
Zmago Šmitek,
Božidar Jezernik

259

IZVLEČEK

Avtorja ugotavljata, da je poleg prevladujoče etnološke tradicije na Slovenskem obstajal tudi živ antropološki miselni tok, in v članku dajeta pregled nekaterih njegovih pglavitnih predstavnikov od 16. stoletja dalje. Zaradi nejasne meje med antropologijo in na Slovenskem prevladujočo etnologijo je v članku poseben poudarek na stališčih slovenskih avtorjev o razmerju med njima.

ABSTRACT

The authors advocate the thesis that - besides the prevailing ethnological tradition in Slovenia - there also exists a strong anthropological line of thought. Their article presents a review of some of the most eminent supporters of this line of thought.

Due to the undefined borderline between anthropology and the - in Slovenia - paramount ethnology, the authors emphasize the views of relevant Slovene authors on the relation between the two disciplines.

Antropologija je ena mlajših akademskih disciplin; to zlasti velja za stanje v Sloveniji, kjer je dobila svoje mesto na Filozofski fakulteti šele leta 1991, ko se je po spremembah v študijskem programu dotedanji Oddelek za etnologijo tudi formalno preimenoval v Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo. Pred tem je bila od konca šestdesetih let eden izmed študijskih predmetov na Fakulteti za naravoslovje in tehnologijo (profesor Božo Škerlj) in na Fakulteti za sociologijo, politične vede in novinarstvo v Ljubljani (profesor Stane Južnič). Seveda pa to ne pomeni, da antropološka vprašanja že dolgo prej niso bila predmet znanstvenega zanimanja.

Slovenski strokovnjaki zastopajo spekter različnih stališč o razmerju med etnologijo in antropologijo. Po nekaterih je za razliko od etnologije, ki velja za nacionalno vedo par excellence, antropologija študij drugih, predvsem neevropskih ljudstev in kultur. Po Vilku Novaku je (slovenska) etnologija veda o (slovenski) ljudski kulturi¹. To stališče je implicirano v vseh obstoječih pregledih zgodovine slovenske etnologije, v katerih zaman iščemo imena piscev, ki obravnavajo neslovenska ljudstva in kulture².

¹ Vilko Novak: Raziskovalci slovenskega življenja, Ljubljana 1986, str. 367-368.

² France Kotnik: Pregled slovenskega narodopisja; v: Rajko Ložar: Narodopisje Slovencev I (Ljubljana 1944), str. 21-52. Slavko Kremenšek: Družbeni temelji razvoja slovenske etnološke misli; v: Slavko Kremenšek & Angelos Baš eds.: Pogledi na etnologijo (Ljubljana 1978), str. 9-65.

Nadalje je med slovenskimi etnologi dokaj zakoreninjeno stališče, da je za razliko od etnologije, ki velja za zgodovinsko vedo³, antropologija študij tako imenovanih ljudstev in njihovih kultur iz nezgodovinskega zornega kota, torej neznanstveno početje⁴. Prepričanje, da je zgodovina edina znanost, torej ni umrlo z Marxom.

Nekateri avtorji vidijo antropologijo zgolj kot smer v etnologiji, pri kateri naj bi za razliko od kulturološke smeri, pri kateri je predmet proučevanje kultura, bil spoznavni cilj človek kot nosilec kulture, kot da bi bilo v znanstvenem proučevanju mogoče obravnavati človeka ločeno od kulture⁵.

Poleg omenjenih stališč je mogoče zaslediti tudi mišljenje, da med antropologijo in etnologijo ni nobene razlike, da gre dejansko le za dvoje imen za isto vedo⁶.

260

Avtorja zastopata mnenje, da med antropološko in etnološko tradicijo na Slovenskem ni mogoče preprosto potegniti enačaja in da gre za dvoje tradicij, ki sta se sicer pogosto prepletali in prekrivali, vendar sta se pogosto razvijali tudi ena mimo druge. Pri tem je bila glavna značilnost antropološke tradicije, da je skušala svoj predmet (človeka) obravnavati holistično in je predvsem problematizirala vprašanje, kaj je človek, kakšno je njegovo poreklo in proces kulturnega dozorevanja, kaj je tisto, po čemer se razlikuje od živali, medtem ko etnologija na Slovenskem tega vprašanja ni eksplicirala kot problem in se še vedno obnaša, kot da je to nekaj samoumevnega⁷.

Razlog za uveljavitev izraza in vsebine etnologije na Slovenskem lahko iščemo v občutku nacionalne ogroženosti v 19. stoletju in v prvi polovici 20. stoletja, ko je bil v evropskem merilu relevanten politični dejavnik narod kot kolektivna entiteta, in ne človek kot posameznik. Zato je mogoče še danes zaslediti mnenje, da antropološke tradicije na Slovenskem sploh ni bilo in da zanjo še danes ni prostora.

Antropologija je po slovarski definiciji študij človeka glede na razširjenost, izvor, razvrstitev in razmerja med rasami, fizične lastnosti, razmerja v družbi in naravnem okolju in kulture⁸. Beseda antropologija je bila prvič uporabljena leta 1501⁹, vendar so o antropoloških vprašanjih razmišljali že prej: "Antropološka vprašanja so večna, ker se osredotočajo na univerzalno zanimanje za človekovo življenje in vedenje."¹⁰

Avtorja vidita temeljno razliko med antropologijo in etnologijo v tem, da je predmet proučevanja antropologije človek kot posameznik, predmet etnologije

³ Slavko Kremenšek: Retrogradni vidik - zanemarjen etnološki metodični pristop?; referat na simpoziju Predsodki in stereotipi v spoznavnem procesu humanističnih ved, Bokrač, oktober 1991, tipkopis, str. 1.

⁴ Slavko Kremenšek: Obča etnologija (Ljubljana 1978), str. 106.

⁵ Slavko Kremenšek: Etnologija (Opis raziskovalnega polja), razmnožen tipkopis za posvet etnologov v Ljubljani, aprila 1992, str. 2.

⁶ Blaž Telban: Kaj je pri nas antropologija?; Delo, 2. 10. 1991, str. 13.

⁷ Božidar Jezernik: O novem vzgojnoizobraževalnem programu; Glasnik SED 31/1-2 (Ljubljana 1991), str. 13-16.

⁸ Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield 1987), s.v. anthropology.

⁹ Magnus Hundt: Anthropologium de hominis dignitate, natura et proprietatibus (Liptzik 1501). Za podatek se zahvaljujeva dr. H. F. Vermeulenu.

¹⁰ Annemarie de Waal Malefijt: Images of Man (New York 1974), Introduction.

pa človek kot kolektivna entiteta. Že sam izraz etnologija implicira prepričanje, da je etnična pripadnost bistvena. Ime etnologija je po doslej znanih virih nastalo v drugi polovici osemnajstega stoletja, in sicer v vzhodnem delu Srednje Evrope. Takrat se je pojavila disciplina etnologija, da bi pripomogla k razreševanju problemov, ki jih je sodobnikom, zlasti seveda avstrijskemu dvoru, zastavljala etnična pestrost prebivalstva v Podonavju, na območju, ki je bilo osvobojeno in vzeto turškemu cesarstvu. V tem smislu je uporabil naziv etnologija Adam Franc Kollár leta 1783¹¹. Pojmoval jo je kot intelektualno dejavnost, v kateri se s proučevanjem jezika, običajev in institucij posameznih ljudstev odkrivajo njihovi izviri in prvotna bivališča. Etnologija naj bi se torej ukvarjala z etnično zgodovino posameznih skupnosti¹².

Temeljna razlika med antropologijo in etnologijo je v tem, da je predmet antropologije človek kot posameznik, predmet etnologije pa je človek kot kolektivna (etnična) entiteta. Že izraz etnologija implicira, da je bistvena etnična pripadnost. Vendar je za človeka kot posameznika pogosto pomembnejša njegova spolna, rasna, verska, starostna, poklicna, razredna itd. pripadnost. Etnična pripadnost je dobila poseben poudarek in pomen v evropski zgodovini 19. stoletja v obdobju romantike, ki je odkrilo državotvorno moč nacionalne zavesti. Zunaj Evrope je ni in tudi ne v Evropi, kjer je temeljni subjekt človek kot državljani ne glede na svojo nacionalno, versko, rasno, spolno pripadnost ...

Začetki antropologije so povezani s srečanji s pripadniki drugih, drugačnih, tujih kultur. Za njenega začetnika štejejo že Herodota. Različnost kultur je za antropologijo bistvenega pomena, saj še danes velja pravilo, da je antropolog "profesionalni tujec". Šele primerjava omogoča problematizacijo, tj. vprašanje zakaj prav tako, in ne drugače. Brez primerjave antropologija kot znanost sploh ni mogoča. Paradoks antropološke pozicije, ki je tudi stalni generator njene krize oziroma je zaradi njega vsaka še tako popolna etnologija nezadostna, je v tem, da je mogoče primerjavo opraviti samo z določene (kulturne) pozicije. Antropolog je lahko nezadovoljen in kritičen do svoje kulture, lahko je nekritičen in zadovoljen, lahko indiferenten, toda ne more biti brez enega od teh stališč. Zato je njegov pogled nujno obremenjen s kulturnim okoljem, v katerem je bil socializiran.

Po Hudgenovi je bilo obdobje 16. in 17. stoletja čas, ko se je zanimanje za kulturne značilnosti ljudi v oddaljenih deželah in obdobjih neizmerno izostrilo. "Ta literatura šestnajstega in sedemnajstega stoletja, ki je dala podlago sodobni antropologiji, primerjalnemu veroslovju, antropogeografiji in številnim drugim sorodnim strokam, pomeni to, kar moramo zdaj šteti za znanstveno metodo v proučevanju kulture in družbe: prvič, v dokončnem prehodu od motiva zabave k organiziranemu raziskovanju; drugič, v bolj ali manj jasnem zastavljanju pomembnih vprašanj ali problemov; in tretjič, v izboru urejanja idej, ki naj bi se uporabile pri obravnavanju vprašanja izvora človeka, različnosti kultur, pomena podobnosti, zaporedja visokih civilizacij in poteka procesa kulturnih sprememb."¹³

¹¹ Adam Franciscus Kollár: *Historiae iurisque publici regni Hungariae amoenitates* (Wien 1783).

¹² Viera Urbancová: *The Beginnings of Ethnography in Slovakia; Ethnologia Slavica 12/13* (Bratislava 1980/81), str. 93-110. Vitomir Belaj: *Plaidoyer za etnologiju kao historijsku znanost o etničkim skupinama; Studia ethnologica 1* (Zagreb 1989), str. 9-17.

¹³ Margaret T. Hodgen: *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia 1971), str. 8.

Prva dela antropološke narave so zato izpod peres popotnikov, ki so potovali v daljne tuje kraje. Zato je - glede na slovensko tradicijo - najbolj primerno začeti ta pregled z Benediktom Kuripečičem (Benedicten Curipeschitz) in njegovim potopisom, ki je bil objavljen leta 1531 brez navedbe imena avtorja in kraja natisa pod naslovom Wegrayss Kö(niglicher) May(estät) potschafft gen Constantinopel zu dem Türckischen Kayser Soleyman. Anno XXX - MDXXXI. Potopis po slovenskem delu ozemlja je skromen: šli smo iz Ljubljane, skozi Grosuplje, Novo mesto in Metliko. Pisec torej domneva, da so bralcu pot in kraji ob njej znani. Podrobneje opisuje bolj oddaljene kraje, zlasti Bosno, ki je bila tedaj evropskemu bralcu neznana. Potopis je najstarejši opis potovanja po Balkanskem polotoku iz 16. stoletja, ki je ohranjen in je pomemben vir za antropologijo, etnografijo, sociologijo, topografijo, orografijo, hidrografijo posameznih balkanskih dežel, saj je iz tiste dobe le malo ali sploh ni ohranjenih podatkov o razmerah in stanju v deželah, skozi katere je potoval (Bosna, Srbija, Bolgarija in Grčija).¹⁴

Med plemiči s slovenskega ozemlja, ki so kot avstrijski ali beneški diplomatski odposlanci potovali v Moskvo ali v Carigrad, si je največji znanstveni ugled pridobil Sigmund Herberstein. Na dveh odpravah v Rusijo (v letih 1516-18 in 1526-27) je skrbno zapisoval vse, kar je moglo zanimati tedanjega evropskega izobraženca, ki o Rusiji ni vedel skoraj ničesar. Leta 1549 je na Dunaju izdal široko zastavljen opis Rusije z naslovom *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*, ki je postal bestseller tedanjega časa in je izšel v številnih prevodih in izdajah. Herberstein je skušal biti v svojih opisih vseskozi racionalen in nepristranski, hkrati pa tudi karseda izčrpen in barvit. Čeprav se je zanašal predvsem na lastno izkušnjo in razumsko presojo, je z izpraševanjem ruskih znancev zbiral tudi podatke o območjih vzhodno od Moskve, ki jih sam ni obiskal. Tako je zapisal zanimive informacije o Sibiriji in Tatarih. Med njegovimi informatorji so bili vojaki, ki so se udeležili obleganja Kazana leta 1524, o območju Jugre (severnega Urala in dela Sibirije) pa se je očitno poučil iz ruskih rokopisnih potopnih vodnikov¹⁵.

Med tistimi, ki so hvalili Herbersteinovo delo, je bil tudi angleški odposlanec v Rusiji George Turberville v svojih *Letters in Verse* (1568). The celebrated *Theatrum orbis terrarum* by Ortelius, first issued in 1570, is sending the reader for more information to Sigmund Herberstein¹⁶.

Potopisci Kuripečičevega in Herbersteinovega tipa so antropološke pojave opisovali nesistematično, a so imeli velik vpliv na oblikovanje evropskih predstav o (tujih) krajih in ljudeh. Zanimanje za razlike med domačo in tujo kulturo se je ujelo s prizadevanji Evropejcev, da bi se definirali kot civilizirani; zato so potrebovali antitezo. Povsod so odkrivali divjake, dobre ali slabe.

V 16. stoletju je prišlo na Slovenskem do ločevanja teologije in filozofije, ko se je zastavilo vprašanje o razmerju med vero in razumom. Pri tem je bil pomemben vpliv socinianizma, radikalnega reformacijskega gibanja, ki ga je poznal tudi najpomembnejši predstavnik slovenske reformacije Primož Trubar¹⁷. Filozofija je tedaj že po logiki omenjene delitve obsegala človeško

¹⁴ Zmago Šmitek: Klic daljnih svetov (Ljubljana 1986), str. 38-39.

¹⁵ O.c., str. 33-35.

¹⁶ M. T. Hodgen, o.c., str. 153.

¹⁷ Jože Pogačnik: Starejše slovensko slovstvo (Ljubljana 1990), str. 221-223.

problematiko in je vsebovala zametke antropologije in etnologije. Trubar se je živo zanimal za kulturne značilnosti Slovencev in drugih Južnih Slovanov (zlasti za njihov jezik in običaje), poročal pa je tudi o značilnostih islama.

Pri drugem reformatorju, Adamu Bohoriču (v predgovoru k slovenski slovnici, 1584), je sicer še zaznaven skepticizem, da bi bilo s filozofijo mogoče priti do pomembnih spoznanj, "ker je človeški razum po grehu staršev oslepel".¹⁸ Vendar je poldrugo stoletje kasneje že delovalo nekaj pomembnih teoretikov, ki so filozofijo razumeli, podobno kot Saint-Simon, kot splošno znanost, ki povezuje dognanja posebnih znanosti¹⁹. Tako je filozof Jakob Štelin dokazoval, da je moralno nazadovanje človeštva potekalo vzporedno z njegovim oddaljevanjem od narave²⁰. Franc Ksaver Gmeiner je v zadoščanju vedno novim človekovim potrebam videl gonilno silo kulturnega napredka²¹. O enakosti različnih ljudstev glede na kvaliteto razuma in njihovi neenakosti glede na njegovo kvantiteto je pisal Martin Kuralt (1783)²².

Potreba po sistematičnosti in metodičnosti se kaže od 17. stoletja dalje v različnih navodilih za zbiranje relevantnih podatkov. Med njimi so imela posebno ugledno mesto takšne navodila angleškega naravoslovca Roberta Boyla: "Upošteva veliki napredek, dosežen pred kratkim na področju naravoslovja (edinega zanesljivega temelja naravne filozofije), s potovanji gentlemanov, pomorščakov in drugih; in hudimi neprijetnostmi, s katerimi se soočajo mnogi bistroumni možje na svojih potovanjih, ker ne vedo vnaprej, o čem naj se poučijo v deželah, kamor pridejo, ali s kakšno metodo naj poizvedujejo o stvareh, ki so tam znamenite, sem menil, da ne bo nesprejemljivo zanje, če bodo imeli splošne napotke, ki se nanašajo na vse, in še posebej na določeno deželo s čim manj omejitvami v njihovih nazorih."²³ Boylovi napotki so bili izdani v knjižni obliki posthumno; v rokopisnih verzijah so bili v uporabi že prej.

Isti ali podoben vprašalnik, namenjen popotnikom, je uporabljal tudi slovenski polihistor Janez Vajkard Valvasor. Valvasor je v svojem enciklopedično zasnovanem delu *Die Ehre des Herzogthums Crain* (Ljubljana 1689) poleg opisov naravnih posebnosti, topografskih in zgodovinskih informacij prvi sistematično prikazal prebivalce tedanje Kranjske in Istre. V delu je opisal običaje, prehrano, nošo, bivališča in gospodarstvo ter označil njihovo etnično pripadnost. Največ antropoloških data je zbranih v šesti knjigi, ki jo je naslovil *Kranjsko-slovanski jezik*, nravi in šege na Kranjskem. V poglavju o Kraševcih je precej pozornosti posvetil tudi zunanosti moških in žensk "in s tem segel daleč naprej v sodobno gledanje (nekake antropološke ali - pretirano - 'rasne' estetike)."²⁴ Valvasorjevo metodo lahko imenujemo antropološko zaradi

18 O.c., str. 220.

19 *Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon*: Izbor iz djela (Zagreb 1979), str. 54.

20 *Jakob Štelin*: Specimen de ortu et progressu morum (Venezia 1740).

21 *Literargeschichte des Ursprungs und Fortanges der Philosophie*, 1-2 (Graz 1788-89).

22 Podrobneje o Štelinu, Gmeinerju in Kuraltu: *Ivan Urbančič*: Poglavitne ideje slovenskih filozofov med sholastiko in neosholastiko; Filozofska knjižnica 10 (Ljubljana 1971), in *Zmago Šmitek*: Slovenski pogledi iz 18. in 19. stoletja na kulturni razvoj človeštva; *Traditiones* 15 (Ljubljana 1986), str. 5-18.

23 *Robert Boyle*: General Heads for the Natural History of a Country, Great or Small; Drawn out for the Use of Travellers and Navigators (London 1692), str. 1-2.

24 *Vilko Novak*: Raziskovalci slovenskega življenja (Ljubljana 1986), str. 14.

njegove naravoslovne usmerjenosti in holističnega obravnavanja, po katerem je kmečki živelj nerazdružni del narave.

Valvasor je zbiral podatke na kraju samem, predvsem zaradi znanstvene skepse, ker je vse hotel videti in preveriti na svoje oči. Njegova terenska metoda je obstajala tudi v opazovanju, spraševanju in skiciranju.

Glede na to, da Boyle v svojih napotkih izrecno omenja Cerknško jezero (The Schernitzer Lake in Carniola),²⁵ po opisu katerega je Valvasor zaslovel na Angleškem, lahko sklepamo, da je obstajala med Valvasorjem in Boylom neka povezava in da je Boylova navodila poznal tudi Valvasor, ko je zbiral gradivo za svojo Slavo vojvodine Kranjske. Delo je zasnovano izredno obsežno in je eden izmed vrhuncev evropskega naravoslovja. Med evropskimi učenjaki 17. in 18. stoletja je odmeval predvsem njegov opis Cerknškega jezera. "O slednjem je baron Valvasor izdal dokaj obširen, eksakten in kuriozen opis v svojem obširnem delu o Slavi vojvodine Kranjske, ki jo je redko najti v naših knjižnicah."²⁶

Anton Tomaž Linhart je objavil obsežno historiografsko delo o Slovencih²⁷, v katerem je v začetnih poglavjih skušal orisati način življenja Slovencev v najstarejši dobi in evolucijski tok njihove kulture. Linhart je verjel, da tudi v tem procesu, tako kot v naravi nasploh, obstajajo trdna pravila. Kulturni razvoj je pojmoval kot ločevanje od narave in stopnjevano poduhovljanje. Ločil je štiri osnovne stopnje kulturnega napredka. Že sredi 19. stoletja je bila o njegovem delu zapisana pravična ocena, da je "prvi Kranjec...", ki je z lučjo etimologije in jezikovne primerjave raziskoval najstarejša bivališča, najstarejše sorodstvo in socialni razvoj", in tudi "prvi, ki je kulturnozgodovinskemu delu poganskih Slovanov posvečal tisto pozornost, iz katere izvirajo pravna stanja in politične razmere".²⁸ Linhart je nedvomno poznal nekatera dela sodobnih francoskih teoretikov o razvoju civilizacije. Svoj spis *Über die Nutzbarkeit der natürlichen Philosophie* (v almanahu *Blumen aus Krain für das Jahr 1781*, Ljubljana 1780) je zasnoval po zgledu *An Essay on Man* angleškega razsvetljenca Alexandra Popa.

Na prehodu iz 18. v 19. stoletje je pomembno delo Bretonca Baltazarja Hacqueta, ki je povezoval svoje široko naravoslovno zanimanje in dejavnost z raziskavami načina življenja, gospodarstva ter ljudskih fizičnih lastnosti in jezikovnih posebnosti²⁹.

Gian Rinaldo Carli, doma iz Kopra, je v osemdesetih letih 18. stoletja v obsežni študiji *Lettere Americane*, objavljeni v *Magazzino Letterario* (Firenze 1780), istega leta v knjižni izdaji v dveh zvezkih in v razširjeni izdaji (Cremona 1781-83), pisal o azteški in inkovski kulturi. Navduševal se je nad njihovo

²⁵ O.c., str. 6.

²⁶ *Alberto Fortis: Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero* (Venezia 1771), str. 81. O pomenu A. Fortisa glej Božidar Jezernik: O metodi in predsodkih v delu Alberta Fortisa (Prispevek za zgodovino antropologije); *Traditiones* 17 (Ljubljana 1988), str. 71-85.

²⁷ *Anton Tomaz Linhart: Versuch einer Geschichte von Krain und den übrigen Ländern der südlichen Slaven Oesterreichs* (I, Ljubljana 1789; II, 1791).

²⁸ *V. Klun: Über die Geschichtsforschung und Geschichtsschreibung in Krain; Mittheilungen des historischen Vereines für Krain* (1857), str. 51.

²⁹ *Abbildung und Beschreibung der südwest- und östlichen Wenden, Illyren und Slawen...* (Leipzig 1801-1808).

državno, družbeno in ekonomsko ureditvijo in zavračal ameriško "degeneracijsko teorijo", katere zagovorniki so bili Buffon, Pauw in drugi.

Franc Samuel Karpe je obravnaval področje "empirične psihologije ali antropologije"³⁰. Bil je zagovornik teorije linearne kulturne evolucije. Zanimale so ga predvsem duševne razlike med ljudstvi in vzroki zanje (podnebje, prehrana, rasne značilnosti, družbena ureditev ipd.).

V procesu oblikovanja ameriške kulturne antropologije ima pomembno mesto misijonar slovenskega rodu Friderik Baraga, ki je v letih 1831-1868 deloval med Indijanci iz plemen Otava in Ojibva (Čipeva). Napisal je monografijo o njihovi kulturi, predvsem na podlagi svojega dotedanjega petletnega bivanja pri Otavah na vzhodni obali Michiganskega jezera, čeprav se je tu in tam skliceval tudi na podatke drugih avtorjev. Baragova knjiga z naslovom *Geschichte, Character, Sitten und Gebräuche der nordamerikanischen Indier* je izšla v Ljubljani leta 1837 sočasno s slovensko priredbo Popis navad in sadershanja indijanov Polnozohne Amerike in s francosko izdajo *Abregé de l'Histoire des indiens de l'Amérique septentrionale*, natisnjeno v Parizu. Baragovo znanstveno delo imenujemo antropološko predvsem zato, ker je črpal vzore in pobude iz ameriške antropološke literature. Leta 1847 je za enega od začetnikov ameriške antropologije Henryja R. Schoolcrafta izpolnil obsežen vprašalnik ("Inquiries") o Indijancih Ojibva. Bil je tudi zbiralec predmetov indijanske kulture in je leta 1837 podaril Kranjskemu deželnemu muzeju zbirko z območja Gornjega in Michiganskega jezera³¹.

Zbiralec in pisec knjige o Indijancih Otava in Ojibva je bil tudi Baragov sodelavec Franc Pirc³².

Ivan Benigar, ki je po preselitvi v Argentino (leta 1908) živel med patagonskimi Indijanci in Aravkanci in si med njimi ustvaril tudi družino, je proučeval koncept prostora, časa in vzročnosti pri Aravkancih in o tem napisal tri razprave. Natisnjene so bile v *Boletino de la Junta de Historia y Numismática* v dvajsetih letih tega stoletja. V bistvu gre za študije o načinu mišljenja in zaznavanja zunanjega sveta, temelječe na lingvistični analizi. V zvezi s tem je nasprotoval tudi nekaterim zaključkom Lévy-Brühlove teorije o predlogičnem mišljenju.

Najobsežnejše Benigarjevo delo je knjiga *El problema del hombre americano* (Bahia Blanca 1928), v kateri je razpravljal o etnogenezi ameriških Indijancev, zlasti o difuzionistični pacifiško-ameriški teoriji, katere predstavnik sta bila Paul Rivet in José Imbelloni. Nasprotoval je zaključkom Imbellonija, bil pa je kritičen tudi do evolucionizma, ki mu je sicer načeloma priznaval veljavo³³.

Po značaju in obsegu svojega dela je bil Benigar pravi antropolog. Zanimala so ga področja lingvistike, zgodovine, arheologije, etnologije, sociologije in filozofije, ki jih je povezoval in imenoval "znanost o bistvu človeka"³⁴.

³⁰ Franz Samuel Karpe: *Darstellung der Philosophie ohne Beynamen* (Wien 1802), vol. 1.

³¹ Zmago Šmitek: Baraga, Schoolcraft in začetki ameriške antropologije; *Naši razgledi* (Ljubljana, 12. 10. 1984), str. 569-570.

³² Franc Pirc: *Die Indianer in Nord-Amerika, ihre Lebensweise, Sitten, Gebräuche* (St. Louis 1855).

³³ Zmago Šmitek: Amerikanistična raziskovanja Ivana Benigarja - zasnove in teoretična izhodišča; *Traditiones* 16 (Ljubljana 1987), str. 73-82.

³⁴ Irene Mislej: Janez Benigar: *Izbrano gradivo* (Ljubljana 1988).

Teolog Lambert Ehrlich se je v letih 1920-21 specializiral na socialni antropologiji v Oxfordu pri profesorju R. R. Marettu. Rezultat takšnega njegovega študija je bilo delo *Origin of Australian Beliefs* (St. Gabriel - Mödling 1922), ki je, po avtorjevih lastnih besedah, "poskus podvreči preizkušnji dejstva iz Avstralije z različnimi uveljavljenimi teorijami, ki se nanašajo na izvor vere in prizadevanje pojasniti - kolikor je to mogoče - avstralska verovanja". Ehrlich je sicer najtesneje sodeloval z Wilhelmom Schmidtom in drugimi predstavniki dunajske kulturnozgodovinske šole, kot profesor na ljubljanski Teološki fakulteti pa je tudi sicer delal na področju primerjalnega veroslovja. Etnologijo je pojmoval dokaj široko, v obsegu, ki se praktično izenačuje s kulturno ali socialno antropologijo.

266

Niko Županič je bil prvi slovenski akademski antropolog. Leta 1921 je bil po njegovih prizadevanjih ustanovljen Etnografski inštitut pri Narodnem muzeju. Županič je postal njegov upravnik, po ustanovitvi Etnografskega muzeja 1923 pa njegov ravnatelj in urednik časopisa *Etnolog*. Muzej je imel po Županičevih besedah "nalogo, da pospešuje narodopisje, antropologijo in zgodovino ljudske umetnosti, da zbira tozadevni material, ga proučuje in hrani v svojih razstavnih zbirkah"³⁵. Županičev opus je izredno širok po tematiki, saj je bilo njegovo raziskovalno področje lingvistika, fizična antropologija in etnična zgodovina Balkanskega polotoka³⁶. Čeprav je ustvarjal v času, ko se je evgenika najbolj vsiljevala v evropskih okvirih, je na mednarodnem kongresu za znanstveno proučevanje ljudskih problemov v Berlinu 29. avgusta 1935 nastopil z referatom O rasni estetiki ljudstva pri Jugoslovanih in zavrnil rasistično zakonodajo, ki je dovoljevala sklenitev zakonske zveze med Arijci in Nearijci le na podlagi poprejšnje sterilizacije, kot "nesodobno, preveč poniževalno in preveč naperjeno proti elementarnemu pravu človeka in vsakega naroda"³⁷. Županič je leta 1940 postal prvi profesor na Filozofski fakulteti v Ljubljani na tedanjem seminarju za etnografijo, ki je kasneje prerasel v samostojen oddelek.

³⁵ Niko Županič: Za Etnografski muzej v Ljubljani; *Etnolog* 7 (Ljubljana 1934), str. 235.

³⁶ Cf. npr. študijo *Etnološki značaj kosovskih Čerkeza*; *Etnolog* 5-6 (Ljubljana 1933), str. 218-253.

³⁷ *Etnolog* 8-9 (Ljubljana 1936), str. 62-81.

THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL TRADITION IN SLOVENIA

Zmago Šmitek,
Božidar Jezernik

267

Anthropology is one of the younger academic disciplines; this applies in particular to the state of affairs in Slovenia, where anthropology had acquired its place at the Faculty of Philosophy only in 1991 when following the changes in the curricula the hitherto Department of Ethnology was formally renamed Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology. Prior to that, since the end of the sixties, anthropology had been one of the subjects studied at the Faculty of Sociology, Political Sciences and Journalism in Ljubljana (Prof. Stane Južnič). This, however, is in no way indicative that anthropological issues should not have been a long time before that a topic arousing scientific interest.

Both authors find that in spite of the prevailing ethnological tradition in Slovenia there has existed also an active anthropological current of thought and in the paper they offer a survey of some of its main exponents from the 16th century onwards. Because of the unclear delimitation between anthropology and in the Slovene area predominating ethnology the article is specifically focused on the viewpoints of Slovene authors as regards the relation between the two fields.

Modern experts plead for a spectrum of different views concerning the relation between ethnology and anthropology. In contradistinction to ethnology which ranks as a national discipline par excellence according to some, anthropology is the study of other, mostly non-European peoples and cultures. According to Novak (the Slovene) ethnology is the discipline about (the Slovene) folk culture. (Vilko Novak, *Researchers into Slovene Life (in Slovene)*, Ljubljana 1986, p. 367-368). This is a viewpoint present by implication in all the existing surveys of the history of Slovene ethnology, in which one would in vain seek for names of writers dealing with non-Slovene peoples and cultures (NS I; Views (in Slovene)).

Among the Slovene ethnologists there is further on a fairly widespread opinion that in contradistinction to ethnology, regarded as a historical discipline, anthropology is the study of the peoples and their cultures from a non-historical angle, thus an unscientific undertaking: the belief that history is the only science, had not died with Marx.

Some authors see in anthropology merely one trend within ethnology, where in contradistinction to the culturological trend, the object of which should

be the study of culture, the scientific pursuit is aimed at man as the vehicle of culture, as if in a scientific study man could be treated in isolation from culture.

In addition to the views indicated above it is also possible to come across an opinion making no distinction between anthropology and ethnology, as if in fact these were but two terms for the same discipline (B. Telban, Delo).

The authors subscribe to the opinion that the anthropological and the ethnological traditions in Slovenia cannot simply be equated and that we are dealing with two traditions often interlinking or overlaying one another but nevertheless often one developing past the other. The principal characteristic of the anthropological tradition in this context was that it sought to treat man or rather its subject holistically and thus concerned itself with the problem: what is man, what is his origin and his process of cultural maturation, what is it that makes him different from animals, whereas ethnology in Slovenia did not explicate this question as a problem and still continues to behave as if it was something understood for granted.

The reason why the term and the content of ethnology had become established in Slovenia may be sought in the Slovene feeling of being nationally imperilled in the 19th and in the first half of the 20th century when within the European networks it was nation as a collective entity that was the relevant political factor and not man as an individual. Therefore there persist traces of the opinion that in Slovenia there has been no anthropological tradition and that today as well there is no room for it.

By the lexicographer's definition anthropology is the study of human beings in relation to distribution, origin, classification, and relationship of races, physical character and social relations and culture. The word anthropology is according to Webster's dictionary first recorded in English in 1593, while anthropological issues had been considered already earlier. "Anthropological questions are timeless because they center around the universal concern to understand human existence and human behavior." (Annemarie de Waal Malefijt, *Images of Man*, New York 1974, Introduction)

The authors see the fundamental difference between anthropology and ethnology in that the subject of anthropology is man as an individual while the subject of ethnology is man as a collective entity. The very term ethnology itself implies that ethnic belonging is essential. According to the sources currently known the word ethnology came up in the second half of the 18th century, specifically in the eastern part of Central Europe. At that time ethnology is said to have developed as a discipline which was to help cope with the problems arising for contemporaries and of course in particular for the Austrian Court through the ethnical variegation of the population in the Danube basin, in the area that had been liberated and taken from under the Turkish Empire. In this sense the term ethnology was used by Adam Franz Kollar in 1783 who regarded ethnology to be an intellectual activity in which the study of language, customs, and institutions of individual peoples is used to discover their origins and original settlements. Ethnology should thus be concerned with ethnic history of individual communities. (cf. Belaj).

While the very term, as said above, ethnology implies ethnic belonging as an essential quality, for man as an individual it is very often more important

where he belongs according to sex, race, religion, age, vocation, class, etc. In the European history of the 19th century ethnic belonging had obtained a special stress and significance in the period of romanticism, which was intent upon discovering the state-forming power of national awareness. Outside Europe it does not exist and also not in Europe where the fundamental subject is man as a citizen, irrespective of where he belongs by nation, religion, race, or sex ...

The beginnings of anthropology are related to meetings with members of other, different, foreign cultures. Its first beginner should be already Herodotus. The difference among cultures is for anthropology of essential importance, with the rule still today holding that the anthropologist is a "foreigner by profession". It is only the comparison that makes it possible to pose problems, i.e. the question of why in this particular way and not otherwise. Without the comparison anthropology is as a science not feasible. The paradox of the anthropological position, which is at the same time a permanent generator of its crisis and because of which any no matter how perfect ethnology remains insufficient, lies in the fact that a comparison can be made only from a fixed (cultural) position. The anthropologist may be dissatisfied with and critical about his culture, he can be non-critical and satisfied, or he can be indifferent, but he cannot but share one of these viewpoints. Therefore his view is necessarily burdened with the cultural environment in which he had become socialized. According to Hodgen, the period of the 16th and 17th centuries was a time when the interest in cultural characteristics of mankind in faraway lands and times was immeasurably sharpened. "This sixteenth - and seventeenth - century literature, which laid the foundation of modern anthropology, comparative religions, anthropogeography, and many other related studies, exhibit the emergence of what must now be regarded as scientific method in the study of culture and society: first, in a definite transition from the motive of entertainment to that of inquiry; second, in the more or less clear statement of questions or problems of importance; and third, in the choice of organizing ideas to be employed in dealing with the problem of origin of man, of diversity of cultures, the significance of similarities, the sequence of high civilizations, and of course the process of cultural change." (Margaret T. Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. p.8. Philadelphia 1971).

The first works of anthropological character are therefore from the pens of travellers who went on journeys to faraway foreign places. It is thus - with regard to the Slovene tradition - most appropriate to begin this survey with Benedikt Kuripečič (Benedicten Curipeschitz) and his travel book published in 1531 without stating the name of the author or the place of printing under the title *Wegrayss Kü(niglicher) May(estät) potschafft gen Constantinopel zu dem Türckischen Kayser Soleyman. Anno XXX - MDXXXI*. The description of the journey through the Slovene part of the territory is really short. ("We went from Ljubljana, through Grosuplje, Novo mesto and Metlika.") The reader is assumed to be familiar with the way and the places along it. He describes in greater detail the more distant places, in particular Bosnia, which was at that time unknown to the European reader. The travel book, coming from the 16th century, is the oldest description of a journey through the Balkan Peninsula and represents an important source for anthropology, ethnography, sociology, topography, hydrography of individual Balkan countries as from that period there are few

or no data preserved about the circumstances and situation in countries through which he was travelling (Bosnia, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece).

Among the noblemen from the Slovene territory who in the capacity of Austrian or Venetian diplomatic emissaries travelled either to Moscow or to Constantinople stands out for his scientific reputation Sigmund Herberstein. On his two missions to Russia (in the years 1516-27) he carefully recorded anything that might be of interest to the European intellectual of his time and who knew about Russia practically nothing. In 1549 he published in Vienna a broad-scaled description of Russia entitled *Rerum Moscoviticarum Comentarii*, which became a bestseller of the time and was to come out in numerous translations and issues. Throughout his descriptions Herberstein tried to be rational and impartial and at the same time as exhaustive and vivid as possible. Although he relied predominantly on his own experience and rational evaluation, from his Russian acquaintances he collected through inquiries also information about regions east of Moscow, which he himself had not visited. He thus recorded interesting information about Siberia and the Tatars. Among his informants were soldiers who had been besieging Kazan in 1524, while on the region of Jugra (northern Ural Mts. and a part of Siberia) he had obviously informed himself from Russian travel guides in manuscript form.

Among those who voiced praise of Herberstein's work was also the English emissary to Moscow George Turberville, in his *Letters in Verse* (1568). The celebrated *Theatrum orbis terrarum* by Ortelius, first issued in 1571, is sending the reader for more information to Sigmund Heberstein. (Margaret T. Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Philadelphia, 1971, p. 153).

Authors of travelling accounts of Kuripečič's and Herberstein's type were offering only unsystematic descriptions of anthropological phenomena, but they exercised a great influence on the formation of European ideas about (foreign) places and people. The interest in the differences between domestic and foreign culture became integrated in the endeavours of Europeans to define themselves as civilized; and for that they needed an anti-thesis. Everywhere they were discovering savages, noble ones and bad ones.

In the 16th century there started in Slovenia a differentiation between theology and philosophy, when the question of the relation between belief and reason came up. Significant here was the influence of Socinianism, a radical reformation movement with which also the most important representative of the Slovene reformation, Primož Trubar, was familiar. (J. Pogačnik, *Older Slovene Literature* (in Slovene), Ljubljana 1990, pp. 221-223). According to the logic of the differentiation mentioned, the philosophy of the period dealt with human issues and included the germs of anthropology and ethnology. Trubar was taking an active interest in the cultural characteristics of Slovenes and other Southern Slavs (especially in their language and customs) and also reported on the characteristics of Islam.

With the second reformer, Adam Bohorič, (in the Preface to the Slovene grammar, 1584) there is already marked scepticism that through philosophy it could be possible to discover significant knowledge, "because the human mind has been made blind through the sin of the parents". (Pogačnik, p. 220). Yet a century and a half later there were active a few theorists who understood philosophy, similarly as Saint-Simon, as a general science integrating the

findings of other sciences (Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon, *A Selection from Works* (in Croatian), ed. by Mile Joka, Zagreb 1979, p. 54). The philosopher Jakob Štelin was thus in his work *Specimen de ortu et progressu morum* (Venezia 1740) arguing that the moral retrogression of mankind went parallel with mankind's estrangement from the nature. Franz Xaver Gmeiner (*Literargeschichte des Ursprungs und Fortganges der Philosophie*, 1-2, Graz 1788-89) saw in the satisfying of man's constantly increasing needs the motive power of human progress. Martin Kuralt (1783) wrote about the equality of various peoples as regards the quality of reason and about their inequality as regards its quantity.

Since the 17th century onwards the need for a systematic and methodological approach is to be seen in various instructions for the collecting of pertinent information. A particularly notable place among these instructions is occupied by this kind of instructions set out by the English natural scientist Robert Boyle: "Considering the Great Improvements, that have of late been made of Natural History (the only sure Foundation of Natural Phylosophy), by the travels of Gentlemen, Seamen, and others; And the great Disadvantage many Ingenious Men are at in their Travels, by reason they know not before hand, what things are they to inform themselves of in every Country they come to, or by what Method they may make Enquiries about things to be known there, I thought it would not be unacceptable to such, to have Direction in General, relating to all, and also in Particular, relating to Particular Countries, in as little Bounds as possible, presented in their View." (Robert Boyle, *General Heads for the Natural History of a Country, Great or Small; Drawn out for the Use of Travellers and Navigators*, London 1692, pp. 1-2). Boyle's instructions appeared in a book form posthumously, but in manuscript versions they were in use already earlier on.

The same or a similar questionnaire, intended for travellers, was used also by the Slovene polyhistor Janez Vajkard Valvasor. In his encyclopaedically conceived work *The Glory of the Dukedom of Carniola* (in German) (Ljubljana 1689) he offered in addition to natural specifics, topographical and historical information also the first systematic presentation of the population of the Carniola and Istria of his time. In his work he described the customs, food, clothes, dwellings and the economy and he outlined also the people's ethnic belonging. Most of the anthropological information is collected in the sixth book bearing the title *Carniolan-Slavic language, Manners and Customs in Carniola*. In the chapter on the Karst inhabitants he paid considerable attention to the external appearance of men and women "and in doing that he reached a long way towards modern views (of a kind of anthropological or - with some exaggeration - 'racial' aesthetics)." (Novak, 14). Valvasor's approach may be called anthropological because of his orientation towards natural science and of his holistic pursuit in the area where the peasant element remains an undissociable part of the nature.

Valvasor was collecting his information on the spot, primarily so because of his scientific scepticism; we wanted to see and very everything with his own eyes. His field method included also observation, inquiring, and sketching.

In view of the fact that in his instructions Boyle explicitly mentions Cerkniško jezero (Schernitzer Lake) in Carniola (p. 6), through a description of which Valvasor became famous in England, we may posit a certain connection between Valvasor and Boyle and we may conclude that Valvasor as well was

familiar with Boyle's instructions when collecting the material for *The Glory of the Dukedom of Carniola*. The work is conceived on an exceptionally broad scale and represents one of the peaks of the European natural history. Among the learned men of Europe of the 17th and 18th centuries a particular response was called forth by Valvasor's description of the Schernitzer Lake. "About the latter Baron Valvasor brought forth a fairly extensive, exact, and curious description in his comprehensive work on the Glory of the dukedom of Carniola, which one rarely finds in our libraries." ("Di quest' ultimo il Baron Valvasori a dato al pubblico una ben lunga, esatta, e curiosa descrizione nella sua vasta Opera sopra Le glorie del Ducato della Carniola, che di raro si trova nelle nostre Biblioteche.") (Alberto Fortis, *Saggio d'osservazioni sopra l'isola di Cherso ed Osero, Venezia 1771*, p. 81).

272

Anton Tomaž Linhart published a historiographic work entitled *Versuch einer Geschichte von Krain und den übrigen Ländern der südlichen Slaven Oesterreichs*, (Vol I, Ljubljana 1789; Vol II, 1791), where in the initial chapters he tried to outline the way of living of Slovenes in the earliest period and the evolutionary course of their culture. Linhart believed that also in this process, like in nature generally, there operate firm rules. He understood the cultural development as a process of separation from nature and as a process of spiritual and intellectual growth. He distinguished four basic stages of cultural progress. Already in the middle of the 19th century a just evaluation of his work was written, according to which he was "the first Carniolian ... who with the light of etymology and linguistic comparison studied the earliest dwellings, the earliest kinship and the social development" as well as "the first who paid to the cultural-historical work of the pagan Slavs attention as to that activity from which proceed legal status and political circumstances". (V. Klun, *Ueber die Geschichtsforschung und Geschichtsschreibung in Krain*, *Mitth. d. hist. Ver. f. Krain 1857*, p. 51). Linhart doubtlessly knew some of the works of the French theorists of his time as regards the development of civilization. His text *Ueber die Nutzbarkeit der natürlichen Philosophie* (contained in the almanach *Blumen aus Krain für das Jahr 1781, Ljubljana 1780*) is modelled upon A. Pope's *An Essay on Man*.

At the turn of the 18th to the 19th century there appeared a significant work by the Breton Baltazar Hacquet relating his diverse interests in natural sciences and his activity to the study of the ways of life, economy, and people's physical characteristics and linguistic specific. (*Abbildung und Beschreibung südwest- und östlichen Wenden, Illyren und Slawen ...*, Leipzig 1801-1808).

Gian Rinaldo Carli, a native of Koper, produced in the eighties of the 18th century a sizeable study *Lettere Americane*, published in *Magazzino Letterario* (Firenze 1780), and in the same year in book form in two volumes (Firenze 1780), and in an expanded edition (Cremona 1781-1783); here he wrote about the Aztecan and Inca cultures. He was full of enthusiasm for their civic, social, and economic organization, and rejected the American "degeneration theory" advocated by Buffon, Pauw, and others.

In the first book of his work *Darstellung der Philosophie ohne Beynamen* (Wien 1802) Franz Samuel Karpe discussed the field of "empirical psychology or anthropology". Karpe was a proponent of the theory of linear cultural evolution. He was primarily interested in mental differences among peoples and in the reasons for them (climate, food, racial features, social order, and the like).

In the process of the formation of American cultural anthropology a significant place is occupied by Friderik Baraga, a missionary of Slovene origin, who was in the years 1831-1868 working among Indians from the tribes Ottawa and Ojibwa (Chippewa). He produced a monograph on their culture, basing it mostly on his five-year stay among them on the eastern coast of Lake Michigan, although occasionally he draw also upon other authors for information. Baraga's book entitled *Geschichte, Character, Sitten und Gebräuche der nordamerikanischen Indier* was published in 1837 in Ljubljana simultaneously with the Slovene version *A Description of Habits and Behaviour of the Indians in midnight America* (in Slovene) and a French edition *Abregé de l'Histoire des indiens de l'Amérique septentrionale*, printed in Paris. Baraga's scientific work is called anthropological above all because he had drawn upon American anthropological literature for his models and initiatives. For the research need of one of the beginners of American anthropology, Henry R. Schoolcraft, he provided answer to his comprehensive questionnaire ('Inquiries') about Ojibwa Indians. Baraga was also a collector of specimens of Indian culture and in 1837 he donated to the Carniolan Provincial Museum a collection from the area around the Upper and Michigan Lakes.

Baraga's colleague Franc Pirc was another collector and author of a book on Indians of the Ottawa and Ojibwa tribes (*Die Indianer in Nord-Amerika, ihre Lebensweise, Sitten, Gebräuche*; St. Louis 1855).

Ivan Benigar, who in 1908 settled down for good in Argentina, lived among Patagonian Indians and Araucanians and established his family there. He studied the concept of space, time, and causality as understood by the Araucanians and wrote three studies about that. They were printed in *Boletino de la Junta de Historia y Numismatica* in the twenties of the present century. Essentially they centre around the study of the way of thinking and perceiving the external world, and are based on linguistic analysis. In this connection Benigar opposed to some of the conclusions of Levy-Bruhl's theory about pre-logical thinking.

Benigar's largest work is the book *El problema del hombre americano* (Bahia Blanca 1921), in which he investigated the ethnogenesis of American Indians, in particular the diffusionist pacifico-American theory, represented typically by Paul Rivet and José Imbelloni. Benigar was opposed to conclusion reached by Imbelloni and he was likewise critical of evolutionism, to which he admitted validity in principle.

By the nature and the scope of his work Benigar was a true anthropologist. His scientific interests spanned over fields like linguistics, history, archeology, ethnology, sociology, and philosophy; he attempted to integrate them and called them a "science of the essence of man".

The theologian Lambert Ehrlich was in the years 1920-21 specialising in social anthropology with Prof. R. R. Marett in Oxford. A fruit of this study was the work *Origin of Australian Beliefs* (St. Gabriel - Mödling 1922), which is in the author's own words "an attempt to apply the test of Australian facts to the various theories put forward concerning the origin of religion, and endeavours to give an explanation - as far as this may be possible - of Australian beliefs." While Ehrlich was most closely cooperating with Wilhelm Schmidt and other representatives of the Vienese cultural-historical school, as Professor at the Faculty of Theology in Ljubljana he was active in the field of comparative

religions. He took a very broad view of ethnology, taking it as almost equal with cultural or social anthropology.

Niko Županič was the first Slovene anthropologist of academic rank. Thanks to his endeavour the Ethnographic Institute was founded in 1921 at the National Museum. Županič became its first principal custodian and after the founding of the Ethnographic Museum its director, as well as the editor of the journal *Etnolog*. According to Županič, the museum had "the task to promote ethnography, anthropology, the history of folk art, to collect relevant material, and to keep it preserved in its exhibition collections". (Niko Županič, *For the Ethnographic Museum in Ljubljana!* (in Slovene); *Etnolog*, No 7, Ljubljana 1934, p. 235).

Županič's work is in its thematic field extremely varied, with investigation reaching from linguistics, physical anthropology to the ethnic history of the Balkan peninsula. (Cf. for instance the study *Ethnological Character of Tscherkesses in Kosovo* (in Slovene), *Etnolog*, No 5-6, Ljubljana 1933, pp 218-253). Although he lived at a time when eugenics was coming to the fore in European frameworks, at the International Congress for Scientific Study of Folk Problems, in Berlin, Županič on August 29th, 1935, presented the paper *On People's Racial Aesthetics among the Yugoslavs* and rejected the racial legislature, which permitted the contracting of matrimonial union between Arians and Non-Arians solely on the basis of the already performed sterilization as "indecent, too humiliating and too much directed against the elementary law of man and any nation". (*Etnolog*, No 8-9, Ljubljana 1936, pp 62-81). In 1940 Županič became the first Professor at the Arts Faculty holding the Chair of Ethnology, which in due course expanded into an independent department.

V angleščino prevedel Fanc Slivnik

O AVTORJIH

Dr. Zmago Šmitek, izr. prof. na Oddelku za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani;

Dr. Božidar Jezernik, docent na istem oddelku.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Zmago Šmitek, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology at the Arts Faculty in Ljubljana.

Dr. Božidar Jezernik, Lecturer at the same department.