
INTRODUCTION

In academia and in everyday life, recent decades have brought us into a situation where we are faced with immense blossom in studying tradition and heritage, as well as a variety of their images and applications being used for various purposes. Testifying to the former is an extremely extensive, almost unmanageable corpus of literature coming from various disciplines, which is to be found in records of heritage studies. The latter, however, is being summarized in a concise manner by the syntagms of heritage production, reproduction and industry. What is more, both terms – tradition and heritage – have in contemporary scholarship, particularly within humanities, as well as in general public been experiencing the fate that reminds more and more of the limits in understanding, defining and interpreting the concept of culture. When speaking of cultural phenomena and processes that are in any way related to the past, we could almost claim that cultural heritage has become synonymous to culture.

It would be preposterous to expect the articles in the current issue of *Traditiones* to provide any final answers to the numerous and multifaceted questions being posed by tradition and heritage. These questions are addressed to expert ethnologists, anthropologists and folklorists who explore both concepts in their everyday research, generally locating them both within theoretical and practical discourses. When these issues were recently thematised at the Institute of Slovenian Ethnology as part of the research project *Tradition and its re-producers* (2008–2011), we made a conscious decision based on our research practice to try to replace the authoritative academic discourse with the dialogic discourse. Speaking in general, the latter comprises the discourse of researchers, producers, reproducers and mediators. Currently, the strongest representatives of the final category are definitely (cultural) politics, media and economy.

In 2011, the ZRC SAZU Institute of Slovenian Ethnology celebrated the 60th anniversary of its research, which was also marked by organising the international conference *Tradition and Cultural Heritage: Challenges for Creativity and Performance*. Its aim was to establish a dialogue with domestic and foreign researchers to consider the topical dilemmas in research and rethink the directions and aims of the discipline in a wider European context, whereas at the same time the chosen topic was supposed to indicate at the wide horizon of knowledge production, which generally speaking is being delineated by the academic, nonprofessional and wider social discourses (instituted by politics, economy and media). All these also express new ways of thematising (post-)modernity, innovations and traditionality; with tradition and heritage, or rather traditions and heritages, any identifications with them and their applications no longer being a self-evident part of researchers' terminology. To rephrase Dan Ben-Amos, they are no longer only the terms to think *with* (which is supposed to be enabled by clear-cut definitions), but also to think *about*, because they define our horizon of comprehension and research both explicitly and implicitly. This is also the reason why tradition and heritage (natural and cultural) have to be exposed to constant criticism, either as concepts or strategic and operational terms.

At the conference taking place last year, the contributions of our colleagues and friends were arranged into three thematic sets: Discourses on Tradition and Cultural Heritage, Creating Cultural Heritage: Systems of Studying Living Cultural Heritage, and Contemporary Appropriations Of Cultural Heritage. Upon the very first presentation it became clear that the topics and issues presented overlap to a great extent, therefore they were arranged a bit differently for the publication.

The first section entitled “Tradition and Heritage: Different Aspects and Appropriations” comprises nine discussions that range from problematizing the concept of cultural heritage (M. Nic Craith, B. Tschofen), to the integration of “cultural” and “natural” aspects of heritage (K. Hrobat, T. Bajuk Senčar), diverse aspects exposed in ethnological studies of contemporary religious practices (G. Barna), uses of tradition in rural environment (S. Poljak Istenič), in cuisine (M. Godina Golija) and in ethnic minorities (M. Prelić), to the problems being tackled by the policies and practice of protecting cultural heritage in ethnological conservation (V. Hazler).

The next section “Tradition, Heritage and Politics” contains three articles that focus on the political aspects of heritage (mis)use, be it political appropriation *sensu strictu* (P. Anttonen), the reception of the subversive cultural phenomenon that had acquired an honoured position in the inventory of Unesco heritage (I. Prica), or quite the suspense story of the colonial-local appropriation of a Roman monument (B. Jezernik). This is far from claiming for other uses to be apolitical.

Coming next are the issues that have been occupying the minds of many academic experts and officials, particularly after the Unesco *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* was put into force in 2003, one of its effects being a complex network of stakeholders: first the main actors, i.e. the bearers, holders, producers of heritage, researchers who canonise from their own perspective certain cultural phenomena and practices as living heritage and eventually act as co-translators of the spirit of the Convention into the national legislation, the realisation of which, however, is entrusted to special institutes or expert groups. In countries where the Convention has been ratified, it is being implemented in various ways depending on numerous local peculiarities – general awareness of the importance of heritage, the very preservation of living heritage, research tradition, features of cultural politics, the level of development of safeguarding mechanisms, the willingness of experts to act in dialogue with heritage holders, the commitment of individuals and local communities, heritage marketing in the field of economy. These issues, i.e. the domestication of the Unesco convention and its effects in Slovenia, France, Austria and Serbia, are discussed in the section “Tradition and Cultural Heritage Classified” by N. Križnar, L. S. Fournier, E. Stiermayr, M. Piko-Rustia and M. Lukić-Krstanović.

This thematic issue is concluded with an essay by R. Jöhler, providing a consideration of the special moment in European ethnology, the disciplinary and research field, which in the 21st century is being faced with deep rearrangements and changes to the world and the life on it. And this it what has always been a challenge to researchers from the very beginnings of the discipline.

And to finish off: a warm thank you to all the authors for their kind cooperation and assistance in helping to create this issue.

* * *

UVOD

V zadnjih desetletjih smo tako v znanosti kakor v vsakdanjem življenju soočeni na eni strani z izjemnim razcvetom študija tradicij in dediščin in na drugi z njunimi mnogoterimi podobami in rabami za raznovrstne namene. O prvem nas prepričuje izjemno obsežen, skoraj nepregleden korpus literature različnih ved, ki polni registre dediščinskih študij, o drugem pa to, kar jedrnato povzemajo sintagme produkcija, reprodukcija in industrija dediščine. Poleg tega oba pojma – tradicija in dediščina – tako v sodobni znanosti, še posebej pa v humanistiki, kakor v širši javnosti doživljata usodo, ki je vse bolj podobna razumevanjskim, definitornim in interpretativnim čerem izraza kultura. Kulturna dediščina ji skorajda postaja sinonim, ko gre za kulturne fenomene in procese, ki imajo kakršno koli zvezo s preteklim.

Preambiciozno bi bilo, da bi od razprav v pričujočem zvezku Traditiones pričakovali kake dokončnejše odgovore na številna in mnogoplastna vprašanja, ki jih tradicija in dediščina naslavljata na strokovnjake – etnologe, antropologe, folkloriste – ki se z obema konceptoma ukvarjajo v svoji dnevni raziskovalni praksi in jih ob tem praviloma tudi postavljajo tako v teoretični kakor bolj praktični diskurz. Ko smo pred leti v Inštitutu za slovensko narodopisje to problematiko tematizirali v raziskovalnem projektu Tradicija in njeni (po)ustvarjalci (2008–2011), smo se zavestno, iz lastne raziskovalne prakse, skušali odmakniti od avtoritativnega akademskega k dialoškemu diskurzu, ki, najsplošneje rečeno, vključuje diskurz raziskovalcev, ustvarjalcev, poustvarjalcev ter posrednikov. Med slednjimi so danes gotovo najmočnejši (kulturna) politika, mediji in ekonomija. V letu 2011 je Inštitut za slovensko narodopisje ZRC SAZU praznoval 60. letnico svojih raziskovalnih prizadevanj in to priložnost označil tudi delovno, z mednarodno konferenco Tradicija in kulturna dediščina. Izzivi za ustvarjalnost in poustvarjalnost / Tradition and Cultural Heritage Challenges for Creativity and Performance. Z njo smo želeli v dialogu z domačimi in tujimi raziskovalci, torej v širšem evropskem obzorju, na eni strani premisliti aktualne raziskovalne dileme, na novo premisliti disciplinarne smeri in cilje, na drugi pa smo z izborom teme nakazali široko obzorje produkcije znanja, ki ga zarisujejo, grobo rečeno akademski, laični in širši družbeni diskurz (kakor rečeno, politični, ekonomski in medijski). Vsi izražajo tudi nove načine tematizacije (post)modernosti, inovativnosti in tradicijskosti, pri čemer tradicija in dediščina ali, ustrežneje, tradicije in dediščine, identifikacije z njimi in njihove rabe niso več samoumevna pojmovna oprava raziskovalcev. So, če parafraziramo Dana Ben-Amosa, ne le izrazi za premišljanje z (kar naj bi omogočile čim manj dvoumne definicije), temveč za premišljanje o, saj eksplicitno in implicitno določajo naše razumevanjsko in raziskovalno obzorje. Prav zaradi tega morata biti tradicija in dediščina (naravna in kulturna) bodisi kot koncepta ali pa kot strateška ali orientacijska pojma nenehno tudi predmet kritike.

Prispevki naših kolegov in prijateljev so se na lanski konferenci razvrstili v tri tematske skupine: Diskurzi o dediščini in tradiciji, Soustvarjanje kulturne dediščine – sistemi obravnave žive kulturne dediščine in Problemi sodobne recepcije in percepcije kulturne dediščine. Že ob predstavitvi se je pokazalo, da se predstavljene teme in problemi prekrivajo, zato smo jih za priložnost objave skupaj zložili nekoliko drugače.

V prvem razdelku »Tradicija in dediščina. Mnogoteri vidiki in prisvojitve / Tradition and Heritage: Different Aspects and Appropriations« je zbranih devet razprav, ki se gibljejo od problematizacije koncepta kulturna dediščin (M. Nic Craith, B. Tschöfen), prek povezanosti »kulturnih« in »naravnih« vidikov dediščine (K. Hrobat, T. Bajuk Senčar), pisanih vidikov, ki jih vzorčno razgrinjajo etnološke študije sodobnih verskih praks (G. Barna), rab tradicije v podeželskem okolju (S. Poljak Istenič), kulinariki (M. Godina Golija) in pri etničnih manjšinah (M. Prelić), do zadreg, s katerimi se spoprijemata politika in praksa varovanja kulturne dediščine v etnološkem konservatorstvu (V. Hazler).

V naslednjem razdelku »Tradicija, dediščina in politika / Tradition, Heritage and Politics« so objavljene tri razprave, pri katerih so v središču pozornosti politični vidiki rab dediščine, pa naj gre za politično rabo sensu strictu (P. Anttonen), recepcijo subverzivnega kulturnega fenomena, ki je dobil častitljiv položaj v zbiru Unescove dediščine (I. Prica), ali pa že skoraj napeto zgodbo o kolonialno-lokalnem prilaščanju spomenika (B. Jezernik). S tem seveda nikakor ni mišljeno, da so druge rabe apolitične.

Sledi problematika, ki zlasti po uveljavitvi Unescove Konvencije o varovanju nesnovne kulturne dediščine (2003) zaposluje številne strokovnjake iz akademskega sveta in uradnike in in eden njenih učinkov je tudi zapletena mreža soudeleženi: najprej tistih, ki so glavni akterji, torej nosilci, ustvarjalci dediščine, raziskovalcev, ki s svoje strani kanonizirajo določene kulturne fenomene in prakse kot živo dediščino ter so navezadnje soprevajalci duha Konvencije v nacionalnih zakonodajah, za uresničevanje teh pa so odgovorne posebne institucije oz. ekspertne skupine. Vsi ti jo v državah, ki so podpisale Konvencijo, uresničujejo na različne načine, odvisne od številnih lokalnih posebnosti – splošne zavesti o pomenu dediščine, same ohranjenosti žive dediščine, tradicije raziskovanja, značilnostih kulturne politike, razvitosti varstvenih mehanizmov, pripravljenosti strokovnjakov za dialog z nosilci dediščine, angažmaja posameznikov in lokalnih skupnosti, ekonomskega trženja dediščine. O teh vprašanih, o podomačevanju in učinkih Unescove konvencije v Sloveniji, Franciji, Avstriji in Srbiji, v razdelku »Razvrščeni tradicija in kulturna dediščina / Tradition and Cultural Heritage Classified« govorijo prispevki N. Križnarja, L. S. Fourniera, E. Stiermayr, M. Piko-Rustia in M. Lukić-Krstanović.

Na koncu tega tematskega zvezka pa nam esej R. Johlerja ponuja premislek o posebnem trenutku evropske etnologije, disciplinarnega in raziskovalnega polja, ki se v 21. stoletju spoprijema z globokimi preureditvami in spremembami sveta in življenja v njem. Te pa so bile od njenih začetkov za raziskovalce vedno izziv.

In prav na koncu: srčna hvala vsem avtoricam in avtorjem za prijazno sodelovanje in pomoč pri soustvarjanju tega zvezka.

Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik