

DEDIŠČINJENJE PREHRANE MED ALPAMI IN JADRANOM

ŠPELA LEDINEK LOZEJ IN KATARINA ŠRIMPF VENDRAMIN

Oljke in kislo zelje, ribe in suhe mesnine, vino in mleko – težko si je zamisliti, da bi se naštetu znašlo skupaj na isti mizi. Pa vendar smo jeseni 2019 etnologi, antropologi, jezikoslovci in geografi iz Avstrije, Italije, Hrvaške in Slovenije sedli k skupnemu jadransko-alpskemu omizju ter spregovorili o naravnogeografski pestrosti in zgodovinski prehodnosti območja med Severnim Jadrantom in Vzhodnimi Alpami, ki sta narekovali razločke in podobnosti v prehranskih sestavinah, načinih prehranjevanja, obredni vlogi in metaforičnim razsežnostih živil in jedi, pa tudi v sodobnejših praksah znamenja živil in dediščinjenja prehrane. Pričujoči razdelek prinaša štiri prispevke, predstavljene na mednarodni konferenci *Dediščina prehrane na stičišču Alp in Jadrana*, ki je bila 24. oktobra 2019 v Vidnu (Dapit idr. 2019),¹ v katerih so obravnavani različni vidike dediščine in dediščinjenja prehrane: od prekrivanja in razhajanja z drugimi kvalifikacijskimi mehanizmi, kot sta npr. certificiranje in znamenje, vpenjanja dediščinstva v trženje in turizem, do izhodišča za opredelitve razločkov med dediščinjenjem in drugimi oblikami prilaščanja preteklosti.

Izrazu »dediščina«, ki je v slovenščini izvirno pomenil »zapuščino«, so se v 20. stoletju širile pomenske razsežnosti in tako danes, po *Slovarju slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, pomeni »vse kar je prevzeto iz preteklosti«.² V drugi polovici 20. stoletja se je prenesena raba v različnih evropskih jezikih³ utrdila v tolikšni meri, da je Barbara Kirscheblatt-Gimblett (1998) dediščino opredelila kot »metakulturno produkcijo«. K vsenavočnosti dediščine so prispevale raznovrstne prakse »ponavzočanja« oziroma »sedanjenja preteklosti«

¹ Mednarodno konferenco *Dediščina prehrane na stičišču Alp in Jadrana* sta organizirala Univerza v Vidnu (Roberto Dapit) in Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti (Maja Godina Golija in Špela Ledinek Lozej) s finančno podporo Evropskega sklada za regionalni razvoj (ESSR) v okviru Interreg programa Območje Alp (projekt *AlpFoodway*), Javne agencije za raziskovalno dejavnost za raziskovalni program *Dediščina na obrobjih* (P5-0408) in Univerze v Vidnu (projekt CIBALP). Polovica prispevkov je bila objavljenih v reviji *Palaver* (Dapit 2020).

² *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, druga, dopolnjena in deloma prenovljena izdaja, www.fran.si, 19. 10. 2020.

³ O dediščini v pomenu 'zapuščina' (*inheritance*) in implikacijami za razumevanje posedovanja, lastništva in odgovornosti za dediščino v pomenu 'vsega iz preteklosti povzetega' (*heritage*) gl. Bendix 2009; o semantičnih razločkih med angleškim izrazom *heritage* ter ustreznici v romanskih idr. evropskih jezikih npr. Nic Craith 2012; splošno o »zadregah s poimenovanji in pomeni« Slavec Gradišnik 2014.

(*past presencing*) (Macdonald 2012, 2013),⁴ od različnih prazničnih oziroma spominskih dejanj, dediščinjenja in zgodovinske zavesti do različnih načinov (kolektivnega) spominjanja in drugih oblik »preteklosti v sedanjosti«. Dediščina oziroma, bolje, dediščinjenje, se od drugih praks ponavzočenja preteklosti razločuje po tem, da gre za namerno in strateško ter v veliki meri tudi avtorizirano in institucionalizirano odbiranje preteklosti (npr. razvrščanje, skrb, ohranjanje, komuniciranje) z nasledki za sedanjost in prihodnost. Dediščinjenje je namreč kljub načelni demokratizaciji ter poudarjanju »skupnosti«⁵ in sodelovanja pogosto še vedno v rokah strokovnjakov različnih disciplin ter administrativnih teles na različnih ravneh.⁶ Slednji postavljajo merila univerzalnosti in enkratnosti, ki so povečini uglašena s širšimi družbeno-ekonomskimi politikami in vpeta v aktualna razmerja moči (Smith 2006). Za razloček od dediščinjenja sta spominjanje in sedanjenje preteklosti, kakor v prispevku »Morje mnogih rib« ugotovljajo Nataša Rogelja Caf, Janko Spreizer in Martina Bofulin (2020), manj institucionalizirana in manj strateška procesa. Avtorice so na primeru štirih jadranskih rib različne načine odbiranja preteklosti (tj. spominjanje, dediščinjenje in sedanjenje preteklosti) postavile ob lokalne posebnosti oz. vsakdanje dispozicije sobivanja s preteklostjo (opredeljene kot neprebavljene zgodovine, zamegljevanje in ohranjanje distance) ter tako analizirale različne imaginarije, v katerih »plavajo« brancini, ciplji, sardele in tune.

Vstop (pre)hrane v dediščinsko areno je narekovalo več vzajemno prežemajočih se procesov: v prvi vrsti prepoznanje identifikacijske in povezovalne vloge hrane in jedi v skupnostih,⁷ pa tudi pozornost na nesnovne vidike dediščine⁸ ter postavljanje režimov kakovosti v kmetijstvu, živilski industriji in trženju (npr. geografske označbe, blagovne znamke idr. oblike certificiranja in znamčenja). Prizadevanja za formalno prepoznanje nesnovnih vidikov dediščine, ki jim intenzivneje sledimo od 80. let 20. stoletja, so se leta 2003 upredmetila v Unescovi *Konvenciji o varovanju nesnovne kulturne dediščine* (2003) (Smith 2006; Aikawa-Faure 2009; Smith in Akagawa 2009; Hafstein 2018). Slovenija je

⁴ Koncept *past presencing* sta Katalin Munda Hirnök in Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik (2019) prevedli »ponavzočenje preteklosti«, Nataša Rogelja Caf, Alenka Janko Spreizer in Martina Bofulin (2020) pa »sedanjenje preteklosti«.

⁵ Prim. npr. osrednjo vlogo, ki jo »skupnostim«, »skupinam« in »posameznikom« pripisuje Unescova *Konvencija o varovanju nesnovne kulturne dediščine* (2003) oziroma »dediščinskim skupnostim« *Okvirna konvencija Sveta Evrope o vrednosti kulturne dediščine za družbo* (2005) (t. i. Farska konvencija), pri čemer pa ostaja še vedno nedorečeno, kaj so skupnosti in kdo naj bi jih zastopal (Adell idr. 2015).

⁶ Kljub številnim nadnacionalnim ustanovam, ki sooblikujejo polje dediščinstva, npr. Unesco in Svet Evrope, ter številnim pobudam evropskega (makroregionalnega) in lokalnega dediščinjenja, so v postopkih avtorizacije dediščine (pri čemer mislimo vpise v različne registre, razglasitve), pogosto še vedno najpomembnejši administrativni akterji (nacionalne) države.

⁷ O vlogi prehrane pri izražanju pripadnosti, identifikacijah in tvorjenju skupnosti gl. npr. Wilk 1999; Demossier 2016; Di Giovine in Brulotte 2016; Ličen 2015.

⁸ Sinergija med vzpostavljanjem (nacionalne) skupnosti v času oblikovanja slovenske državnosti ter široko obravnavanimi vidiki dediščine je razberljiva iz poljudnoznanstvene monografije *Sto srečanj z dediščino na Slovenskem* (1992) spod peresa etnologa Janeza Bogataja, v kateri je bila v posebnem razdelku obravnavana tudi dediščina »kulinarične« oziroma »prehrambene kulture«.

Konvencija ratificirala leta 2008, prvi vpis prehrane v Register nesnovne kulturne dediščine Slovenije, in sicer tradicionalno izdelovanje kranjskih klobas, je bil predložen leta 2012, dve leti po vpisu prvih prehranskih enot, tj. hrvaškega lectarstva, mehiške kuhinje, francoskega gastronomskega obeda in mediteranske diete, na Unescov Reprezentativni seznam nesnovne kulturne dediščine človeštva.⁹

Prvi vpisani primer prehranske enote v nacionalni register nesnovne dediščine, tj. tradicionalno izdelovanje kranjskih klobas, je poveden tudi za ponazoritev prekrivanja in razhajanja med različnimi režimi vredno(s)t(i) – v našem primeru med režimom dediščine in režimom geografskih označb.¹⁰ Kranjska klobasa je bila leta 2008 zaščitena z geografsko označbo na nacionalni ravni. Ko je bilo štiri leta pozneje tradicionalno izdelovanje kranjskih klobas vpisano v Register nesnovne kulturne dediščine Slovenije, so bili kot nosilci zapisani imetniki certifikatov. Če je Evropska unija leta 2015, po razrešitvi ugovorov Avstrije, Hrvaške in Nemčije, kranjsko klobaso zaščitila z geografsko označbo na evropski ravni, pa je Unescovo ocenjevalno telo nominacijo enote »tradicionalno izdelovanje kranjskih klobas« zavrnilo, in sicer zaradi nezdržljivosti sistema certificiranja izdelovalcev z nosilstvom in medgeneracijskim prenosom veščin in znanja (Židov 2018: 53; Mlekuž 2020: 416). Medtem ko se režim dediščine nanaša predvsem na pretekle (tradicionalne) prakse in so dediščinski instrumenti (npr. registri, razglasitve, predstavitve tradicionalne izdelave) namenjeni v prvi vrsti povezovanju in razločevanju skupnosti na različnih ravneh, se geografske označbe nanašajo predvsem na območje pridelave ali predelave¹¹ in z njim povezan *terroir*, instrumenta, kot sta zaščita porekla in certificiranje proizvajalcev, pa sta mehanizma za doseganje prednosti na tržišču. V praksi pa se kaže tudi nasprotno: torej, da je tudi dediščinjenje kvalifikacijski mehanizem, ki omogoča razločevanje ponudnikov in dodano vrednost na tržišču, ter da geografske označbe ne le zastopajo, marveč tudi gradijo lokalnost. Na slednje, tj. tvorjenje lokalnosti z zaščitnimi označbami porekla in kolektivnimi blagovnimi znamkami, v članku »Znamčenje tolminskega sira« opozarja Špela Ledinek Lozej (2020). Historiat izdelovanja, poblagovljenja, poimenovanja in znamčenja lokalnega sira je razkril

⁹ Intangible Cultural Heritage, <https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists>, 19. 10. 2020. Mediteranska dieta je bila leta 2010 tudi prva večlateralna nominacija prehrane na Unescov reprezentativni seznam, pri kateri so sodelovale Italija, Španija, Maroko in Grčija, katerim so se leta 2013 pridružile še Hrvaška, Ciper in Portugalska (Di Giovine in Brulotte 2016: 13–14). Izhodiščna ideja nadnacionalnega makroregionalnega vpisa je bila navdihujoča za pripravo primerljivih projektov, mdr. tudi za pripravo temeljev za nominacijo alpske prehranske dediščine, ki smo se ji v državah alpskega loka – ob upoštevanju kritik po večji pritegnitvi skupnosti – posvetili partnerji projekta *AlpFoodway – interdisciplinarni, transnacionalni in participativni pristop k alpski prehranski dediščini* (Godina Golija in Ledinek Lozej 2018).

¹⁰ Geografske označbe so bile v Evropski uniji poenotene in regulirane v shemo kakovosti, ki razločuje med zaščiteno označbo porekla, zaščiteno geografsko označbo in zajamčeno tradicionalno posebnostjo; podrobneje prim. Evropska komisija, https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/food-safety-and-quality/certification/quality-labels/quality-schemes-explained_sl#pdo, 22. 10. 2020.

¹¹ V evropski in nacionalni shemi kakovosti je v tem pogledu izjema oznaka zajamčena tradicionalna posebnost (gl. <https://www.gov.si teme/sheme-kakovosti-in-zasciteni-kmetijski-pridelki-in-zivila/>, 20. 10. 2020).

kompleksnost procesov, mnogovrstnost perspektiv ter razlike v razmerjih moči akterjev. Prvo, torej vlogo dediščinjenja pri oblikovanju drugačne, »butične«, turistične ponudbe v zaledju sredozemskih turističnih krajev pa v prispevku »Med tradicijami in inovacijami« orišeta Maja Topole in Primož Pipan (2020). Na primerih iz Istre in s Krasa pokazeta, na kakšen način preživetvene strategije turističnih kmetij krmarijo med predstavljanjem in (po) ustvarjanjem lokalnih prehranskih tradicij in zadoščanjem zahtevam sodobnega porabnika po uvajanju novosti, ter tako skupaj z obiskovalci, mediji idr. promotorji takšnih doživetij sooblikujejo lokalno dediščin(stv)o.

Združevanje časovne, prostorske, družbene in senzorno-izkušenske perspektive hrane oriše v prispevku »Zgornjesavinjski želodec – pripoved o prostoru, prehrani in ljudeh« Maja Godina Golija (2020). Avtorica po Barbari Kirschenblatt-Gimblett (2014: XI) zapiše, da je hrana, v obravnavanem primeru torej zgornjesavinjski želodec, »užitni kronotop«, vpet v gospodarske in ritualne prakse Savinjanov. Dodamo lahko, da je z vpisom v Register nesnovne kulturne dediščine zgornjesavinjski želodec dobil poleg prepoznane ekonomske in ritualne še metakulturno vrednost (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1998). In če kot aktanta pri dediščinjenju upoštevamo tudi samo (pre)hrano, ugotovimo, da je ta v svoji snovnosti pravzaprav efemerna, a obenem vsenavzoča. Zato je primerna, kot dokazujejo predstavljeni primeri tolminskega sira, savinjskega želodca, kraškega šetraja in sardin, za poblagovljenje ter učinkovita pri retradicionalizaciji kraškega in istrskega zaledja, piranskega ribištva, tolminskega sirarstva in savinjskega mesarstva.

Preučevanje dediščine in dediščinjenja prehrane se umešča na stičišče humanističnega preučevanja človeka v skupnosti in času ter družboslovnih raziskav ekonomije pridelave, predelave in porabe ter (identitetnih) politik na različnih in med različnimi ravni, od lokalne do (nad)nacionalne in globalne. Če krilatico »o ohranjanju dediščine za prihodnje rodove« vzamemo resno, in dediščino, kot je zapisal Rodney Harrison, razumemo kot »vrsto dejavnosti, ki se ukvarjajo s sestavljanjem, graditvijo in oblikovanjem prihodnjih svetov« (Harrison idr. 2020: 4), potem tu zbrani prispevki orisujejo, kako različne skupine in ustanove z raznovrstnimi dediščinskimi praksami in orodji gradijo svoje zelene prihodnosti. Vprašanja, ki se postavljajo, so, kaj nam takšne prihodnosti med Alpami in Jadranom napovedujejo za »našo skupno prihodnost«,¹² ali je v času porajajočih se mnogovrstnih tveganj s hrano mogoče tudi oblikovanje alternativnih in vključujočih prihodnosti ter bodočih dediščin prehrane in kakšna naj bo naša vloga – ob predpostavki, da je vsako opazovanje oziroma preučevanje tudi že poseg/posredovanje.

¹² Dokument *Naša skupna prihodnost (Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future)* (<http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>, 28. 10. 2020), ki ga je Svetovna komisija za okolje in razvoj objavila leta 1987, velja za prvo opredelitev trajnostnega razvoja. O (zlo)rabah koncepta in možnostih za preobrazbo gl. Podjed in Peternel 2020.

FOOD HERITAGE-MAKING BETWEEN THE ALPS AND THE ADRIATIC

Olives and sauerkraut, fish and cured meats, wine, and milk—it is difficult to imagine these combinations at the same table. Nonetheless, in the fall of 2019, ethnologists, anthropologists, linguists, and geographers from Austria, Italy, Croatia, and Slovenia gathered around a joint Adriatic–Alpine roundtable to discuss the natural geographical diversity and historical permeability of the area between the northern Adriatic and the Eastern Alps, which dictated differences and similarities in ingredients, diets, and the ritual role and metaphorical dimensions of foodstuffs and dishes, as well as in the modern practices of food branding and heritage-making. This section features four papers presented at the international conference *Food Heritage at the Crossroads of the Alps and the Adriatic* held in Udine on October 24th, 2019 (Dapit et al. 2019).¹ They explore various aspects of food heritage and its heritage-making: from overlapping with and differing from other qualification mechanisms, such as certification and branding, and incorporating heritage into marketing and tourism, to the bases for defining the differences between heritagization and other forms of appropriating the past.

The Slovenian term *dediščina* ‘heritage’, which originally denoted ‘inheritance’, expanded its meaning in the twentieth century, so that today, according to the Standard Slovenian Dictionary, it means “anything adopted from the past.”² In the second half of the twentieth century, the extent to which the transferred meaning established itself in various European languages³ led Barbara Kirscheblatt-Gimblett (1998) to define heritage as a “metacultural production.” The omnipresence of heritage was contributed to by multiple practices of past presencing (Macdonald 2012, 2013), from various commemorative or remembrance acts, heritage, and historical awareness to various forms of (collective) memory and other types of “the past in the present.” Heritage—or better, heritage-making—differs from other past presencing practices by the fact that it involves an intentional, strategic, and largely authorized and institutionalized selection of the past (e.g., through classification, curating, safeguarding, and communication) with implications for the present and the future. Despite

¹ The international conference *Food Heritage at the Crossroads of the Alps and the Adriatic* was hosted by the University of Udine (Roberto Dapit) and the ZRC SAZU/Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (Maja Godina Golija and Špela Ledinek Lozej) with financial support from the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) as part of the Alpine Space Interreg program (*AlpFoodway* project), the Slovenian Research Agency within the research program *Heritage on the Margins* (P5-0408), and the University of Udine (CIBALP project). Half of the papers have been published in the journal *Palaver* (Dapit 2020).

² *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, second expanded and partially revised edition (www.fran.si, accessed October 19, 2020).

³ For heritage in the sense of “inheritance” and implications for understanding the possession, ownership, and responsibility for heritage in the sense of “anything adopted from the past,” see Bendix 2009; for semantic differences between the English term *heritage* and its equivalents in Romance and other European languages, see for instance Nic Craith 2012; for “dilemmas associated with names and meanings” in general, see Slavec Gradišnik 2014.

its democratization in principle and emphasis on “community”⁴ and participation in recent approaches to heritage, it nonetheless often remains in the hands of experts from different disciplines and administrative bodies at various levels.⁵ These set the universality and uniqueness criteria, which are largely harmonized with the broader socioeconomic policies and embedded in the current power relations (Smith 2006). In contrast to heritagization—as established by Rogelja et al. (2020) in their article “Plenty of Fish in the Sea”—remembering and past presencing are processes that are less institutionalized and strategic. The authors compare various methods of selecting the past (i.e., remembering, heritagization, and past presencing) against the local special features or everyday dispositions of coexisting with the past (defined as undigested histories, blurring, and distancing), through analyses of various imageries in which sea bass, mullets, sardines, and tuna “swim.”

Several interconnected processes dictated the entry of food into the heritage sphere: first and foremost, recognition of the identifying and connecting role of food and dishes in communities,⁶ as well as attention to intangible aspects of heritage⁷ and defining quality regimes in agriculture, the food industry, and marketing (e.g., geographical indications, brands, and other forms of certification and branding). Efforts to formally recognize intangible aspects of heritage, which have been observed more intensively since the 1980s, materialized in 2003 in the UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (Smith 2006; Aikawa-Faure 2009; Smith and Akagawa 2009; Hafstein 2018). Slovenia ratified this convention in 2008. The first food element in the Slovenian Register of Intangible Cultural Heritage (i.e., “Traditional production of the Carniolan sausages”) was listed in 2012, two years after the first food elements (i.e., Croatian gingerbread, Mexican cuisine, French gastronomic meal, and the Mediterranean diet) were included on the UNESCO Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity.⁸

⁴ Compare for example, the central role attributed to “communities,” “groups,” and “individuals” by the UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* (2003), or to “heritage communities” by the *Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society* (the Faro Convention, 2005), whereby it still remains unclear what communities are and who is supposed to represent them (Adell et al. 2015).

⁵ Despite a variety of supranational institutions that co-shape the field of heritagization, such as UNESCO and the Council of Europe, and many heritagization initiatives at the European (macroregional) and local levels, administrative actors of individual (nation) states often continue to play the most important role in heritage authorization procedures (i.e., entries in various registers and declarations).

⁶ For the role of food as an expression of belonging, identity, and community-building see for example Wilk 1999; Demossier 2016; Di Giovine and Brulotte 2016; Ličen 2015).

⁷ The synergy between establishing a (national) community during the formation of Slovenian statehood and the broadly explored aspects of heritage can be deciphered from the general-interest volume *Sto srečanj z dediščino na Slovenskem* (One Hundred Meetings with Heritage in Slovenia, 1992) by the Slovenian ethnologist Janez Bogataj, in which a special chapter is dedicated to “culinary” or “food heritage.”

⁸ Intangible Cultural Heritage (<https://ich.unesco.org/en/lists>, accessed October 19, 2020). In 2010, the Mediterranean diet was also the first multilateral food nomination for the UNESCO representative list,

The first entry of a food unit into the national register of intangible heritage (i.e., the traditional production of the Carniolan sausages) is also informative for illustrating the overlaps and differences between various value regimes—in this case, between the heritage and geographical indication regimes.⁹ In 2008, Carniolan sausage was protected through a national geographical indication. When the traditional production of the Carniolan sausage was registered as Intangible Cultural Heritage four years later, the certificate holders were entered as heritage bearers. In 2015, the European Union, after clearing objections from Austria, Croatia, and Germany, assigned Carniolan sausage a Protected geographical indication at the European level, but the UNESCO evaluation body rejected the nomination of “traditional production of the Carniolan sausages” due to incompatibility of the producer certification system with the bearers of the relevant skills and knowledge, and their intergenerational transfer (Židov 2018: 53; Mlekuž 2020: 416). The heritage regime primarily refers to past (traditional) practices, and heritage instruments (such as registers, lists, inscriptions) are primarily intended for indicating (non)belonging and community-building at various levels, whereas geographical indications primarily refer to the area of production or processing¹⁰ and the related *terroir*, using instruments such as the protection of origin or producer certification as mechanisms for achieving a competitive advantage on the market. However, the opposite is also evident in practice: that heritagization is also a qualification mechanism that makes it possible to differentiate providers and generate added value on the market, and that geographical indications not only represent local identity but also build it. The formation of locality through protected designations of origin and collective brands is highlighted by Špela Ledinek Lozej (2020) in her article “Branding Tolmin Cheese.” Her description of producing, commodifying, naming, and branding the local cheese reveals the complexity of processes, diversity of perspectives, and differences in the actors’ power relations. In turn, the role of heritagization in shaping a different or “boutique” range of tourism services and products in the countryside surrounding Mediterranean tourist resorts is outlined by Maja Topole and Primož Pipan (2020) in

in which Italy, Spain, Morocco, and Greece participated, and in 2013 they were also joined by Croatia, Cyprus, and Portugal (Di Giovine and Brulotte 2016: 13–14). The basic idea behind this supranational macroregional entry inspired comparable projects, including the preparation of foundations for the nomination of Alpine food heritage by Alpine countries, which the partners in the project *AlpFoodway: A Cross-Disciplinary, Transnational and Participative Approach to Alpine Food Cultural Heritage* focused on, taking into account criticism regarding the need for enhanced inclusion of communities (Godina Golija and Ledinek Lozej 2018).

⁹ In the EU, geographical indications are standardized and regulated under a quality scheme that distinguishes between protected designations of origin, protected geographical indications, and traditional specialities guaranteed; for details, see the European Commission (https://ec.europa.eu/info/food-farming-fisheries/food-safety-and-quality/certification/quality-labels/quality-schemes-explained_sl#pdo, accessed October 22, 2020).

¹⁰ An exception in this regard under the EU and national quality schemes is the “traditional speciality guaranteed” label (see <https://www.gov.si teme/sheme-kakovosti-in-zasciteni-kmetijski-pridelki-in-zivila/>, accessed October 20, 2020).

their article “Between Traditions and Innovations.” Using case studies from Istria and the Karst Plateau, they show how agritourism’s survival strategies navigate between presenting and (re)creating local food traditions and meeting modern users’ demands for introducing innovations, and in this way shape local heritage together with visitors, the media, and other promoters of these types of experiences.

In her article “The Upper Savinja Valley Stomach Sausage – A Narrative of Space, Diet, and People,” Maja Godina Golija (2020) describes the integration of the temporal, spatial, social, and sensory-experiential perspectives of food. In line with Kirschenblatt-Gimblett (2014: XI), Golija argues that food—or, specifically, Upper Savinja stomach sausage (Sln. *zgorrnjesavinjski želodec*)—is an “edible chronotope” imbedded in the economic and ritual practices of the Upper Savinja Valley. It can be added that, by being entered in the Slovenian Register of Intangible Cultural Heritage, Upper Savinja stomach sausage also acquired a meta-cultural value in addition to its already recognized economic and ritual values (Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1998). If food itself is taken into account as a heritage-making actant, it can be established that, in its materiality, food is actually both ephemeral and omnipresent. As proven by the examples of Tolmin cheese, Upper Savinja stomach sausage, Karst winter savory, and sardines, it is therefore suitable for commodification and is effective in re-traditionalizing the Karst and Istrian countryside, Piran fishing, Tolmin cheesemaking, and Upper Savinja Valley meat processing.

Studying food heritage and heritage-making can be placed at the intersection of humanist studies of people in communities and time, social-science studies of the economy of production, processing, and consumption, and (identity) policies at and between various levels, from the local to (supra)national and global. If the buzz phrase “preserving heritage for future generations” is taken seriously and heritage is conceived “as a series of activities that are intimately concerned with assembling, building, and designing future worlds” (Harrison et al. 2020: 4), the articles presented here outline how various groups and institutions use diverse heritage practices and tools to build their desired futures. Questions arising in this regard include what these futures between the Alps and the Adriatic predict for “our common future,”¹¹ whether during the time of emerging food-related risks it is also possible to design alternative and inclusive futures and future food heritages, and what our role in this should be, assuming that any observation or exploration is already an intervention itself.

¹¹ The document *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future* (<http://www.un-documents.net/our-common-future.pdf>, accessed October 28, 2020), published by the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987, is considered the first document to define the term *sustainable development*. For (mis)uses of this concept and possible transformations, see Podjed and Peternel 2020.

REFERENCE / REFERENCES

- Adell, Nicolas idr./et al. 2015. Introduction: Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage. V/In: Nicolas Adell idr./et al. (ur./eds.), *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 7–21.
- Aikawa-Faure, Noriko. 2009. From the Proclamation of Masterpieces to the Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage. V/In: Laurajane Smith in/and Natsuko Akagawa (ur./eds.), *Intangible Heritage*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 13–44.
- Bendix, Regina. 2009. Inheritances: Possession, Ownership and Responsibility. *Traditiones* 38 (2):181–199. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2009380212>.
- Bogataj, Janez. 1992. *Sto srečanj z dediščino*. Ljubljana: Prešernova družba.
- Dapit, Roberto. 2020. Presentazione. *Palaver* 9 (2): 11–16. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1285/i22804250v9i2p11>.
- Dapit, Roberto idr./et al. (ur./eds.). 2019. *Il patrimonio alimentare nell'area di contatto fra le Alpi e l'Adriatico: Conferenza internazionale = Dediščina prehrane na stičišču Alp in Jadrana: Mednarodna konferenca = Food Heritage at the Crossroads of the Alps and the Adriatic: International conference*. Udine: Univerza v Vidnu / University of Udine; Ljubljana: Založba ZRC / ZRC Publishing. Povzetki dostopni na / Abstracts available at: <https://www.zrc-sazu.si/sites/default/files/viden.pdf>.
- Di Giovine, Michael in/and Ronda L. Brulotte. 2016. Food and Foodways as Cultural Heritage. V/In: Ronda Brulotte in/and Michael Di Giovine (ur./eds.), *Edible Identities: Food as Cultural Heritage*. London in/and New York: Routledge, 1–27.
- Godina Golija, Maja. 2020. Zgornjesavinjski želodec – pripoved o prostoru, prehrani in ljudeh. *Traditiones* 49 (3): 35–52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2020490303>.
- Godina Golija, Maja in/and Špela Ledinek Lozej. 2018. Pomen in cilji projektov ohranjanja dediščine prehrane: Register nesnovne kulturne dediščine, Etnofolk in AlpFoodway. *Etnolog* 28: 85–103.
- Hafstein, Valdimar. 2018. *Making Intangible Heritage: El Condor Pasa and Other Stories from UNESCO*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Harrison, Rodney idr./et al. 2020. *Heritage Futures: Comparative Approaches to Natural and Cultural Heritage Practices*. London: UCL Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.9781787356009>.
- Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1998. *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley, CA, Los Angeles in/and London: University of California.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2014. Foreword. V/In: Lucy Long (ur./ed.), *Culinary Tourism*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 11–14.
- Ledinek Lozej, Špela. 2020. Znamčenje tolminskega sira. *Traditiones* 49 (3): 53–80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio20202490304>.
- Ličen, Daša. 2015. The Fine and the Tasteless: Istrian Culinary Experts and Taste. *Traditiones* 44 (3): 113–130. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2015440306>.
- Macdonald, Sharon. 2012. Presencing Europe's Pasts. V/In: Ulrich Kockel, Máiréad Nic Craith in/and Jonas Frykman (ur./eds.), *Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*. Oxford in/and New York: Wiley Blackwell, 233–252.
- Macdonald, Sharon. 2013. *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London: Routledge.

- Mlekuž, Jernej. 2020. The Renaissance of Sausage: The Role of Kranjska Sausage in the Contemporary Process of Reconstructing the Slovenian Nation. *Nations and Nationalism* 26 (2): 407–423. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12572>.
- Munda Hirnök, Katalin in/and Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik. 2019. Meje in spomini nanje. *Traditiones* 48 (1): 27–75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2019480102>.
- Nic Craith, Máiréad. 2012. Europe's (Un)Common HHeritage(s). *Traditiones* 41 (2): 11–28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2012410201>.
- Podjed, Dan in/and Lana Peternel. 2020. Transforming Sustainability in the Time of Pandemic. *Traditiones* 49 (1): 7–12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2020490100>.
- Rogelja Caf, Nataša, Alenka Janko Spreizer in/and Martina Bofulin. 2020. Morje mnogih rib: Odbiranja preteklosti v severovzhodnem Jadranu. *Traditiones* 49 (3): 17–34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2020490302>.
- Slavec Gradišnik, Ingrid. 2014. V objemih dediščin. V/In: Tatjana Dolžan Eržen, Ingrid Slavec Gradišnik in/and Nadja Valentinčič Furlan (ur./eds.), *Interpretacije dediščine*. Ljubljana: Slovensko etnološko društvo, 8–24.
- Smith, Laurajane. 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. London in/and New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Laurajane in/and Natsuko Akagawa. 2009. Introduction. V/In: Laurajane Smith in/and Natsuko Akagawa (ur./eds.), *Intangible Heritage*. Abingdon: Routledge, 1–9.
- Topole, Maja in/and Primož Pipan. 2020. Med tradicijami in inovacijami: Butični kulinarčni turizem v zaledju sredozemskih turističnih krajev. *Traditiones* 49 (3): 81–111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3986/Traditio2020490305>.
- Wilk, Richard. 1999. Real Belizean Food: Building Local Identity in the Transnational Caribbean. *American Anthropologist* 101 (2): 244–255.
- Židov, Nena. 2018. Težave Slovenije pri varovanju nesnovne kulturne dediščine v luči Unescove Konvencije (2003). *Etnolog* 28: 41–62.

Doc. dr. Špela Ledinek Lozej, znanstvena sodelavka / Assist. Prof., Research Fellow
ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko narodopisje / Institute of Slovenian Ethnology
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, spela.ledinek@zrc-sazu.si

Dr. Katarina Šrimf Vendramin, znanstvena sodelavka / Research Fellow
ZRC SAZU, Inštitut za slovensko narodopisje / Institute of Slovenian Ethnology
Novi trg 2, SI – 1000 Ljubljana, katarina.srimpf@zrc-sazu.si

Prispevek je nastal v okviru raziskovalnih programov *Dediščina na obrobjih* (P5-0408) in *Etnološke in folkloristične raziskave kulturnih prostorov in praks* (P6-0088), ki ju sofinancira Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije iz državnega proračuna. / The authors acknowledge the financial support from the Slovenian Research Agency (research core funding Nos. P5-0408 and P6-0088).