

Vintilă Mihăilescu, Ilia Iliev and Slobodan Naumović (eds.)

Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies II

Socialist Era Anthropology in South-East Europe

LIT

Chapter 14

On a Not So Well Tempered Marxism: Ideological Criticism, Historical Reconstructions, and a Late Return to Ethnogenesis in the Work of Špiro Kulišić

Gordana Gorunović

This paper takes the example of a single author, Špiro Kulišić (1908–89), to look at how Marxism was applied in the Serbian/Yugoslav ethnology. This individual case will interest us here insofar as an examination of Kulišić's professional biography and institutional activity, ideological involvement and scholarly work may reveal some fundamental properties of ethnology and the application of Marxism in the post-war period and within the political context of Yugoslav socialism. With the benefit of hindsight, we may argue that the 'Kulišić case', often thought to be closed once and for all, turns out to be far more complex in its significance and meaning. Hence to reopen it might result in a more comprehensive picture of ethnology under socialism and a more realistic appraisal of its legacy.

Until the 1970s 'Marxism' in Serbian and Yugoslav ethnology was a hybrid, derived from an encounter and blending of classical anthropological evolutionism with historical materialism. This strand of thought is conventionally known as 'evolutionary-Marxist' theory (Pavković, Bandić and Kovačević 1983), sometimes (pseudo-)Marxism, or simply evolutionism (Prošić-Dvornić 1997: 96). The sources of the evolutionary-Marxist conception Kulišić promoted in our ethnology may be found in Soviet ethnography (Kosven 1957, 1963) and the Italian ethnological-folkloristic school (Gasparini 1973).

The story presented here of the lone champion of a marginal theoretical paradigm – since dialectical materialism was just 'an appendix' in Serbian ethnology (Kovačević 2005: 14), as the received wisdom puts it – is potentially revisionist. The argument of marginality and sterility of Marxism in Serbian/Yugoslav ethnology is partly justified by the fact that this Marxism lacked any deeper theoretical reflection or elaboration, while its application boiled down to reiterating 'commonplaces' packaged in popular explanations taken from Engels or Soviet and Italian authors. The same argument

was then transferred to the entire opus of the author who is thought to be the one most responsible for such theoretical reduction and methodological simplification. Nevertheless, the subsequent demonization of Marxism–‘Špirinism’ is unable to explain some important points, such as: how a ‘marginal’ author could influence the shaping of the research agenda, the strategy of institutional development and the polemical atmosphere in ethnology from the 1950s to the early 1980s, as Kulišić did; and why at least one, and probably the most problematic portion of his work (the discourse on Montenegrin ethnogenesis) survived both the author and socialism. Independently of the theoretical and ideological sign, Kulišić’s approach, with its topics and problems, resonated among a number of admirers and followers, who in their turn occupied important posts in our discipline until very recently.

Kulišić’s professional biography reflects the social circumstances that favoured the mobility of intellectual cadres in the two Yugoslav states – both the kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. One of the peculiar features of Yugoslav socialism as compared with the Soviet Union and other people’s democracies was a looser connection between party power centres at different levels (such as the federation and the republic). The permeable inter-republic boundaries enabled a relatively unhampered flow of intellectual cadres and scientific cooperation between individuals and institutions. This was particularly true of the southern republics, which, in addition to mutual cultural and historical ties, as well as geographic contiguity, were linked together by higher education policies (in the case of ethnology, by the dependence on Belgrade University). The ‘heroes’ of our story of ethnology in the early socialist period, Špiro Kulišić and Milenko Filipović,¹ are among the most prominent professionals who, until the 1970s, decisively contributed to shaping the face of ethnology and museology in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Serbia, while at the same time leaving a trace in Balkan studies as well.

Beside limitations resulting from insufficient or unavailable sources, our understanding of the past is also burdened by the tendency to interpret professional antagonisms and disputes through the lens of the supposedly repressive ‘spirit’ of socialism/communism and its ideological cleavages. It

¹ Born in Podlugovi near Sarajevo in 1902, Filipović studied (1921–5) and obtained his Ph.D. (‘The Ethnic Past of Our People in the Region of Visoko, Bosnia’, 1928) in Belgrade. In 1930 he was appointed Assistant Professor, and in 1938 Full Professor at the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje (Macedonia). In 1939 he founded the Ethnological Society in Skopje and launched its organ ‘Ethnology’. After the 1950s his life and work were most closely tied to Bosnia-Herzegovina: he was professor at the Faculties of Philosophy and Natural Science, member of the Scientific Society of BH, director of the Institute of Balkan Studies and member of the Academy of Sciences of BH since 1966. He died in Belgrade in 1969.

is sometimes difficult to uncover the direct political input in events and separate unambiguously political interests from the personal motivations of the actors involved, who were at once bearers of discourses, careerism, personal vanities and professional rivalries (as it was the case in the 1950s debate on functionalism and contemporary ethnology between Kulišić and Filipović).

Depending on the historical moment, social context and current political objectives, the instrumentalization of historical materialism followed the tumultuous dynamic of the societal system: from the clash with 'class enemies' of the party and the people to the pursuit of particularistic interests and national programmes of certain ethnic groups. In the Cold War period, criticism of Soviet science and Western paradigms was intended as a means to purge home ranks and establish historical materialism as a class-conscious and ethnically neutral paradigm. In the period after the death of Josip Broz Tito and the bursting of the Yugoslav crisis, in the hands of Kulišić and his political 'mentors' the same paradigm (the discourse of Montenegrin ethnogenesis as a sort of ethnicization of ethnology) benefited precisely those processes against which it was originally introduced as a remedy – the politicization of ethno-national identity, Montenegrin separatism and secessionism, and the final disintegration of the common state.

Biography and Institutional Activity

Kulišić was born in Boka Kotorska (then within the Austro-Hungarian empire) in the south of today's Montenegro, in 1908. This was the year of the political crisis in the Balkans provoked by the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which would instigate further escalation of the Serbian and Yugoslav problems (Cvijić 1987 [1908]). He studied ethnology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade (1927–33) with the 'founding fathers' of the Serbian academic ethnology Jovan Erdeljanović and Tihomir Đorđević. His teaching jobs took him from the kingdom's capital to Croatia and Bosnia. On the eve of World War II he became a communist, and during the war he joined the partisan movement. After the war, he was a leading specialist in Bosnia-Herzegovina for two decades. He worked in the Ministry of Education and Ministry of Science of the People's Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina (as the official in charge of scientific institutions and associations), in the National Museum, and the Institute of Folklore Studies in Sarajevo, where he coordinated regional research projects. For a short time he was a part-time teacher at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Universities in Sarajevo and Belgrade. The curiosity connected with his unsuccessful university career is that he never obtained a Ph.D. degree. In the early 1960s he moved to Belgrade to take up the post of director of the Ethnographic Mu-

seum. Although he withdrew from institutional life comparatively early (retiring in 1963), he took part in public life through published writings until the early 1980s. He died in 1989, a couple of months before the fall of the Iron Curtain and the Berlin Wall. The year of his death coincided with the explosion of the crisis of the Yugoslav federal state and the one-party system.

The creation of the separate republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina (as a federal unit within the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, FPRY) was a political decision that had to be legitimated, including the development of institutional infrastructure in higher education² and science.³ During the first post-war years, the needs for ethnological research in the Republic by far surpassed the available financial and personnel resources. Everything had to start from scratch: work had to be organized, ethnologically trained staff brought in from Belgrade, and a feasibility study composed on the prospective development of the Ethnographic Department of the State Museum in Sarajevo, which soon regained its old name of the National Museum of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The two authors who worked most actively on this study were Kulišić, State Museum director (1947–50), and Filipović, 'very well acquainted with ethnological phenomena of the Bosnian-Herzegovinian region' (Buturović and Kajmaković 1988: 156).

Specialists in Bosnia-Herzegovina were among the first in Yugoslavia to try out team work. There were a variety of reasons for such a choice, like the complexity of research problems, and the necessity to harmonize divergent views espoused by the leading authorities from different university centres (Filipović-Fabijanić 1970: 157). At the end of the 1950s, under Kulišić's leadership a new conception of research work was introduced within the Institute of Folklore Studies and the Ethnological Department of

² The Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo was founded in 1950. Its Chair in Geography included courses in ethnology as well (at first as compulsory and later as optional) until 1962, when the Chair was abolished. Since then ethnology has not been taught at all. For a brief period in the early 1950s Kulišić also taught at this Chair, to be replaced by Filipović as Full Professor in anthropogeography and ethnology (1955–62).

³ In 1951 the Scientific Society of Bosnia-Herzegovina was founded, with the aim of coordinating scientific work in the Republic. In 1954, the Institute of Balkan Studies was established as one of its branches. During the eight years of existence the Institute housed comparative and interdisciplinary research in languages and cultures of all Balkan peoples. From 1955 on Filipović was a full member of the Scientific Society and the director of the Institute of Balkan Studies (1959–62). The Institute's most voluminous and ambitious project, and a contribution of lasting significance, was the study of a central problem in Balkanology – the medieval Vlach *katun*. The Institute of Balkan Studies was closed in 1962, and its activity was taken over by the Centre for Balkan Studies of the Academy of Sciences and Arts of Bosnia-Herzegovina, focusing on Illyrian heritage. In 1965 Kulišić became a permanent research fellow of the Centre.

the National Museum in Sarajevo. Its chief tasks and goals were: the inclusion of the generally scarce trained personnel in new, 'theoretically grounded, long-term museological and especially scientific research projects' (Palavestra 1990: 192) geared into targeted team-based ethnological and folklore studies; the study of ethno-cultural traits and formation processes of regional groups of the three majority peoples (Serbs, Croats and Moslems).⁴

The methodology of complex monographic studies consisted of preparatory work and fieldwork (see Buturović and Kajmaković 1988). The chief novelties were team work, field research, systematization of ethnographic-historical corpus, and collective monographs.⁵

It is difficult to say whether party organs at the republic level had any direct influence on scholarly research, by either commissioning or initiating particular projects, since there are no incontrovertible data on this. The example from the following quotation suggests the possibility of seemingly informal and personal initiatives, one among them resulting in the invention of ethnic groups and their tradition:

Kulišić invented *White Šokci* and *Ikavian Serbs*. Some time around New Year's Eve the then republican official Jovan Marjanović asked Kulišić in a conversation about *White Šokci*. Kulišić had no idea what it was all about, but he managed to dodge the answer. He immediately called upon me and ordered me to go to Prnjavor and dig out who the '*White Šokci*' were. I had to do as he said; there I found out that this was the autochthonous Croatian population that had retained their traditional white costume, after which they were named *White Šokci*.

And as for the 'Ikavian Serbs', three of us colleagues had to go into the field, to the mountain of Vlašić, in the middle of winter, treading knee-deep snow, trailing a horse that was carrying our baggage. There we found out that these Serbs really had an Ikavian word or two, but this stock of Ikavian words could simply have been taken from the neighbours. Since in Livno there was a group of Serbs with Ikavian elements in their speech, the category of Ikavian Serbs was invented, together with the project that had to prove their existence,

⁴ In the early 1960s the main task of ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina was defined as 'the study of ethnic processes and ethnic formations' in the Middle Ages, so that over time a 'comprehensive scientific study of the national development' of Bosnia's peoples would become possible (Kulišić 1961a: 323, see also 1961c).

⁵ These ethnological and folkloristic studies shed light on the medieval formations and processes in the shaping of the contemporary Croatian population at Neum and its surroundings (1959), of Croats, Serbs and Moslems in Livanjsko Polje (1961), and Serbs in the village of Imljani at the mountain of Vlašić (1962).

entitled *Livanjsko Polje and Its Surroundings* (R. Kajmaković, interview).

Kulišić himself was more inclined to armchair study than to fieldwork. In the account of his closest assistant:

Kulišić was no fieldworker. Once, just after the war, he went into the field accompanied by two soldiers. People in the villages were frightened; there were quite a few remaining Chetniks and Ustashas around in isolated villages at the time, and a visitor from town escorted by armed soldiers provoked additional fear.

Our work proceeded in such a way that he would design the project outline and distribute work tasks. Customs was my area. When the collection of data and research were finished – we spent three months in the field every year – I had to hand over to him a neat, typed paper. Then he would say: ‘I will take this, and you take that.’ He would use only those data that suited him. All that did not fit into his preconceived ‘story’ or idea was ignored. Yet at the same time he prevented anybody else from using these data either (R. Kajmaković, interview).

As the director of the Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade (1960–3), Kulišić introduced significant changes in the organization of museological and scientific work (Kostić 1992: 389–90). Upon his initiative, an educational division was created, departments for studying textiles, economy, and sociability, as well as documentation and conservation services. In the field of scientific research, Kulišić consistently implemented his conception of complex monographic studies of regional wholes, now in the territory of Serbia (north-western Serbia, focusing on the Serbian-Vlach ethno-cultural symbiosis), which required team members to specialize in different areas (sociability, customs, material and spiritual culture, ethnogenesis, etc.). The museum has retained the same structure to this day.

Ideological Engagement: Critique of Past and Present

In the first decade of socialist transition, the rhetoric of the new era and new system promulgated a sharp break with the past and an ‘ideological and theoretical clearing up’ (Djilas 1949; Kulišić 1953a). The ‘theoretical clearing up’ implied a critical analysis of the results previously achieved and methods utilized, from the standpoint of Marxism–Leninism, and a concrete application of the principles of the latter doctrine in studying national history and culture of all Yugoslav peoples and nationalities. According to the ill-articulated conception of the new, trans-ethnic science, the socialist ethnology was from that moment on supposed to serve the goal of providing a ‘correct explanation’ of the past and a ‘correct ideological and cultural

upgrading of our people' (Kulišić 1953a: 30). Its positioning as regards Western anthropology and Soviet ethnography proceeded through ideological critique of the political functions of bourgeois science and the 'revisionism' (or 'reactionary deviation') of contemporary Soviet ethnography. The critique was primarily aimed at the heritage of the local 'bourgeois science' – the Serbian anthropogeographical and ethnological school of J. Cvijić and J. Erdeljanović – and at contemporaries in ethnology, archaeology and physical anthropology (Kulišić 1953c) who were deemed 'suspicious' because of their pro-Western theoretical orientation and/or political past.

This new trend was announced in Kulišić's propagandistic 1953 paper 'Ideological and Theoretical Grounds for the Development of Our Ethnographic Museums', which contains a critique of museological practice in the inter-war period. The first expression of 'ideological orthodoxy' (Naumović 1999) was his attempt to introduce a new name for the discipline, 'ethnography'⁶ instead of the usual 'ethnology' that enjoyed consensus in academic and specialist community (Rusić 1954). According to Kulišić, 'ethnography' is an 'essentially social science whose development is closely connected with the development of the national question and directly conditioned by the basic tendencies in the development of contemporary society'. Its primary task is to 'study the emergence of particular peoples and their culture' (Kulišić 1953a: 27).

The argument for introducing the new name was mechanically transplanted from the Soviet ideological repertoire: ethnology was a bourgeois reactionary science,⁷ which should be rejected even at the level of terminology. After the 1948 Cominform Resolution, when the Yugoslav communists changed drastically their course towards the Soviet Union and encouraged open critique of Stalinism, such a belated reflex of Stalinist-Zhdanovist critique of ethnology was paradoxical. As soon as the mid 1950s the author himself renounced it and definitively opted for the name 'ethnology'. In the early 1960s he criticized the solutions he had previously advocated (Kulišić 1961b: 20–1).

Bearing in mind the internal political situation and the position of FPRY towards the USSR and other East European countries, it is quite understandable that Kulišić, in a 1953 paper, attempted to distance himself from Soviet practice and Soviet science. In this criticism he argued that

⁶ In this Kulišić was not alone within the Yugoslav space: the Slovenian organ of the Ljubljana Museum of Folk Culture *Etnolog* [*Ethnologist*] was the first to change its name into *Slovenski etnograf* [*Slovenian Ethnographer*] in 1948 (Rusić 1954: 60–1).

⁷ The label 'ethnology' was censured because of the 'retrograde teachings' of West and Central European scientists (e.g. Wilhelm Schmitt) and rejected at the congress held in Leningrad in 1929 (Rusić 1954: 59–60).

Soviet ethnography was undergoing a 'serious crisis' caused by: 'profound contradiction between its proclaimed principles and actual Soviet practices' (the 'hegemonist policy of the Soviet leadership'; the 'policy of restricting the free development of peoples'; the 'phenomenon of genocide'); absolutization of Soviet and Russian science; and a revival of chauvinist pan-Slavic ideology.

The contextualization of the Serbian bourgeois ethnology, originating from within the nineteenth-century national-historical science, was supposed to confirm the assumption of its class and political partiality, and ethnocentric premises.⁸ Ever since the creation of the kingdom of Yugoslavia with its 'centralist' and 'unitarist' regime, Kulišić writes, the development of ethnology was subject to the 'policy of national oppression' enforced by the ruling bourgeoisie.⁹

The 'hegemonist policy of the regime' reflected also on the methodical principles of museology, derived from dominant 'bourgeois' theories – evolutionism and the cultural cycles theory (the so-called German and Austrian cultural-historical school). The basic characteristics of museum work were: underestimation of ethnic peculiarities and cultural-historical development of minority groups (Montenegrins, Macedonian Slavs); the tendency to present the cultures of majority nations in the state-political community as an integrally Yugoslav whole (Yugoslav and Serbian ethnocentrism); methodological 'formalism' and 'anti-historicism' (Kulišić 1953a: 28).

Yugoslav ethnology in the 1950s was characterized by several recognizable features: a focus on rural traditional culture; 'collectionist empiricism'; introduction of the model of ideologically correct doctrine of society and history (especially of the 'primeval society'); and the rise of an alternative research strategy (proto-functionalism) which the ideologized, (pseudo-)Marxist current considered alien, potentially subversive and rival.

The alternative to ethnology as the science of the rural setting and traditional culture ('antiquarian ethnology', of the scholarship of 'living antiquities'), to whose persistence Kulišić continued to contribute in his later years, was formulated as early as the mid 1950s by Milenko Filipović, probably the most prolific Serbian ethnologist and Kulišić's most prominent rival. This proposal is all the more remarkable since it came in a period of radical social change, when most ethnologists thought that the phenomena

⁸ In later years, too Kulišić repeatedly invoked the thesis of 'ideological-political tendentiousness' of Serbian bourgeois ethnology and anthropogeography (1966: 102, 104; 1967b: 205).

⁹ This interpretation was based on the doctrinaire stand of the Comintern and the Yugoslav Communist Party that the kingdom of Yugoslavia had been the 'dungeon of peoples', because of the chauvinist (Greater Serbian) ideology and practice of the ruling dynasty and the Serbian bourgeoisie.

threatened by extinction should be recorded and 'the picture of the ideal village society reconstructed', while the 'questions of transformation, social development and current problems the society was facing were relegated to sociologists' (Prošić-Dvornić 1997: 73).

Contrary to Kulišić's predominantly armchair working style, Filipović was 'starting from empirical evidence, from establishing facts and framing the problem' (Filipović-Fabijanić 1970: 158). He promoted social ethnology or ethno-sociology (Filipović 1956: 146), the functional approach in studying contemporary culture, and application of ethnological knowledge in implementing social actions and in solving practical issues.

This realistic alternative was motivated by objective reasons of theoretical and social-practical nature: by the awareness of the necessity for modernizing the theoretical and methodological apparatus of Serbian ethnology and approaching current trends in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-American anthropology, whose preoccupations Filipović knew and some of them even shared. Industrialization, urbanization, country-town migrations, spread of literacy and other processes were affecting, albeit unevenly, all segments of society and contributing to the transformation of traditional patterns in the life of rural populations.

In order for home ethnology to be able to meet the challenge of modernity, it had first to get rid of its obsession with exoticism, primitivism and archaism, idealized models of folk (peasant) life and culture, and the imperative of 'ideological orthodoxy'. One of the ritual expressions of this orthodoxy and a new 'genre in ethnographic writing' (the 'ideological denunciation of colleagues', Naumović 1999: 58–9) was the critique of functionalism and its propagators in domestic scholarship (Kulišić 1955a, 1956a). It was precisely then that the 'universal' method-formula of ideological and political defamation of the opponent was invented, based on an equation between the categories of 'anti-historicism', 'functionalism', and 'imperialism'.

Seeking to depict the standpoint of anthropological functionalism as being intimately tied to the practice of Western societies in the neo-colonial epoch (imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism), Kulišić drew on the Soviet critique of British applied anthropology (Potechin 1948). He argued that the 'class essence' of the functional theory consisted of pragmatic tasks – to preclude the awakening of national consciousness in the colonies and to facilitate functional integration of the latter into capitalist society; 'in other words, to ensure colonial exploitation' (Kulišić 1955a: 298). And it was precisely this purpose, wrote Kulišić caustically, that bestowed 'topicality' and 'trendiness' on the principles and objectives of the functionally oriented anthropology, which rightly took on the attributes of 'practical' and 'applied'.

The immediate cause that prompted Kulišić to compose this 'piece unusual in its contents as well as its manner' was Milenko Filipović's article 'Ethnological (Ethnographic) Work in Bosnia-Herzegovina' (1955).¹⁰ In this text Filipović sketched in general terms and 'in a style accessible to the non-specialist readership' a critical overview of the earlier ethnographic-ethnological work in the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina and presented his own ideas on how further research should be conducted.

Because of temporal indeterminacy, regional unevenness and disparateness of ethnographic data, Filipović pleaded for 'critical' research that would take strictly into account the chronology of data, geographical spread of the phenomenon, and its role ('functional relation'). At the same time, he did not deny the need for additional efforts in the direction of historical reconstructions. Within this research agenda he formulated a host of problems belonging into the domain of historical ethnology and cultural history (Filipović 1955: 214-15).

Today's ethnology, that Filipović then proposed to be preceded by the adjective 'social', after the model of 'social anthropology':

looks at phenomena in the life of the people in all their dynamics, observes and studies processes, their conditions and consequences; and any data collection is subordinated to these goals; while in earlier times objects and descriptions were being collected just for their own sake' (213-14).

Stressing the new possibilities opened up for ethnological research by fresh paradigms, he set forth explicit demands for synchronic studies of the current condition in folk life and culture, and for viewing the cultural phenomenon from its social side (Rakić 1970: 178). He stressed that Bosnia-Herzegovina was a rewarding region

... also for those scholars who deem ethnology to be a science of living antiquities. For, in our ranks there are also such antiquarian ethnologists (ethnographers) who devote all their attention to antique forms of tools and technology, age-old customs and beliefs as supposed survivals, etc. (*ibid.*: 213).

Having read these words, Kulišić felt called upon and asked to speak in the name of these 'antiquarian ethnologists (ethnographers)' searching for

¹⁰ The article was published in *Pregled* [Review], the Sarajevo journal for social issues that often served as the arena for scholarly and specialist debates. Filipović (1956: 143) was 'ready for discussion, and even wanted it, all the more so as our ethnology, especially the Serbian one, is at the moment in a state of slumber ... As much as Š. Kulišić's initiative must be welcomed for broaching several theoretical problems in his article, the way he did it is lamentable.'

'supposed survivals'. And speak he did, in a paper on functionalism.¹¹ He seemed to be personally hurt by the fact that his colleague brought into question the impassioned devotion to 'age-old customs and beliefs'. Filipović tried to smooth it over in a subsequent article (1956: 148):

It is not antiquarian ethnography if one is engaged in real study of archaic elements, including 'survivals'. This sort of work is held in high esteem everywhere. My attitude to this sort of work, that is apparently Kulišić's chosen area of specialization, is very well known to him from my highly favourable review of his essay 'The Origin and Meaning of Christmas Ritual Bread among South Slavs' (1953, see Filipović 1954: 166–8).

This statement did not help; a rift ensued, and cooperation and friendship were broken between the two leading Serbian ethnologists, whose works had influenced a whole generation of specialists. The debate on tendencies in contemporary ethnology and the most urgent tasks of domestic science, initiated by Filipović in the mid 1950s in the hope of launching a true dialogue, failed soon and, thanks to Kulišić's manner of debating, spilled well over the confines of a scholarly polemic. The unofficial version of events furnished by Kulišić's assistant from the National Museum sheds some light on the personal dimension of their ideological conflict:

After the war, since the founding of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo in 1950, Kulišić taught ethnology at the Chair in Geography. His post was conditioned upon obtaining the Ph.D. degree. He chose the topic – Christmas ritual breads, with Dr. Dušan Nedeljković as supervisor. Privately, Kulišić knew Milenko Filipović, they were friends; they used to pay each other family visits, and Milenko was helping him. But Milenko and Dušan Nedeljković had some 'unsettled accounts' from the past, from the pre-war period when both worked at the Faculty in Skopje. Filipović apparently forgot to mention to Kulišić a small piece by Nedeljković on *kravaj*, which Kulišić was supposed to consult when working on his dissertation. The conflict between Nedeljković and Kulišić broke out when Špiro, short-tempered as he was, refused to do so and to edit the already written text. The result was that he withdrew his dissertation.

After that he went to Split and for some time taught at the Higher Educational School there. During this time Milenko Filipović

¹¹ He accused Filipović of 'total anti-historicism'; of limiting himself, in the form of 'modern ethnology' and 'genuine science', to 'the present and exclusively to the present', propagating thereby 'reactionary' ideas and methods of the functional school which gives a 'practical contribution to the enslavement of colonial peoples', etc. (Kulišić 1955a: 298–302, 1956a: 463–6).

worked at the Sarajevo Faculty of Philosophy, at the Chair in Geography, and was also a consultant in the National Museum. Špiro returned to Sarajevo, expecting an appointment at the Faculty, but there was no place for him there. This was obviously a sufficient reason for him to have a personal requital with Filipović, a requital which had the outside form of a 'scholarly' polemic on functionalism. Kulišić had to work in school again, he was the headmaster of some school, but he wanted to come back to the Faculty. Then he sent a letter to Milenko Filipović, in which he advised him 'as a friend' to give up Western literature and turn to the Soviet one. He had already published the article on the anti-historicism of the functional school in ethnology. It was then that the campaign against Filipović started (Radmila Kajmaković, interview).

After that Filipović 'refrained from engaging in public debates on theoretical issues' (Rakić 1970: 179), but in actual research he consistently deployed his principles in the area of ethno-sociology and ethno-history, combining elements of functional and historical approaches.¹² Although he 'never really abandoned the classical East European paradigm' (Prošić-Dvornić 1997: 76), his theoretical-methodological orientation was in its time more modern than the mainstream in most East European ethnologies (Halpern and Hammel 1970). 'Unfortunately, few Serbian ethnologists followed his lead', Mirjana Prošić-Dvornić concludes resignedly.

At that particular time and in the context of Serbian ethnology, Filipović's pro-functional orientation constituted a realistic alternative and a creative challenge to historical materialism and evolutionism. Maybe his critics recognized or felt the subversive potential of the new paradigm – 'the threat to their own discipline and its subject matter', to paraphrase the words of Prošić-Dvornić, or just to their personal professional and political positions. They were well served by Filipović's political status of *persona non grata* that closed the doors of the Belgrade University to him, and therefore the chance to establish his own ethnological school. In this way, whether 'grey or yellow, the devil' of functionalism (Kulišić 1956a: 464) was, at

¹² For example, under his leadership the Sarajevo Institute of Balkan Studies organized an interdisciplinary symposium on the medieval Vlach *katuns* – their socio-demographic and economic structure, position towards the village organization within the feudal society, and role in the creation of the Dinaric tribes in the late Middle Ages. In addition to Filipović, participants included the historians Branislav Djurdjev (professor) and Desanka Kovačević (assistant professor) from Sarajevo, and the anthropogeographer Jovan Trifunoski (professor of Skopje University) as lecturer. Their presentations and discussions, as well as contributions of guest participants, were published in the collective volume *Simpozijum o srednjovjekovnom katunu* [*Symposium on Medieval Katun*] (1963)

least for some time, neutralized by magical formulae, so that the imperilled community of the 'orthodox' could buttress their faith.

The liberalization of the political climate in Yugoslavia during the 1960s, opening up towards the West and to some Western paradigms, rather strongly felt in domestic philosophical and sociological circles, had a negligible impact on ethnology. In the words of one of the fiercest critics of domestic academic ethnology of the period, 'the best example of avoiding any contact with philosophy, both substantially and formally, is the Belgrade chair in ethnology, which avoids even sociology' (Gluščević 1966: 343).

The Marxist current, flimsy in professional terms but occasionally aggressive, decided to ignore the international development of Marxism itself, as well as its philosophical and anthropological reception in the country. In response to its manoeuvres and attacks against others, the Marxist current was taken to task for advocating vulgar materialism, poor knowledge of classical Marxism, and misunderstanding of 'the possibilities Marx had opened for anthropology' (Gluščević 1966: 343).

After the debate on 'genuine' ethnology, its subject and its present tasks was opened, new actors joined in (Gluščević 1966 vs. Kulišić and Barjaktarović 1964). Manojlo Gluščević, who defended his doctoral dissertation in 1960 (Gluščević 1964) at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo with M. Filipović as supervisor, published an article entitled 'Ethnography, Ethnology, and Anthropology' (1963: 21–50), one of the first explicit criticisms of Erdeljanović's conception of ethnology as the science of nations, ethnic characteristics and ethnogenesis. This was also an early attempt at anthropologizing domestic science: the author defines ethnology in an anthropological vein, as the study of man in all aspects of his existence (biological, social and cultural).

The article prompted Špiro Kulišić and Mirko Barjaktarović, then a professor at the University of Belgrade, to write a polemical pamphlet (1964: 348–58), whose rhetoric essentially boiled down to the defence of the good old ethno-historical perspective in ethnology and to the application of the universal formula of 'anti-historicism'. They rebuked the author for neglecting a basic aspect of man's existence – historicity, and for denying ethnology the character of historical discipline. Yet the real target of Gluščević's criticism (1963: 27, 1966: 340–1) was *putative history* in ethnology which 'conjures up on the basis of unchecked and highly unreliable oral tradition' and at best can be nothing more than a 'hypothetical reconstruction of past events'. The critics 'on duty'¹³ disputed the view that anthropology was the

¹³ Gluščević (1966: 331, 343) criticized the two ethnologists for their lack of familiarity with the English language and Anglo-Saxon literature, for scholastic logic in their argumentation, and for repeating the commonplaces of vulgar Marxism ('they speak in the name of Marxism

most comprehensive science of man in nature, society and culture. They claimed that ethnology was not a science of culture and society since 'it studies the emergence and development of ethnic communities, their social institutions and their culture' – as if ethnic communities were not social communities! (added Gluščević 1966: 338). They also set forth the thesis of the non-homogeneity (i.e. class character) of national culture. Gluščević retorted that these authors when studying the so-called 'folk culture' never took into account the totality of a people's culture, but just of a part of it, that is, the peasants. Hence, the alternative was either to study the past of certain backward strata or to adopt a modern concept of ethnology, that is, anthropology.

However, neither the modern conception of ethnology nor the very term 'anthropology' were innocent or neutral. In spite of his knowledge of French and Italian, and brief visits to foreign countries, Kulišić's distancing from anthropology and sociology was drastic. He challenged the concepts of social and cultural anthropology and the very possibility for the existence of anthropology as a global science.¹⁴ He was also sceptical about the study of contemporary socio-cultural phenomena and working-class culture ('and perhaps what is actually meant by the name of ethnography is sociological surveys...') within Soviet ethnography, concluding that 'welding together ethnological and sociological problems and methods can only aggravate our difficulties in research' (Kulišić 1961b: 21).

Such rigidity and conservatism of the 'Marxist' branch of Serbian ethnology partly accounts for the unpopularity and failure of historical materialism¹⁵ within the discipline, which in turn produced sporadic resorting to Filipović's alternative or escaping into the 'enemy ranks' of socio-cultural anthropology, informed by humanistic Marxism and *praxis* philosophy that was promoted by Prof. Zagorka Golubović. Unaware of his own contribution to such a result, Kulišić (1974a: 26) thought it pernicious

that generations of students could complete their studies without really getting to know anything about a creative application of his-

of which they are equally ignorant'). He accused them of 'camouflaging their ignorance by ideological sensitivity', of using the method of ideological-political discreditation of opponents, etc.

¹⁴ For instance, he complained that Levi-Strauss' understanding of anthropology (Lévi-Strauss 1989 [1958]: 343) involves, 'quite unnecessarily, also those phenomena and tasks that naturally belong into the domain of sociology, as a separate scientific discipline' (Kulišić 1961b: 8).

¹⁵ Kulišić was openly criticized for not being able to use the historical-dialectical method or the results its application yielded. His 'historical-dialectical method', which he so much 'bragged about' was 'neither historical nor dialectical', but rather consisted of 'naked quotations from Marxist authors' and 'miserable platitudes' on the material and social conditioning of religion (Djurić 1974: 28).

torical materialism. In the same way ethnologists obtained their Ph.Ds and M.As, and some of them even got important positions in ethnological institutions ...

Describing the situation in Serbian ethnology as a 'void' and 'autarchic closure', he saw the reasons for such stagnation in the absence of scientists of the calibre of J. Cvijić, T. Đorđević and J. Erdeljanović; marginalization of Marxism (Kulišić 1973a); lack of a 'clear and consistent theoretical orientation and methodology'; and discrimination against the discipline (administrative-political 'tutelage').

Various 'internal' committees were formed, like for instance at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, playing the role of some sort of tutoring agencies. Or external committees were put together in a purely bureaucratic fashion, entrusted with assessing and channeling the work of ethnological institutions in Serbia. I was also a member of such committees, and in the end I refused to take part in this job any more, since no administrative, tutoring commissions can help the development of a science, nor is this a path to recovery (Kulišić 1974a: 26).

Classical Topics and Grand Questions

Kulišić's research work bore the sign of continuity with classical topics, the 'grand' questions of ethno-history, and applied research methodology. There are three thematic clusters characterizing Serbian ethnology since its academic beginnings in the early twentieth century that also represent the core of Kulišić's interests: tribal organization in the Dinaric region; ethnic history and the relations between Slavic and autochthonous Balkan populations in the Middle Ages; and popular religion among Serbs and Montenegrins.¹⁶ His research work built on the tradition of ethnographic and ethnological study of the people (peasantry) and traditional culture, marked by the long-lasting dominance of the historical-comparative and genetic approach as the most general theoretical and methodological framework within national science (Pavković *et al.* 111-12).

In his work on reconstructions, Kulišić followed the theory of matriarchy and patriarchy as two universal successive stages with the two corresponding forms of the 'primeval gentile community'; the transition from one to the other is a 'historically necessary' and 'lawful' process. Applied to

¹⁶ A sizeable and perhaps the most valuable part of Kulišić's opus comprises his works on religion - this at least was the opinion of the late Prof. D. Bandić (personal communication), a leading authority in the field. Kulišić drew upon and harmoniously continued the tradition of Serbian ethnology and folklore studies in reconstructing pre-Christian religion, mythology and customs (see Kulišić 1953b, 1970a, 1970b, 1979).

local ethnographic data, this kind of 'putative history' automatically entailed the rigid assumption that the forms of gentile organization and kinship institutions, popular religion and customs among South Slavs had a matriarchal origin. As a consequence, ethnographic research had to be geared into the search for 'surviving' elements, relics of archaic relations and concepts in social practice and the symbolic sphere, while the analysis had to focus on interpreting their origin and 'secondary' development.

Contrary to Kulišić's main premise, Yugoslav historiography generally believed that South Slavs were never 'in the stage of transition from matriarchy to patriarchy'. The Slavic tribes that in the early Middle Ages arrived into the Danubian basin and the Balkan peninsula had, according to historical sources (see Curta 1998), patrilineal-patrilocal family and the so-called military-democratic social system.¹⁷ The Slavic colonization of the Balkans coincided with the highest stage in the development of their patriarchal tribal organization, in which the 'seeds of the future class society and state building' were already present (Djurđev 1954: 209; Čubrilović 1974: 50). The processes of economic differentiation and decline of the 'gentile basis' of the tribes, probably unleashed already during the migrations, military campaigns and alliances, escalated in the Balkans when the 'territorialization' stage set in.

One of the 'grand questions' of domestic ethnology and historiography, and one that still awaits a conclusive answer, is the explanation of two interconnected processes: the disintegration of feudal societies, and the formation of the tribal structure in the Dinaric region in the late Middle Ages (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries). There is still no theoretical-analytical framework that would successfully connect the conditions of locally specific cores and the effects of various factors in the formation of tribes. Among these factors the following are most often cited as decisive: ecological (cattle-breeding economy that requires seasonal migration between winter and summer pastures); ethnic and demographic (migrations of the population within the Dinaric and neighbouring regions); socio-political and historical (crisis of the feudal order of local feudal states; Turkish invasions).

For this reason the old debate between 'ethnographers' and 'historiographers' on the emergence and origin of tribes (the continuity theory vs. the Vlach-*katun* theory) has remained unresolved to this day. The theory of

¹⁷ The term and concept of 'military democracy' was coined by Morgan (1981 [1877]: 204). In Engels' interpretation (Engels 1979: 115), military democracy is a specific organizational structure of gentile society that emerged when war and organization for warfare became 'regular functions of a people's life', and the plundering of neighbours 'a constant branch of the economy'. The main organs of this system were the military leader (rex, basileus, thiudans), council and popular assembly.

historical *continuity* of the Slavic tribal system¹⁸ (Erdeljanović 1921; Cvijić 1966), emphasized the ethnic dimension of the process of repatriarchalization: the renewal of the tribe and reinforcement of the 'patriarchal regime' were understood as being in the function of 'ethnographic rejuvenation' and ethnic restructuring/'reshaping' of the Serbian people, in the political vacuum that ensued after the collapse of feudal states and Turkish conquests.

In historiography, proponents of this theory have been criticized for seeking the origin of tribes and the 'roots of tribal institutions' in the presumed Slavic background, neglecting historical facts (Djurdjev 1954: 209). The rejection of Erdeljanović's evolutionist generalizations (the theory of the Slavic background and two stages in tribal development),¹⁹ but affirmation of his ethnographic results in studying specific tribes (see Erdeljanović 1981) have resulted in the conclusion that (paradoxically) the ethnologist, working in the field and on the material of popular oral tradition, proved the thesis formulated by historians – of the 'delayed shaping of Montenegrin and Highland tribes' (Djurdjev 1981a: 115). Though opinions are divided as to the political motivation underlying Erdeljanović's work (Yugoslavism or Serbian ethnocentrism?), his studies of tribal society are today considered the most complete and 'unsurpassed' – 'by breadth and depth of grasp, by originality and novelty' (Djurdjev 1981a; Pavković 1995); he is also seen as a precursor of political ethnology/anthropology (Pavković 1995: 274).

The main contention of the post-war Marxist historians, the upholders of the so-called Vlach-katun theory,²⁰ was that Montenegrin, Highland and Herzegovinian tribes had emerged towards the end of the Middle Ages and at the beginning of the Turkish period from the katun organization of Vlach cattle-breeders. According to their assumption, the medieval Vlach-

¹⁸ Jovan Erdeljanović was the first professional Serbian ethnologist who in the early twentieth century began a systematic study of tribal life. Evolutionist and, more narrowly, Morganian, he – like Lewis Morgan himself (1981 [1877]) – found a lively tribal organization and tradition, which enabled him to engage in immediate fieldwork. On the basis of many years of ethnographic and historical studies, he concluded that there had been two stages and two ethnic layers in the development of tribes.

¹⁹ The so-called 'older' formation belongs to the period from Serbian settlement to the founding of the Nemanjić state, while 'younger' or 'new' formation occurred after Ottoman conquests (Erdeljanović 1921: 67–79).

²⁰ Its original formulation is ascribed to K. Jireček (1959 [1879]) and Milan Šufraj (1925). Later elaborations developed thanks to the discovery and interpretation of new archival sources – Turkish defters in the Constantinople Archive (Djurdjev 1954). Kulišić (1963: 75, 1981: 59) described the Vlach-katun theory as a social-Darwinist conception and an 'artificial', 'mechanical' construction, without grounds or confirmation in primary sources.

herdsmen katun,²¹ as a form of gentile organization with military functions, was the opposite of the farming-feudal village organization.

The generators of the process of formation of tribes as forms of 'patriarchal democracy' in Montenegro (Zeta), Highlands, Herzegovina and northern Albania were to be found in the crisis of the feudal order in Raška and Zeta after the death of Emperor Dušan in 1355 (Čubrilović 1959, 1963, 1974). The 'perturbation' that spread over the whole society and turned its old strata upside down (Djurđev 1981b: 47) resulted in anarchy and anomie. Thereby conditions were created for the formation of tribes and establishment of the military-democratic system in these territories.

The tribes, known from the Ottoman period of Montenegrin history, developed gradually from *knežine* and *vojvodstva* (dukedom) rather than directly from Vlach katuns or feudal *nahijas* (Djurđev 1954, 1963). At first, Vlach-herdsmen katuns were deterritorialized – they were transformed from narrow kinsmen and gentile groups into a broader territorial-type organization (descent into *župe* or districts and unification of groups of katuns); then occurred the 'stratification' of farming-village organization, carried out by the already territorialized katuns. The results of these processes were two new forms of organization, *knežine*²² and tribes. In the tribes, the gentile system prevailed, allegedly originating from the katun organization of Vlach herdsmen.

On this interpretation, Montenegrin tribes were formed within 'Vlach *nahijas*' in the conditions of Turkish supreme control over Montenegro at the end of the fifteenth century. In the early sixteenth century Montenegro gained the status of autonomous province; *timari*, the fiefs of *spahije*, Turkish landowners were abolished, and the entire population of the *vilayet* (country) was proclaimed free peasants – *filuridžije*.²³

In the seventeenth century Montenegro was not a 'tribal society' but rather a 'military-democratic federation of tribes and *knežine* with feudal and estate elements' and an 'ethnarchy' (Djurđev 1974: 292–3).²⁴

²¹ By that time the term 'Vlach' had lost its ethnic meaning (the Slavic assimilation of Roman Vlachs had been finished). It denoted instead a social status, the fact of belonging to the stratum of mountain herdsmen.

²² In *knežine*, territorial organization prevailed, as demonstrated by the example of Serbia (the Smederevo sanjak), where Vlach cattle-breeders, *filuridžije*, settled there soon turned into farmers under the influence of the Ottoman 'feudal' system.

²³ The term comes from *filurija* (Tur. *filuri* – gold coin); it was the Turkish name for the tax that in the former state was intended for Vlach, herding population.

²⁴ The 'feudal' elements consisted of the remnants of domestic petty aristocracy and members of the church hierarchy. Their social position and political legitimacy were based on local feudal law (the continuity of tradition of the Crnojević state and of the Serbian Orthodox

Though Kulišić's solution to the problem of emergence and origin of the tribal organization was formulated in contradistinction to dominant theories, it still owes them something. Kulišić interprets the so-called re-emergence of tribes in the period of Ottoman rule as a 'renewal' of gentile forms of social structure and 'revival of archaisms', relics of pre-patriarchal gentile relations, that functionally adapted to the new context (Kulišić 1958, 1959). The key factor in the process of formation of the 'secondary' gentile-tribal organization in the Dinaric region was the symbiosis of the older Balkan (Roman-Illyrian, Vlach) and Slavic populations (Kulišić 1967a, 1980a, 1980b) rather than katun organization: the katuns did not represent a form of gentile structure, but a type of settlement (village) inhabited by cattle breeders, organized in gentes and fraternities. In this point, his conclusion does not depart significantly from the thesis of the Vlach-katun theory, which argued that the nucleus of tribal organization comes from the medieval katun organization.

In Kulišić's last analysis, the complex structure and evolution of Dinaric gentile society reflect, on one hand, the historical continuity of elements of the ancient Slav tribal organization and common law from the pre-patriarchal epoch, and on the other, the influences of the native Balkan communities.

The global solution Kulišić proposed appeared as the third one, rather peculiar, isolated and somewhat tautological. Differently from the 'logical-positivist' method of historiographers, it affirmed the dialectical approach (Kulišić 1963, 1981) which claimed to provide an insight into 'more profound and hidden realities' (see Lefevr 1973) by moving from the appearance of social forms to their 'essence' (structure) and historical genesis.

Kulišić questioned the idea that the tribal society in the Dinaric region was patriarchal by structure, historical development and origin. In the history of society 'there were no pure formations, devoid of internal contradictions'. The basic infrastructural contradiction stems from the opposition between 'old, more or less obsolete social relations, and the new ones'; 'the new that is becoming dominant and the old that is falling apart but at the same time subsisting or reappearing, in specific forms and to the extent dependent on the new social circumstances' (Kulišić 1963: 6; Godelier 1989: 203). Tribal society 'as a whole is at once lively and anachronous, and thus, in spite of all the necessary and compromise adjustments, in class societies it appears as an alien body' (Kulišić 1981: 52).

Fraternity was the main unit of the tribal society that was actually responsible for 'its basic gentile character' and the form of the gentile commu-

Church) and on the warrants of the Turkish supreme authorities, whose representative in Montenegro until the mid seventeenth century was a Turkish landowner (spahija).

nity from which this society had developed. By its shape, structure and functions Dinaric fraternity was identical to the patrilineal, patrilocal gens or exogamous clan (Kulišić 1957a, 1957b). This is not to say that it may be identified with the primitive *gens*, but just that its 'essence' was gentile.

In reconstructing *zadruga*, Kulišić (1955b) started from Engels' and Kovalevski's conclusion that the South Slavic *zadruga* – the 'patriarchal household community ... sharing property and labour' (Engels 1979: 43) – is the transitory form and a step between the matriarchal gentile community and the modern nuclear family. According to Kulišić, the most significant indicator of such a position and the matriarchal origin of *zadruga*²⁵ was precisely its *fratriarchal*²⁶ rather than patriarchal character.

Zadruga constituted the 'economic and social essence' of such 'formations' as the Vlach katuns in the Middle Ages, and fraternities later on. By invoking the 'character of production and social relations', Kulišić (1963: 9, 1981: 64) borrowed Marx's findings in his analysis of the 'shared, immediately socialized labour' on the example of the 'patriarchal industriousness of the peasant family' (Marx 1973: 79). The household or *zadruga*-type production 'as Marx already suggested, represents the social function of family as a whole, where "individual forces act from the outset as organs of the common, family labor force"'. In this point Kulišić, probably unwittingly, approached the solution that was formulated independently by some French and American anthropologists influenced by Marxism (Meillassoux 1960, 1981; Sahlins 1972) – the idea of the so-called 'domestic mode of production'.

On the comparative-historical level, Kulišić analysed forms of social organization in the Balkans and the Caucasus,²⁷ reaching the conclusion that

²⁵ In the structure of Dinaric and South Slavic *zadruga* Kulišić discovered 'essential elements' of a 'specific', 'transitional' and 'contradictory' form that had arisen in the stage of collapse of primitive matriarchal-gentile relations and gradual formation of the *zadruga* family with patrilocal marriage (Kulišić 1963: 9). This stage was 'frozen' in Serbian and Montenegrin wedding customs that focus on the ritual act of introducing the bride into the bridegroom's group (Kulišić 1956b).

²⁶ This form and 'historical type' of *zadruga*, argues Kulišić, cannot be defined as strictly patriarchal. In spite of patrilineal kinship and patrilocal marriage, it lacks the structure of the large (Indo-European) family under the despotic rule of the father or father's father. The fratriarchal character of *zadruga* stems from its egalitarian kinship structure (equality of generations and genders; democracy in decision-making and management).

²⁷ The novelty introduced by Kulišić in Serbian ethnology was the utilization of Caucasian data for comparative-historical purposes, probably under the influence of Mark O. Kosven, the Soviet specialist for the Caucasus and 'questions of primitive society'. Kulišić claimed to have established the identity of archaic forms in the Balkans and the Caucasus. On this basis he concluded that there must have been 'a broader and considerably older social and ethnic

these social structures formally belonged to the same type, characterized by historical longevity and a certain ability to adjust to class-based socio-economic formations (like feudalism and capitalism). These were secondary gentile communities, whose basic economic elements – restricted common production (certain forms of cooperation) and collective ownership (cf. Garodi 1967) – changed extremely slowly. Kulišić explained the persistence and/or renewal of gentile forms in the Balkans, the Caucasus and elsewhere by the similarity of historical conditions that favoured the maintenance of collective property.

With his book *O etnogenezi Crnogoraca* [*On the Ethnogenesis of Montenegrins*] (1980b) Kulišić attracted the attention of the broader and political public. The book's arguments engage in a risky interpretation of Byzantine and domestic written sources for medieval history, as well as the existing ethnographic evidence found in the works of Kulišić's predecessors. The historians, of course, intervened promptly, revealing the real content of the sources Kulišić used and the unacceptable way he used them (see Vukčević 1981).

The conclusions to this book represent Kulišić's final settling of accounts with the heritage of 'older bourgeois science', the 'national-romanticist approach' of Serbian anthropogeography and ethnology, and the 'positivist orientation' of post-war Marxist historiography and archaeology. The chief originality in Kulišić's interpretation of ethnogenesis was – unexpectedly for many – the explicitly 'heretical' statement that Montenegrins, by their ethnic origin and specific socio-historical and cultural development, are a separate South Slavic ethnicity and a modern nation. This contradicted the official view formulated by the party ideologue Milovan Djilas (1947 [1945]): that Serbs and Montenegrins have 'one and the same (Serbian) ethnic origin, one root, but their development into nations, the development of national consciousness, has taken different paths'. According to this view, until the end of the nineteenth century Montenegrins were an ethnic group within the Serbian nation, growing into a separate nation after the 1878 Berlin Congress in the process of state- and civil society-building.

Immediately after publication, the book provoked 'unprecedented turmoil', scholarly controversies and political responses. It served as the occasion for a public panel discussion *The Ethnogenesis of Montenegrins and the Marxist Definition of the Nation* organized by the Marxist Centre of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Montenegro (1981). The topic was not new; it had been present in a highly ideologized guise since the late 1960s. The dissidents in various scientific disciplines, in rising

substratum' underlying them, which preceded Indo-Europeans (Kulišić 1963: 56, see also 1973b, 1973c, 1974b. Cf.: Martine 1987: 90–1; Kiznija 1996: 34–5, 38).

numbers after 1968, had advocated the idea of the non-Serbian origin, 'autochthonousness' of the Montenegrin people and the 'sovereignty' of the Montenegrin nation. Kulišić's book, which in specialist terms probably did not deserve the attention it was accorded, was treated as the expression of the revival of national 'romanticism' in domestic science (Djurđjević 1981b: 46), encouraged by the political aspirations for Montenegrin sovereignty and secession. It was instrumentalized in the politicization of ethnicity and, at a critical moment, it functioned as the 'litmus test of being for or against Montenegrin nationhood' (Vujović 1981: 57; Brković 1988).

In social reality, however, the scientific pertinence of a discourse says nothing of its ideological relevance for the members of a given group. From the perspective of independence Montenegro achieved by the May 2006 referendum, one could argue that Kulišić's ethnogenetic discourse, regardless of his intentions – today we can only speculate about them anyway – played a part in such an outcome and generally in today's identity politics.

Conclusion

The characteristic motifs in the narrative about our author – the posts and roles he took in his relatively brief active career (a successful museum official, ideologist and hated polemicist in the profession), his professional mobility and the paradoxical turn he made in his advanced age – reflect the specific conditions and main trends in the dynamic of Yugoslav society. From a pretentious ideologue of supra-national ethnology of the socialist society – where the national question was allegedly 'resolved most consistently' by applying the principles of Marxism–Leninism (the platitude of brotherhood and unity of all Yugoslav peoples and nationalities) – he turned into an advocate of Montenegrin nationalism, that is, of the political programme that many years later would bring to its end the process of Yugoslav disintegration, by breaking up its last 'relic', the federation of Serbia and Montenegro. From an 'ideologically–politically' conscious ethnologist of Marxist persuasion, who was always on the alert against signs of 'metaphysical thought' and ideologically unsuitable paradigms in science, he became a doctrinaire advocate of unilinear evolutionism. He never realized that his pseudo-historical reconstructions and, particularly, the discourse on the origin and development of the tribal society in the territory of Montenegro and Herzegovina, anecdotally labelled 'evolutionary structuralism', suffer from the same shortcomings that he used to ascribe to others – atemporality, schematicism and national romanticism.

What does this individual case tell us about ethnology in the socialist period? In spite of ideological imperatives that called for a break with the past, in the new theoretical framework we discover the existence of signifi-

cant continuities with the pre-war tradition of the discipline – in terms of the definition of the science's subject and character; classical topics and grand questions; and methodological accent – the comparative–historical and cultural–genetic method.

The contribution of historical materialism in innovating the traditional paradigm may be viewed from different aspects. At the theoretical–methodological level, its positive sides are: a consistent, though schematic and too extensively applied comparativism, at a time when it had all but disappeared from sight in domestic ethnology; the potentially fruitful approach to traditional society and culture in terms of an infrastructure–superstructure dialectic developed in the early 1960s – an approach that mostly remained an unfulfilled promise, since it was premature and theoretically ill prepared in comparison with the subsequent development of Marxism and structural Marxism in anthropology. The basic evolutionary approach and the partial solutions – reconstructions of kinship, ethnic history and, particularly, folk religion, mythology and customs – that Kulišić proposed under the label of Marxism/historical materialism, won a number of adherents who continued working in a similar style (e.g. Kostić 1969; Pantelić 1980, 1981; Petrović 2000a, 2000b, 2002), disregarding the theoretical sign or without any explicit theory altogether.

As far as the institutional aspect of scholarly research is concerned, we can identify the innovations that may be counted among the benefits of the socialist heritage, such as: collective projects and teamwork, field research and complex, sometimes interdisciplinary studies of regional wholes, ethnic and social groups; publication of results (collective monographs, edited volumes) and systematic museological activity.

Publishing, debates and criticism in the academic community, though infrequent and contaminated by ideological and personal interests, demonstrate that historical materialism was not the only, not even the dominant paradigm, and this also holds for the years of the Cold War and estrangement from the Soviet Union. At that time already there existed an alternative strategy that opposed antiquarian selection of topics and conjectural history by the study of contemporary times and the application of ethnological knowledge in social practice. The critique of 'Špirinism', at first implicit, and then increasingly overt, though politically undesirable and potentially subversive, could be tolerated when it was voiced in the name of a more authentic, classical and humanistic Marxism.

The negative assessment of historical materialism within Serbian ethnology was a logical outcome of Kulišić's failure to offer the discipline a more persuasive demonstration of the potentials of Marxist analytical categories. Further reasons include animosity to Marxism as a consequence of

ideological saturation, and indifference to anthropological theory in general until the 1970s. For these and other reasons (such as a shift of interest from the traditional and rural to the contemporary and urban), the classical issues of national ethnology and historiography, which in socialism not only survived but were reworked within the historical-materialist paradigm, are nowadays largely neglected and abandoned, although many of the problems involved have remained unsolved.

References

- Brković, S. 1988. *Etnogenezofobija, prilog kritici velikosrpstva*. Cetinje: Književna opština Cetinje.
- Buturović, D., and R. Kajmaković. 1988. Naučna djelatnost u oblasti etnologije 1945–1988 godine. In V. Palavestra, *Spomenica stogodišnjice rada Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine 1888–1988*, pp. 156–78. Sarajevo: Zemaljski Muzej Bosne i Hercegovine.
- Čubrilović, V. 1959. *Terminologija plemenskog društva u Crnoj Gori. Posebna izdanja, CCCXXI*. Beograd: Etnografski institut SAN.
- . 1963. Postanak plemena Kuča. *Zbornik Filozofskog fakulteta VII* (1): 313–34.
- . 1974. Patrijarhalna društva i njihova običajna prava u Albaniji i Crnoj Gori u srednjem veku. In V. Čubrilović (ed.), *Običajno pravo i samouprave na Balkanu i u susjednim zemljama*. Zbornik radova, pp. 43–69. Pos. izdanja I. Beograd: Balkanološki institut SANU.
- Curta, F. 1998. Feasting with 'Kings' in an Ancient Democracy: On the Slavic Society of the Early Middle Ages (Sixth to Seventh Century A.D.). *Proceedings of the Illinois Medieval Association. Essays in Medieval Studies* 15: 19–28.
- Cvijić, J. 1908. Aneksija Bosne i Hercegovine i srpsko pitanje. Reprinted in J. Cvijić. 1921. *Govori i članci I*, pp. 203–33. Beograd: 'Napredak'.
- . 1966. *Balkansko poluostrvo i južnoslovenske zemlje. Osnovi antropogeografije, I–II*. Beograd: Zavod za izdavanje udžbenika SR Srbije.
- Djilas, M. 1945. O crnogorskom nacionalnom pitanju. *Borba* 1. maj, p. 1.
- . 1949 O nacionalnoj istoriji kao vaspitnom predmetu. *Komunist; Organ Centralnog Komiteta KPJ*, January, pp. 52–57.
- Djurđjević, B. 1954. Iz istorije Crne Gore, brdskih i malisorskih plemena (Popis Hota, Kuča, Pipera i Klimentata iz 1497). *Radovi Naučnog društva NR Bosne i Hercegovine II*, Odjeljenje istorisko-filoloških nauka I: 165–220.

- . 1963. Teritorijalizacija katunske organizacije do kraja XV veka (katun-knežina-pleme). *Simpozijum o srednjovjekovnom katunu*. Naučno društvo SR Bosne i Hercegovine. Odjeljenje istorijsko-filoloških nauka, pp. 143–67. Sarajevo: ND SR Bosne i Hercegovine.
- . 1974. Značaj crnogorskog zbora u XVII veku. In V. Čubrilović (ed.), *Običajno pravo i samouprave na Balkanu i u susednim zemljama*, pp. 269–99. Beograd: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti.
- . 1981a. Neki istorijsko-metodološki problemi pri upotrebi etnografskog materijala u ispitivanju naših plemena. In D. D. Pejović, and I. Božić, *Predmet i metod izučavanja patrijarhalnih zajednica u Jugoslaviji*, pp. 109–21. Titograd: Odjeljenje društvenih nauka. Naučni skupovi.
- . 1981b. O postanku crnogorskog naroda. *Praksa* 4: 33–49.
- Djurić, V. B. 1974. Još o mitu i religiji. *NIN* 26. V. (1220): 27–8.
- Engels, F. 1979. *Poreklo porodice, privatne svojine i države*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Erdeljanović, J. 1921. Neke crte u formiranju plemena kod Dinarskih Srba. *Glasnik Geografskog društva* V: 67–79.
- . 1981 [1907]. *Kući, Bratonožići, Piperi. Fototipско izdanje*. Beograd: Slovo Ljubve.
- Etnološko-folkloristička ispitivanja u Neumu i okolini*. 1959. Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja XIV. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej.
- Etnološka i folkloristička ispitivanja u Livanjskom polju*. 1960–1. Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja, XV–XVI. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej.
- Etnološko-folkloristička istraživanja u Imljanima*. 1962. Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja XVII. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej.
- Filipović, M. S. 1954. Š. Kulišić: Porijeklo i značenje božićnog obrednog hleba u Južnih Slovena. *Zbornik Matice srpske. Serija društvenih nauka* 8: 166–8.
- . 1955. Etnološki (etnografski) rad u Bosni i Hercegovini. *Pregled* 10: 211–15.
- . 1956. Savremena etnologija ili etnografija. Osvrt na članak Š. Kulišića: 'Antiistorizam funkcionalne škole u etnologiji'. *Pregled* 3–4: 143–52.
- Filipović-Fabijanić, R. 1970. Kratak pregled i karakteristike rada u BiH u vremenu 1945–1969. *Radovi. Savetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije* 11, pp. 155–9. Zenica: Muzej grada Zenice.
- Garodi, R. 1967. *Kinesko pitanje*. Beograd: Sedma sila.
- Gasparini, E. 1973. *Il matriarcato slavo: Anthropologia culturale dei protoslavi*. Firenze: Sansoni.

- Gluščević, M. 1963. Etnografija, etnologija i antropologija. *Sociologija* 3–4: 21–50.
- . 1964. *Kuvada. Etnološka rasprava*. Beograd: Etnološka biblioteka 6.
- . 1966. Kritika između neobjektivnosti i proizvoljnosti. *Pregled* XVIII (LVI), 4: 331–45.
- Godelie, M. 1989 [1987]. Analiza tranzitornih procesa. *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta* XXXVIII: 203–15.
- Halpern, J. M., and E. A. Hammel. 1970. Milenko S. Filipović 1902–1969. *American Anthropologist* N. S. 72 (3): 558–60.
- Jireček, C. 1959 [1879]. *Vlasi i Mavrovlasli u dubrovačkim spomenicima – Zbornik Konstantina Jirečeka*. Vol. I. Beograd: Naučno delo.
- Kiznije, Ž. 1996. *Etnologija Evrope*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.
- Kostić, P. 1969. Godišnji običaji u Negotinskoj Krajini. *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja* 31–32: 363–96.
- . 1992. Špiro Kulišić (Perast 1908 – Beograd 1989). *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja* 56: 389–93.
- Kosven, M. O. 1957. *Očerki istorii pervobytnoj kultury*. Moskva: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.
- . 1963. *Semejnaja obschina i patronimija*. Moskva: Akademiya Nauk SSSR.
- Kovačević, I. 2005. Iz etnologije u antropologiju Srpska etnologija u poslednje tri decenije 1975–2005. In D. Radojičić (ed.), *Etnologija i antropologija: stanje i perspektive*, pp. 11–19. Beograd: Zbornik EI SANU.
- Kulišić, Š. 1953a. Idejna i teoriska osnova u razvitku naših etnografskih muzeja. In B. M. Drobnjaković, *Zbornik Etnografskog muzeja 1901–1951*, pp. 27–31. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
- . 1953b. Porijeklo i značenje božićnog obrednog hljeba u Južnih Slovena. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* VIII: 7–47.
- . 1953c. Povodom članka B. Škerlja i J. Korošca o odnosu između arheologije i etnografije. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* VII: 360–2.
- . 1955a. Antiistorizam funkcionalne škole u etnologiji. *Pregled* 12: 298–302.
- . 1955b. O postanku slovenske zadruge. *Bilten Instituta za proučavanje folkloru* 3: 43–56.
- . 1956a. Još o funkcionalizmu u etnologiji. Odgovor dr Milenku Filipoviću. *Pregled* 7–8: 463–6.
- . 1956b. Tragovi arhaične porodice u svadbenim običajima Crne Gore i Boke Kotorske (ogled). *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* XI, Istorija i etnografija: 211–42.

- . 1957a. Arhaično bratstvo u Crnoj Gori i Hercegovini. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* XII, Istorija i etnografija. N.s.: 155–77.
- . 1957b. O postanku i karakteru našeg 'bratstva'. *Pregled* 2–3: 133–8.
- . 1958. Matrilokalni brak i materinska filijacija u narodnim običajima Bosne, Hercegovine i Dalmacije. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* XIII: 51–75.
- . 1959. Matrilokalni brak i materinska filijacija u narodnim običajima Bosne, Hercegovine i Dalmacije' (dopuna). *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* XIV: 307–9.
- . 1961a. Etnološka i folkloristička ispitivanja u Livanjskom polju: Uvod. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* XV–XVI (1): 5–20.
- . 1961b. Glavni pravci i neka osnovna teorijska pitanja u etnologiji. *Glasnik Etnografskog muzeja* 24: 5–24.
- . 1961c. Starije etničke formacije i etnički procesi u obrazovanju naroda Bosne i Hercegovine. *Pregled* 1: 9–16.
- . 1963. *Tragovi arhaične rodovske organizacije i pitanje balkansko-slovenske simbioze*. Beograd: Biblioteka Etnološkog društva Jugoslavije 5.
- . 1966. Naučno djelo dr Jovana Erdeljanovića. *Zbornik Matice srpske* 45: 92–109.
- . 1967a. O nekim problemima etničkog razvitka našeg dinarskog stanovništva i njegovihodnosa sa balkanskim starincima. *Godišnjak Akademije nauka i umjetnosti BiH* V. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja 3, pp. 191–212. Sarajevo: ANU BiH.
- . 1967b. Osvrt na razvitak naučne misli u srpskoj etnologiji'. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* XXII: 197–206.
- . 1970a. *Iz stare srpske religije. Novogodišnji običaji*. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga.
- . 1970b. Stara srpska religija i mitologija. In Š. Kulišić, P. Ž. Petrović, and N. Pantelić (eds.), *Srpski mitološki rečnik*, pp. XV–XXII. Beograd: Nolit.
- . 1973a. Zajedno sa marksizmom potiskivana je i napredna nauka. *Delo* 12: 1658–80.
- . 1973b. Značaj slovensko-balkanske i kavkaske tradicije u proučavanju stare slovenske religije I. *Godišnjak Akademije nauka i umjetnosti BiH* X. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, pp. 189–212. Sarajevo: ANU BiH.
- . 1973c. Značaj slovensko-balkanske i kavkaske tradicije u proučavanju stare slovenske religije II. *Godišnjak Akademije nauka i umjetnosti BiH* XI. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, pp. 109–83. Sarajevo: ANU BiH.

- . 1974a. Putevi i stranputice etnologije. *MIN* 19. V. (1219): 26.
- . 1974b. Značaj slovensko-balkanske i kavkaskе tradicije u proučavanju stare slovenske religije III. *Godišnjak Akademije nauka i umjetnosti BiH* XII. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, pp. 5–54. Sarajevo: ANU BiH.
- . 1979. *Stara slovenska religija u svjetlu novijih istraživanja posebno balkanoloških*. Sarajevo: Djela.
- . 1980a. Nekoliki tragovi balkanskog supstrata u etnogenezi stanovništva Crne Gore i Hercegovine. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* XXXIV/1979. Etnologija. N.s.: 7–26.
- . 1980b. *O etnogenezi Crnogoraca*. Titograd: Pobjeda.
- . 1981. O potrebi dijalektičkog proučavanja našeg dinarskog rodovskog društva. In D. D. Pejović, and I. Božić, *Predmet i metod izučavanja patrijarhalnih zajednica u Jugoslaviji. Odjeljenje društvenih nauka*, pp. 51–70. Titograd: CANU.
- , and M. Barjaktarović. 1964. Povodom jednog napisa o etnografiji, etnologiji i antropologiji. *Pregled* 10: 348–58.
- Kulišić, Š., P. Ž. Petrović, and N. Pantelić (eds.). 1998. *Srpski mitološki rečnik*. Beograd: Etnografski institut SANU.
- Lefevr, A. 1973. *S onu stranu strukturalizma*. Beograd: Komunist.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 1989 [1958]. *Strukturalna antropologija*. Zagreb: Stvarnost.
- Martine, A. 1987. *Indoevropski jezik i 'Indoevropljani'*. Novi Sad: Književna zajednica Novog Sada.
- Marx, K. 1973. *Kapital. Kritika političke ekonomije*. Vol. I–III. Beograd: BIGZ/ Prosveta.
- Meillassoux, C. 1960. Essai d'interprétation du phénomène économique dans les sociétés traditionnelles d'autosubsistance. *Cahiers d' Etudes Africaines* 4: 38–67.
- . 1981. *Maidens, Meal and Money: Capitalism and the Domestic Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, L. H. 1981 [1877]. *Drevno društvo. Istraživanja čovekovog razvoja od divljaštva i varvarstva do civilizacije*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Naumović, S. 1999. Identity Creator in Identity Crisis: Reflections on the Politics of Serbian Ethnology. *Anthropological Journal on European Cultures* 8 (2): 39–128.
- Palavestra, V. 1990. In memoriam: Špiro Kulišić (1908–1989). *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja* 45. Etnologija. N. s.: 191–3.
- Pantelić, N. 1980. Tradicionalni elementi društvene organizacije u severoistočnoj i delu centralne Srbije. *Godišnjak Akademije nauka i umjetnosti BiH* XVIII. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, knj. 16, pp. 173–99. Sarajevo: ANU BiH.

- . 1981. Tradicionalni elementi u ženidbenim običajima u severoistočnoj i delu centralne Srbije. *Godišnjak Akademije nauka i umjetnosti BiH* XIX. Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, pp. 199–229. Sarajevo: ANU BiH.
- Pavković, N., D. Bandić, and I. Kovačević. 1983. Težnje i pravci razvoja etnologije u SR Srbiji (1945–1983). *Zbornik 1. kongresa jugoslovenskih etnologov in folkloristov rogaška Slatina 5.-9.10.1983*, pp. 107–22. Ljubljana: Knjižnica Glasnika Slovenskega etnološkega društva.
- Pavković, N. F. 1995. Etno-politikološki pogledi Jovana Erdeljanovića. *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU* XLIV: 271–8.
- Petrović, S. 2000a. *Antropologija srpskih rituala*. Srpska mitologija, knj.3. Niš: Prosveta.
- . 2000b. *Sistem srpske mitologije*. Srpska mitologija, knj.1. Niš: Prosveta.
- . 2002. Prežici matrijarhatskog kulturnog modela u ritualima prelaza, posebno prilikom rođenja i svadbe. In Z. Divac (ed.), *Običaji životnog ciklusa u gradskoj sredini*, pp. 25–38. Beograd: EI SANU.
- Potechin, I. I. 1948. Funkcionalnaya shkola v etnografii na sluzhbe britanskog imperalizma. *Sovetskaya etnografiya* 3: 33–49.
- Prošić-Dvornić, M. 1997. Susret dva sveta: odnosi američke kulturne antropologije i srpske etnologije. In N. F. Pavković (ed.), *Susret dva sveta (1492–1992)*. *Zbornik radova naučnog skupa*, pp. 67–77. Beograd: Filozofski fakultet, Centar za etnološko-antropološka istraživanja.
- Rakić, R. D. 1970. Zajednička i granična problematika etnologije i sociologije: proučavanje društvenog života. *Radovi 11. Savetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, 175–90. Zenica: Muzej grada Zenice.
- Rusić, B. 1954. Etnografija ili etnologija? *Zbornik Matice srpske* 8. Serija društvenih nauka, pp. 56–66.
- Simpozijum o srednjovjekovnom katunu*. 1963. Sarajevo: Naučno društvo SR Bosne i Hercegovine.
- Sahlins, M. D. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Šufraj, M. 1925. *Srbi i Arbanasi (i njihova simbioza u srednjem vijeku)*. Beograd: Biblioteka Arhiva za arbansku starinu, jezik i etnologiju.
- Vujović, D. 1981. O etnogenezi Crnogoraca i marksističkom opredjeljenju nacije. *Praksa* 4: 57–85.
- Vukčević, N. 1981. *Etničko porijeklo Crnogoraca*. Beograd: N. Vukčević.