová, Katarína and/in Ivan Murin. 2021. Changes in Intangible Cultural Heritage in Slovakia: The Case the *Fujara. Traditiones* 50 (1): 151–173. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500109.

Ledinek Lozej, Špela and/in Marjeta Pisk. 2021. Collections, Walks, and Cultural Landscapes: Slovenian–Italian Cross-Border Heritage Initiatives. *Traditiones* 50 (1): 79–106. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500106.

Lowenthal, David. 1985. *The Past is a Foreign Country.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthes, Erich Hatala. 2018. The Ethics of Cultural Heritage. In/V *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed./ur. Edward N. Zalta, https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/ethics-cultural-heritage/.

Munda Hirnök, Katalin and/in Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik. 2019. Meje in spomini nanje. *Traditiones* 48 (1): 27–75. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2019480102.

Peball, Roland W. Peball and/in Klaus Schönberger, Territorial and Linguistic Demarcations in the *Dispositif Kärnten/Koroška. Traditiones* 50 (1): 151–173. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500105.

Slavec Gradišnik, Ingrid. 2014. V objemih dediščin. In/V *Interpretacije dediščine*, eds./ur. Tatjana Dolžan Eržen, Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik and/in NadjaValentinčič Furlan, 8–24. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo.

Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage.* London: Routledge.

Testa, Alessandro. 2021. The Anthropology of Cultural Heritage in Europe: A Brief Genealogy from the Desk (1970–2020) and Empirical Observations from the Field (2010–2020). *Traditiones* 50 (1): 15–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2021500102.

Tunbridge, John E. and/in Gregory Aschworth. 1996. *Dissonant Heritage.* Chichester: Wiley.

Welz, Gisela. 1998. Moving Targets. *Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 94 (2): 177–194.

Assoc. Prof./Izr. prof. dr. Jurij Fikfak, ZRC SAZU, Institute of Slovenian Ethnology/Inštitut za slovensko narodopisje, Ljubljana, jurij.fikfak@zrc-sazu.si