

39(497.6)(091)
316.7(497.6)(091)

Bogdan D. Drazheta
Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology
Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade
e-mail: drazetab@gmail.com

ETHNOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA: PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

Abstract: The paper presents a brief overview of the situation of ethnology and anthropology in Bosnia and Herzegovina, from their constitution as disciplines to the contemporary period, in various socio-economic systems and cultural frameworks, as well as, about some indications how they may develop in further. Previous researches in this area, come mostly from authors' pen from "developed" countries, as well as domestic authors who have been educated and trained at the local universities. Their focus is largely based on issues related to war conflicts and post-war social reality. However, before the beginning of the war in 1992, the Department of Ethnology of the National Museum in Sarajevo directed its attention more to the traditional culture of certain "ethnographic micro-regions". Due to the connection with the museum but not with the academic institutions, ethnology in Bosnia and Herzegovina did not experience anthropological transformation that affected Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia during the seventies of the last century. Several attempts to establish it at universities did not bear fruit. How this discipline will develop further is a big question. However, its further shaping has the potential to examine past and present cultural and social processes in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this way, one gets an insight into how the complexity of this area can in the future be an incentive to some future research and developments.

Key words: ethnology and anthropology, Bosnia and Herzegovina, history of discipline, ethnological and anthropological research, development perspective

Ethnology and Anthropology Brief History in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Ethnology and anthropology in Bosnia and Herzegovina was founded by the establishment of the National Museum in Sarajevo in 1888, specifically the Ethnological Department within this institution.¹ The work of this department

¹ The first four years after the founding, the Archaeological and Ethnological department operated as one unit, than in 1892 Ethnology Department became separated unit and, finally, in 1913 it was settled in the pavilion of the museum where it still operates (Popić Filipović 2012: 1-4). Today, the museum has four Departments, listed in this order:

had its developmental stages, starting with Austro-Hungarian rule, over the period of the Kingdom of Serbs of Croats and Slovenes /Kingdom of Yugoslavia and socialist Yugoslavia, until the last war (1992-1995) and the contemporary period. As early as 1889, Department started publishing *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu*, which continued until the nineties of the last century, in the capacity of the oldest museum magazine in these areas (Bajić 2012: 189). The literary folklore magazine *Bosanska vila* published texts in the form of ethnographic articles at the end of the XIX and beginning of the 20th century. Somewhere at that time, the work of Jovan Cvijić in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as his students began (Drljača i Rakić 1999: 400-401).² During the existence of the Kingdom of Serbs of Croats and Slovenes / Yugoslavia, the work of the museum stagnated, mainly due to financial difficulties (Bajić 2012: 191). Beside National Museum, the Museum of Vrbas Banovina was founded in Banja Luka in 1930, where ethnologists worked on museological and scientific-research activities. After the Second World War, the establishment of several regional and local museums and the Institute of Folklore at the National Museum pointed to some shifts. These shifts were reflected into undertaking collective ethnological researches, in about a dozen geographical regions (Drljača and Rakić 1999: 401-403) had being processed. There is also a special study on above mentioned and other regional and local museum complexes with ethnological collections, throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina (Leka 2017).

Milenko S. Filipovic scientific opus in the period before and, especially, after World War II, was directed to the research of many regions in Bosnia, although this “disciplinary ancestor” had certain objections to the work of the ethnological institutions in BiH itself. Namely, in his article *Ethnological (ethnographic) work in Bosnia and Herzegovina* from 1955, he criticized the activities of various experts of the National Museum during the Austro-Hungarian administration in BiH, stating their deliberate distraction from ethnic and national reality, for the sake of deceiving visitors.³ Professionalism, in his opinion, should had been a criterion for studying this space, and not sponsors from Belgrade, Zagreb, or Vienna, “to scramble” who, how and where will investigate (Miljković Matić 2012: 74-77). In addition, he considered that the entire folk life could not be viewed equally and uniformly in this area, so the extensive studies with a certain specific

Department of Material Culture, Department of Spiritual Culture, Conservation Unit and Documentation Department. “Ethnology Department of the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina”, available at: <http://www.zemaljskimuzej.ba/bs/etnology>, last visit 21.10.2018.

2 As Milan Karanovic writes, it turns out that Jovan Cvijić did not come across the broader support of all that time researchers of folk life. Cvijić’s *Instructions for the Study of Villages in Bosnia and Herzegovina* from 1898 were received by Priest Stjepa Trifkovic, but they were never accepted in full by all those who could follow them (Karanovic 1937a: 101-109, Karanovic 1937b: 186- 191).

3 Milenko Filipovic’s daughter, Radmila Filipović-Fabijanić, wrote a similar article entitled *Brief overview and characteristics of ethnological work in BiH in the period 1945-1969* (Filipović-Fabijanić 1970: 155-159).

aspect needed to be realized (for example, nutrition or economics). Bosnia represents a “grateful area for ethnological research”, because its population possesses many “archaic elements” in culture, although in the research process had to be taken into consideration the chronology, geographic distribution and role, i.e., the function of these elements of culture.⁴ However, as he criticized the research work focused only on “archaic” forms of culture, Špiro Kulišić, his friend and colleague, and ethnology lecturer at the Department of Geography at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo,⁵ felt personally insulted. The result was a theoretical-methodological but also “interpersonal” discord between the two of them, detailed elaborated in a special work (Gorunović 2006: 185-204). Rad Milenko S. Filipovic in the ethnological and anthropological research of Bosnia and Herzegovina, is important for the comprehension of the overall complexity of this region, as stated by other authors (Miljkovic Matic 2018: 104-106, 117-119; Glucevic and et al., 1962: 13-24).

Yugoslav ethnology in Bosnia and Herzegovina formed experts for one specific area, or “ethnographic micro region” (already mentioned geographical regions), from which the large ethnographic archives were created “descriptive and highly technical”. Due to the connection with the museum but not with the academic institutions, ethnology in Bosnia and Herzegovina did not experience anthropological transformation that affected Serbia,⁶ Croatia and Slovenia during the seventies of the last century (Kurtović 2014a: 46-49).⁷ Experts saw Sarajevo as a starting station on a career path to a “better” business position. However, the researches of the then employees of the National Museum created a recognizable model of ethnographic research, called the *Sarajevo School of Ethnology*. Teamwork, standardized questionnaires and audio-visual materials collected during the study of the given geographical area are just some of the features of this school. Milenko Filipovic’s criticism of “methodological debauchery” also echoed after his death in 1969, although these changes were slow, with the lack of wider institutional support for their implementation on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Kurtović 2014b: 305-327).

4 Some of these Filipovic works related to Bosnia have been entitled: *Life and folk customs k in Visocka nahija* (Filipovic 1949), *Rama in Bosnia* (Filipovic 1955) or *Popovo in Herzegovina - Anthropogeographical view* (Filipovic and Micevic 1959). Similar is Radmila Kajmaković monograph on *Semberija* (Kajmaković 1974), as well as the efforts of Đorđe Pejanović to show the historical and demographic development of the population of BiH (Pejanović 1955).

5 In the period from 1950 to 1962, when this department was abolished.

6 The transformation of Serbian ethnology, beginning in the 1970s, was worked out concisely by Ivan Kovačević, reflecting on romantic nineteenth-century and its pre-war roots (Kovačević 2005: 11-18). Slobodan Naumović dealt with the same topic from the angle of social, economic and political processes (Naumović 2002: 7-37).

7 About the similar development of Croatian and Slovenian ethnology see the works of Jasna Čapo and Valentina Gulin Zrnić, and Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin and Rajko Mursić (Rihtman-Auguštin 1994: 151-158; Čapo and Gulin Zrnić 2014: 49-62; Mursić 2003: 113-125 Mursić 2017: 55-69).

During the eighties of the 20th century ethnologists from the National Museum began to explore the effects of modernization, new living conditions among people and urban areas. During the war, they collected information about the everyday life of the inhabitants of Sarajevo, and even two exhibitions were organized in the museum.⁸ After signing the Dayton Agreement in 1995, two volumes of *Glasnik* came out, and during the war, one common for the whole Museum. Three field researches were conducted by employees, financed by several state ministries. The museum was also damaged during the war activities in the area of Sarajevo. The lack of a common Ministry of Culture of BiH on a state level, caused the National Museum to depend on short-term donations, so it was provisionally closed in October 2012, while employees' salaries were not paid back in months (Kurtović 2014a: 46-49). However, in 2015, the museum was reopened, although the issue of debt amounting to about 1.5 million euros has not yet been resolved.⁹ The intense work of the staff of the National Museum in Sarajevo was between 1947 and 1957, when the collections dedicated to the material and spiritual culture of the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina were increased. Many items were then purchased, such as peasant household items, tools for production, tools for agriculture, hunting, fishing, textiles and other activities, as well as folk costumes. They served as the basis for strategic planning of further purchases in the so-called *White Book (Bijela knjiga)*. Thus, up to 15,500 artefacts were collected until 1992, while today's ethnographic collection contains slightly more than 18,000 cases and nearly 300 sets of costumes (Bajić 2012: 191-192).

However, the National Museum is not the only institution where ethnologists worked. At the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Banja Luka, ethnology was appended to geography studies in 1994. However, after two school years, the geographical department went under the jurisdiction of the Department of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and instead of two-dimensional studies of geography and ethnology, tourism was introduced. In addition to the initiative to reintroduce ethnology studies at the Faculty of Philosophy in Banja Luka, such developments did not happened (Rakić i Drljača 1999: 398-400). The interest in social and cultural anthropology in Bosnia and Herzegovina has grown lately,¹⁰ primarily thanks to experts educated in the

8 All museum artefacts during the war conflicts were saved (Popić Filipović 2012: 1-4).

9 „Otvoren Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine”, Al Jazeera Balkans, 15.9.2015, available at: <http://balkans.aljazeera.net/vijesti/otvoren-zemaljski-muzej-bosne-i-hercegovine>, last visited on 21.10.2018.

10 I was a witness myself of a person's from BiH interest for doctoral studies in ethnology and anthropology at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, and the latter enrolment. There were also several other people who wanted to enrol BA studies in Ethnology, but did not have where to do it. At BA studies at the Department of Geography of the Faculty of Science in Sarajevo, there is a compulsory course *Ethnology of Bosnia and Herzegovina* (applied approach), as well as an optional subject *Ethnology* (general approach). “Tourism and Environmental Protection Studies”, available at: <http://www>.

West, as well as literature published in Serbia and Croatia. In this relation, in the next section of this paper will be discussed the ethnological and anthropological researches in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the last war. During the school year 2009/2010 in the frames of the master program of the Faculty of Political Sciences in Sarajevo, the module entitled *Introduction to Socio cultural Anthropology*, led by colleague Larisa Kurtović, was organized and implemented. In a special work she summarizes her efforts regarding to the establishing this MA program, and also giving insights into student topics and works created on the basis of ethnographic research in the area of Sarajevo, determining the notion of *social-cultural anthropology (društvenokulturna antropologija)*. For her it is “a compound of two interrelated and never explicitly separate scientific traditions – of ‘British’ social and of American cultural anthropology - which emerged through systematization comparative study of non-western cultures aiming to find an answer to the ambitious question ‘what does it mean being human?’”. The author draws the disciplinary historical thread between early folkloristic and museum studies, through the ethnological during the socialism, to the present day efforts Social cultural anthropology to attain appropriate position at Bosnian-Herzegovinian Universities (Kurtović 2011: 359-383). As can be seen, several attempts to establish the academic and University discipline failed. Domestic scientific production gave a work worthy of attention, which gives (auto)reflexive retrospective on field research (Beljkasic-Hadžidedic 2007). There is also the work on the logs and folk architecture of the population of Bosnia (Bugarski 2009), as well as the accompanying study by Aise Softic regarding the second edition of Antun Hangi’s book on the customs of Muslims in BiH (Softic 2009: 459-533). The same author dealt with the Bosniaks’ oral traditions (Softic 2005), and Nirha Efendić with Bosniak oral lyrics (Efendic 2015). Dželal Ibraković dealt with the historical and ethnological aspects of Bosnia and Bosniaks (Ibraković 2008). There is also the work on Bosniaks’ funeral customs (Križanec-Beganović 2017: 233-253). Branko Pjević dealt with the Serbs’ traditional culture in Sarajevo Plain (Pjević 1998). One aspect of this system of values that author analyzes more detailed, is focused on female yarnning parties, villages and villagers common gatherings. He systematise the typology and definitions of thosenotions in the historical-demographic and spatial context, where they were studied (Pjevic 2008, 33-73). Studies of the everyday culture of Usore (Katić 2011), Ravne-Brčko region (Katić i Marčetić 2014) and New Travnik region (Katić i Bugarin 2016) are important in the context of analysis of the “ethnographic micro regions”. How ethnology and anthropology will continue to develop in this area is a big issue. Besides the efforts of individuals, it can be said that the state not recognizes the importance of studying people that live on the ground, since there is no attempts

pmf.unsa.ba/geografija/files/I%20ciklus/Turizam_i_zatita_ivotne_sredine.pdf, last visit on October 21, 2018. Course with the same title *Ethnology* is in the curriculum of master studies at the Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Political Sciences in Sarajevo. All these courses are taught by Dželal Ibraković. “Department of sociology master studies”, available at: http://fpn.unsa.ba/b/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/B-SOC-NNP_MA-2015-161.pdf, last visit on October 21, 2018.

to help people who work in museums, while on the other hand leaves this field being at the mercy to the amateurs and self-appointed experts. Exactly because of that it has never been firmly academically grounded as science, ethnology and anthropology is now in such a difficult situation, pawning as “the product of its political-economic context” (Kurtović 2016: electronic message, 9-10.2016).

However, Bosnia and Herzegovina and its ethnology was not a lonely example in socialist Yugoslavia. Ethnology in the other two republics within the former state, did not get its place on the scientific scene, as was the case in Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia. The development of ethnology in Macedonia is closely related to the development of Serbian ethnology, not only in teaching, but also in the field of scientific thought. At the Faculty of Philosophy in Skopje, at the Department of Geography, course in Ethnology was taught from the school year 1922/1923. In 1927, an Ethnological Seminar was set up where Vojislav Radovanovic and Milenko Filipovic were engaged. Their student, Vera Klichkova, led the Ethnology Department at the National Museum of Macedonia from 1945. On the other hand, one of Tihomir Djordjevic and Jovan Erdeljanovic students Branislav Rusic,¹¹ led the Ethnological Seminar until the school year 1952/1953. year, when this group was abolished (Malinov 2018: 101-116). Further development is reflected in the complete suppression and placement of ethnology as one course in the curriculum of Geography studies, and than in 1988 studies in ethnology were reopened at the Institute of Geography. In 2005, the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology was established as an organizational unit within the Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (Risteski 2017: 7-9).

In Montenegro, the situation resembles that of Macedonia or Bosnia and Herzegovina. The developmental path of ethnological and anthropological discipline takes place in several institutions, with the absence of its academic foundation and wider affirmation. In 1951, the Ethnographic Museum of Montenegro was established in Cetinje and was incorporated into the National Museum of Montenegro in 1964, in which ethnographic units also operated the Association of Ethnologists of Montenegro (1978-1985). The Committee on Ethnology at the Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts was founded in 1973, and then focused its attention on researching traditional culture and regional ethnographic studies. For the first time, ethnology as an academic course was introduced at the Faculty of Cultural Studies in Cetinje in 1981. Since 1994, the Ethnology course at Sociology studies at the Faculty of Philosophy in Niksic has been introduced, and according to the current curriculum it is present today.¹² In the last twenty years there are projects presenting and preserving cultural heritage, with the help of the workers of various local and other museums

¹¹ Professor Rusic was also involved in establishing the Institute for Folklore in Skopje in 1950, today's Institute “Marko Cepenkov”.

¹² There are other anthropological courses in sociology and psychology studies. These are the *Introduction to Sociocultural Anthropology*, *Cultural Anthropology*, *Anthropology of Contemporary and Popular Culture* and *Anthropology of Popular Culture*. “University of Montenegro - Lidija Vujačić”, available at: <https://www.ucg.ac.me/radnik/190981-vujacic-lidija>, last visit on October 21, 2018. At the Faculty of

(Vujacic 2005: 45-53; Djukic, Popovic and Vucinic Neskovic 2014: 199-206). These two ethnological traditions are given just for comparison with the state of ethnology in Bosnia, and all three are distinguished by being largely marginalized in SFRY. Perhaps in some of the next studies could be examined in more detail the course of the disciplinary developments in each of the six Yugoslav republics, and elaborate the situation of the above three in a broader socio-economic and political context, which is certainly not the subject of this paper.

What was studied and what is being studied in or about Bosnia and Herzegovina?

In this section I will deal with the topics studied in Bosnia and Herzegovina by foreign ethnologists and anthropologists as well as domestic ones with foreign education.¹³ In this regard, a certain range of topics are considered as “good” for studying in this area. Thus it can be noticed that after the war (1992-1995) in the context of economic, political and social transformations, BiH became an attractive ground for ethnographic research. Larisa Kurtović does not observe the “flowering” of these topics as “necessarily a bad thing in Bosnian ethnology”, especially since the researchers from outside managed to give “useful insights regarding the postwar economy, political affiliation and international intervention.” However, there is anxiety that the previous generation ethnologist of various experts may be completely forgotten, leaving the terrain for those who come “from aside” to further design. According to her, we should recall those who were there before us and explore, in order to provide the basis for those who are investigating today “which can give Bosnia a completely new generation of ethnographers.” Therefore, “it remains to be seen whether the moment of the crisis will be turned into a space of opportunity” (Kurtović 2014a: 49-51).

When it comes to the work of foreign authors, during the existence of the SFRY, two monographs emerged from the study of ethnic and economic relations in the 1970s in a village in Central Bosnia (Lockwood 1975), as well as on the constructing processes of the ethnic and religious identity of Bosnian rural Muslims during the eighties (Rand Bringa 1991). Everyday life during the war in Sarajevo was analyzed by Ivan Maček, living all the time in this town (Maček 2009). In the same area, Larisa Kurtović dealt with cultural events during the war. 182 theatre performances, 170 exhibitions and 48 concerts were held from 1992 to 1996. Radio ZID did not interrupt broadcasts, while the group of enthusiasts printed postcards, where everyday warfare was mocking (Kurtović 2015: 197-224). After the war, there are topics such as inter-ethnic reconciliation in Brčko

Political Sciences in Podgorica there is a course *Political anthropology*, at BA and MA studies (Đukić, Popović and Vučinić Nešković 2014: 200).

13 When I say *domestic anthropologists*, I mean ethnologists-anthropologists from the territory of the former Yugoslavia, scientifically, culturally and linguistically similar, so that they can be treated as one group. I note that this text does not mention the research of all authors who dealt with BiH after the war, but only those I get familiar with by searching, reading and talking with my colleagues.

and Mostar (Moore 2008, 2013, 2016), than search for social connections and their involvement in humanitarian actions in a small town in the north of BiH (Brković 2012, 2014, 2016) or the construction of social relations and everyday practices in relation to the categories, procedures and priorities of local and global actors who are transforming the Bosnian-Herzegovinian society (Jansen, Brković and Čelebičić 2017). In his ethnographic research, Stef Jansen focused on the desire of ordinary people for “normal life”, primarily the inhabitants of the Dobrinja district of Sarajevo. The influence of the institutional structure on understanding citizens own standard of living was explored through attitudes and behaviours in urban transport, the functioning of one primary and secondary school before, during and after the civil war, as well as local community (Jansen 2015). In addition, he in a special article presented the problem of *boundaries* and their materialization in the space in the case of the division of Sarajevo. Who, how, when, and with what purpose creates boundaries that will later shape the everyday life of people in an area, is an anthropological question, considers this author (Jansen 2013: 23-36).

Peter Locke, from the perspective of medical anthropology, tried to find out how the clinical diagnosis of entire groups of people in Sarajevo is used as a mask to conceal real political, economic and social dissatisfaction. Namely, foreign investments in post-war psychiatric research and training of employees whose task is to help residents with war trauma did not bear fruit “in practice”. Local NGOs and medical institutions are trying to adapt and apply mental health science results from the West to local problems, creating a gap between themselves and Sarajevo citizens (Biehl and Locke 2010: 327-337). Torsten Kolind worked on post-war narratives about experienced traumas. The research was carried out in Stolac in Herzegovina among Bosniak community, whose members decided to return to their homes after the war. His conclusions go from one site where people can not wage war and ethnic politics from their narratives to the opposite side, where ethnic categories became unclear in a relation to the environment in which people live and that what is being propagated by official ideologies (Povrzanović Frykman 2003 : 62-63; Kolind 2002). Anders Stefansson also investigated the return of refugees to their homes, along with an existing narrative of reconciliation which protagonists were mostly international institutions. Ethnographic studies were conducted in Sarajevo and Banja Luka (Stefansson 2007: 59-77; Stefansson 2010: 62-76).

Andrew Gilbert explored how and to what extent the western concepts of state-building, democratization and development have “rooted” in BiH after signing the Dayton Agreement. The context of the post-war refugee return and the attempts of domestic and foreign actors to build a new and different society is compared to what people think of the past (historical imagination) and what they realize as politically possible (political imagination) at the present time (Gilbert 2017). Azra Hromadzic is working on one interesting topic in her works. Her focus on teachers and students of the Mostar High School indicates the complete intricacies of what the ruling ideologies (on an ethnic basis) propagate. Although the classes within the High School are ethnically separated, the students *mix*

them up (se mijeshaju) while smoking cigarettes or chatting in the common areas (library, informatics room, toilets, and chamber). Teachers of Croat and Bosniak nationality “unite” during a strike for increasing their salaries and respecting their status in society in 2006, although they had been sitting on opposite sides of the Chamber until then. The author thinks that everybody felt “abandoned” by the local and state administration as *unsatisfied citizens*, regardless of how they expressed themselves. So these practices are not in line with the ethnicification of everyday life in post-war BiH, where the ethnic question became the main issue in educational structures and politics (Hromadžić 2011: 269-286; Hromadžić 2012: 30-48; Hromadžić 2015: 1-17, Hromadžić 2017).

Elena Bassi dealt with the influence of the boundary perception in the space, based on ethnographic research of spatial narratives and practices of the Sarajevo and East Sarajevo inhabitants. Combining “top-bottom” and “bottom-top” approaches, interviewing institutional leaders and residents of both parts of the city, the author found that the existence of the border does not “disturb” everyday practice, regardless of the symbolic marking of the territory through flags, street names and the construction of religious objects (Bassi 2013: 69-79; Bassi 2014: 105; Bassi 2015: 101-113). Zaira Ticiano Lofranko (Lofranko 2012: 179-209) dealt with the issue of property-legal relations in various legal-political frameworks in BiH, as well as in the relation with Sarajevo refugees and discontinuities in housing policies. Ondrej Žila dealt with the population dynamics of the three majority people (*narodi*) (1971-1991) and interethnic tensions, which rose before the beginning of the war in the context of an ever worse socio-economic situation at the federal, Yugoslav level. The same author investigated the perception of home among the refugee populations, with an existing myth of return. Restitution of property does not imply a re-sense of the existence of a *home* in those who have settled down with life elsewhere, because that notion also includes a way of life, much more than the location itself (Žila 2013: 5-25; : 130-145). Fren Markovic gives the readers an introduction to the narratives and practices of the inhabitants of Sarajevo in the context of understanding the buildings, monuments, museums, streets, history and other urban aspects. She states that in her book, she seeks to study “how ‘Sarajlije’ manage, negotiate, reproduce and change what they think they are, on different levels: within the authoritative history discourses, in interaction with the government, through their encounters for the built environment and in relation to other people with whom they share the same neighborhood, city, country and continent” (Markovitz 2010). Elisa L. Helms dealt with women’s activism within the NGOs and political institutions in the Bosniak community. Her doctoral dissertation is based on the two-year fieldwork of female activists and their participation in the formation of gender and ethno-religious identities (Helms 2003). Larisa Jašarević elaborated the arrival of Moroccan healer Meki Torabi in Sarajevo in the period from 2010-2011 year. On that occasion, she looked at his public healing from the angle of the *New Age* “trend” over the last few decades, i.e. people’s desire to feel security and others’ empathy in difficult circumstances. In a similar way, she also treated

the gathering of people from different parts of the world at the so-called Bosnian pyramids in Visoko. This, certainly, anthropological phenomenon encourages people to think, glorify, speak and act outside the framework imposed by the modern world, says the author (Jašarević 2014: 1-13; Jašarević 2017: 179-193). Xavier Bugarel, along with Elisa L. Helms and Ger Duijzings edited a collection of works titled *The New Bosnian Mosaic*. Many of the authors I mentioned in the previous section gave their contribution in this three-part extensive set of different articles. Symbolic titles of the section (*Behind the Ethnicity, Behind the Ancient Hatred, Behind the Protectorate*) portray the multi-layered views from “the bottom” to the contemporary problems that the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina face. The Proceedings gives an insight into the thematic opus of post-war researchers in B&H (Bougarel, Helms and Duijzings 2007).

The concept of “antagonistic tolerance”, applied through the work on the project with the same title, points to the joint competitive use of religious sites, and provides a starting point for the study of multireligious environments. Different communities are mutually tolerant, and their members live “harmoniously in close proximity to one another”. On the other hand, these communities are at the same time antagonistic because every community singularly sees itself as different from others (Hayden 2002: 205-219; Hayden et al., 2016). The positioning of a religious community through the control of key religious sites is the starting historical basis, and it is necessary that religious groups have a degree of syncretism (Hayden et al., 2016: 19-20), which in the case of the people’s folk religion (Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats) from the South Slavic area should not be specifically proven (Duranović 2011: 69-142; 193-195; Bandić 2008: 55-67; Čvrljak 1984: 97-123). This model was largely developed by the American anthropologist Robert M. Heiden, who states that ethnic and religious communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina have developed a consciousness of their specific group identity, although media and scientific circles have presented an image of multicultural paradise (Hayden 2007: 105-117). Larisa Kurtović conducted her research in Jajce, where she analyzed, throughout the female interlocutors’ stories, the relationship between the electoral successes of political parties and the perception of this framework by people, sometimes inadvertently oriented towards the reproduction of the current state of affairs. In this way, the ethno-political framework of BiH becomes additionally further problematical (Kurtović 2011: 242-253).

Mart Bax produced an ethnography about Medjugorje in Herzegovina, a place of pilgrimage for many members of the Roman Catholic faith in the world. His research was contested because he stated that the alleged supernatural appearances began to occur at a time when the Franciscan Order began to lose its centuries-old authority in BiH. The lack of respondents and written sources are the main points of criticism, which is explained in detail. Bax was called “a cheater,” and his book “degradation of all scientific works” (Jolić 2012, 309-328 according to: Bax 1995). While Scott Bolens dealt with cities divided on ethnic, political and other grounds in the world, and Sarajevo and Mostar as well, combining an ethnographic method with extensive factography (Bollens 2001:

169-187; Bollens 2007: 83-129; 167-202) Vani D'Aleccio tried to see the phenomena of such urban environments through the notion of the *disputed* city. This means that the state does not have formal legal jurisdiction in resolving problems in the city, and such entities can even serve as a polygon for examining the socio-economic aspects of modernization. This enlarges the notion of a divided city on large world metropolises such London, Paris, New York, etc. where, due to social stratification, the city does not represent a single, cohesive whole (D'Alessio 2013: 451-480).

Exploring how residents remember in Mostar, through the statements of members of the three generations who talked about events from the past, Monika Palmberger introduces the concept of *generational positioning*, because it is precisely the current life situations and experiences of the students who formulate a recollection of the past. Public discourse, Croatian and Bosniac, is compared to these statements and perceives generational similarities, besides the proclaimed national (Palmberger 2016). The culture of memories in Srebrenica and the relation of the international factor to all of this were dealt with by Lara Nettfield and Sara E. Wagner (Nettfield and Wagner 2015), while Kimberly Coles studied electoral practices under the auspices of foreign interventionism (Coles 2007). Federica Tarabusi tried to follow the work of an Italian NGO in BiH (Tarabusa 2010), and Julie En Roberts studied war crimes against children (Roberts 2011). Jorgen Vien analyzed interethnic relations and ethnicity among the youth in Brčko, in relation to the ethno-political structure and a different culture of memory among Bosniacs, Serbs and Croats (Wien 2017).

Giulia Carabelli studied urbicide, i.e. radical architectural changes, which also reflected on social relations in Mostar during 2009 and 2010. Walking has proven to be an adequate reflexive practice, because observation, writing field notes and data gathering happen during a walk. The author's observation is that the city has not become a place for all its inhabitants over time, which could be felt through informal conversations with various people. Carabelli also conducted a research related to the implementation of the project *(Re)collecting Mostar*, directed by the organization Abart in 2009. The aim of the project was to see how the public spaces are used in Mostar as memory sites, and then to rethink how divisions can be overcome with the holding of exhibitions, workshops and artistic performances in "border" areas (Carabelli 2013: 48-63; 2014: 201-206; 2016: 116-128). Yanis Armakolas used an ethnographic method for studying the narratives and spatial practices of Serbs who started living in Pale after the war towards the city of Sarajevo, where they lived before the war. His cultural background and relationship with the local community helped him the methodological position and other problems during the research to overcome auto reflexively. Although he had a language barrier, he had no obstacles communicating to the people, which was conditioned not only by his ethnicity, but by the hospitality of a small group of people he met earlier (Armakolas 2001: 165-182; Armakolas 2007: 79-99).

The problem of language barrier was highlighted by two researchers with whom I had an electronic correspondence. Adam Mur immediately pointed out

that he considered himself “an outsider”, with no well known connections in the region and without good language skills for communication. While he had a fairly open communication with local politicians and other respondents in Brcko, to whom he could say that he works on a comparative study of the two cities, in Mostar the case was completely opposite. Being a researcher of the process of building peace in both cities, it was obvious that in Mostar it was not a case, so he quickly understood that he can not tell the interlocutors they would be “material for comparison” (Adam Moore, electronic message: 15 -27.11.2016). Although had a wider language knowledge than Moore, Peter Locke apology immediately after mailing me his paper, notifying: “there is a lot of things that I haven’t done right in ethnographic work, including the failure to quote key colleagues as well as huge generalization of certain things in regards to Bosniacs. So I hope you are going to read my paper generously.” This failure he also relates in a matter of above mentioned cultural barrier (Peter Locke, electronic mail: 11-12.04.2017). At the beginning, I was not aware of the language barrier. Quickly I discovered the advantage of adequate understanding with my interlocutors, starting my own researches on identification processes in the context of holidays and economy in Mostar and Sarajevo, at the end of 2017. What I perceived while working, things sometimes seem “closer” to me, as someone who can “understand” a culture of people.

Final considerations and future ethnology and anthropology in Bosnia and Herzegovina

Presenting a brief outline of the state of arts of the ethnology and anthropology in Bosnia and Herzegovina, from its constitution to the contemporary period, throughout distinctive socio-economic systems and cultural frameworks, I tried to introduce the readers and scientific community with the context. Annoying research of this company, almost always came from the author of “developers”, as well as the home’s authors who were studying and attending at that university. Previous research in this field, mostly comes from the pen of the authors from “developed” countries, as well as domestic authors who have been educated and trained at the western universities. Once again, I note that this text does not notifies all researches of all authors who dealt with BiH after the war, but the ones I came across in search, reading and talking with my colleagues. Their focus is largely based on issues related to war conflicts and post-war social reality. However, before the beginning of the war in 1992, the Department of Ethnology of the National Museum in Sarajevo directed its attention more to the traditional culture of certain “ethnographic micro-regions”. Due to the connection with the museum but not with the academic institutions, ethnology in Bosnia and Herzegovina did not experience anthropological transformation that affected Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia during the seventies of the last century. Several attempts to establish anthropology as university and academic discipline did not bear fruit. How this discipline will develop in further is a big question. However, its further shaping has the potential to examine past

and present cultural and social processes in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In this way, one gets an insight into how the complexity of this area can in the future be an incentive to some future research and developments. Whether the recognition and attractiveness of studying, generally speaking, of culture, will come to the “agenda” does not depend only on the “top” factors. An important factor is what is done “from below”, so what individuals can do on that issue. While on one hand, development is possible in the direction of further strengthening the ethnological museum basis, on the other hand, combining this basis with a potential academic approach, promises a bright future for ethnology and anthropology in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Sources:

„Одјељење за етнологију Земаљског музеја Босне и Херцеговине”, available at: <http://www.zemaljskimuzej.ba/bs/etnologija>, last visit 21.10.2018.

„Odsjek sociologija master studij”, available at: http://fpn.unsa.ba/b/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/B-SOC-NNP_MA-2015-161.pdf, last visit 21.10.2018.

„Otvoren Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine”, Al Jazeera Balkans, 15.9.2015, available at: <http://balkans.aljazeera.net/vijesti/otvoren-zemaljski-muzej-bosne-i-hercegovine>, last visit 21.10.2018.

„Smjer turizam i zaštita životne sredine”, available at: http://www.pmf.unsa.ba/geografija/files/I%20ciklus/Turizam_i_zatita_ivotne_sredine.pdf, last visit 21.10.2018.

„Univerzitet Crne Gore – Lidija Vujačić”, available at: <https://www.ucg.ac.me/radnik/190981-vujacic-lidija>, last visit 21.10.2018.

References:

Вујачић, Лидија. 2005. „Етнологија и антропологија у Црној Гори (институционални и професионални оквири)”. У *Етнологија и антропологија – сјање и перспективе*, ур. Драгана Радојичић, 11-19. Београд: Етнографски институт САНУ.

Глушчевић, Манојло, Милош Бјеловитић, Неџад Хаџидедић и Јован Трифуновски. 1962. “Живот и рад проф. др Миленка С. Филиповића – поводом шездесетгодишњице живота”. *Географски преглед* VI: 13-24.

Дрљача Душан и Радомир Д. Ракић 1999. “Етнологија у Републици Српској и српски духовни простор”. У *Српски духовни простор*, ур. Милорад Екмечић, 391-421. Бања Лука и Српско Сарајево: Академија наука и умјетности Републике Српске, Научни скупови Књига 1, Одјељење друштвених наука, Књига 1.

Ковачевић, Иван. 2005. “Из етнологије у антропологију – српска етнологија у последње три деценије 1975-2000”. У *Етнологија и антропологија – сјање и перспективе*, ур. Драгана Радојичић, 11-19. Београд: Етнографски институт САНУ.

Миљковић Матић, Јелена А. 2012. “Миленко Филиповић у српској етнологији”. Докторска дисертација, Универзитет у Београду.

Миљковић Матић, Јелена. 2018. *Миленко С. Филиповић и национална наука*. Београд: Институт за политичке студије.

Пејановић, Ђорђе. 1955. “Становништво Босне и Херцеговине”. *Посебна издања Српске академије наука*, књига ССХХХХ, *Одељење друштвених наука*, Нова серија књига 12. Београд: Српска академија наука.

Пејевић, Бранко. 1998. “Традиционална култура Срба Сарајевског поља”. Дипломски рад, Универзитет у Београду.

Пејевић, Бранко. 2008. “Традиционална сеоска окупљања и забаве, као социокултурни феномен с посебним освртом на сијела и прела у Сарајевском пољу и околини”. *Башићинар* VI (11-12): 33-73.

Карановић, Милан. 1937а. “Цвијићеви напори око проучавања Босне” *Просвета*, 15.02.1937, 101-109. <http://www.infobiro.ba/>.

Карановић, Милан. 1937б. “Цвијићеви напори око проучавања Босне II” *Просвета*, 15.03.1937, 186-191. <http://www.infobiro.ba/>.

Филиповић, Миленко С. 1949. “Живот и обичаји народни у Вискочкој нахији”. *Српски етнографски зборник*, књига LXI, *Животи и обичаји народни*, књига 27. Београд: Српска академија наука

Филиповић, Миленко С. 1955. “Рама у Босни”. *Српски етнографски зборник*, књига LXIX. Београд: Српска академија наука.

Филиповић, Миленко С. и Љубо Мићевић. 1959. “Попово у Херцеговини – Антропоеографски приказ”. *Дјела*, књига XV, *Одељење историјско-филолошких наука*, књига 11. Сарајево: Научно друштво НР Босне и Херцеговине.

Armakolas, Ioannis. 2001. “A Field Trip to Bosnia: The Dilemmas of the First-Time Researcher”. In *Researching Violently Divided Societies: Ethical and Methodological Issues*, eds. Marie Smyth and Gillian Robinson, 165-183. Tokyo and New York: United Nations University Press.

Armakolas, Ioannis. 2007. “Sarajevo No More? Identity and the Experience of Place among Bosnian Serb Sarajevans in *Republika Srpska*”. In *The New Bosnian Mosaic: Identities, Memories and Moral Claims in a Post-War Society*, eds. Xavier Bougarel, Elissa Helms and Ger Duijzings, 79-99. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Вајић, Светлана. 2012. “Етнолошко одјелjenje Земаљског музеја Босне и Херцеговине у Сарајеву (1888. - 2012.)”. *Informatica museologica* Vol. 43, No. 1-4: 189-197.

Бандић, Душан. 2008. *Carstvo zemaljsko i carstvo nebesko*. Београд: XX век.

Bassi, Elena. 2013. “Sarajevo: divided or redoubled? Regulations, representations and practices across the boundary”. PhD diss., Università degli studi di Milano-Biocca.

Bassi, Elena. 2014. “Divided Sarajevo. Representations and Sense of Belonging across the Boundary”. *Social Analysis* Vol. 4, No. 1-2: 93-107.

Bassi, Elena. 2015. "Divided Sarajevo: space management, urban landscape and spatial practices across the boundary". *Europa Regional* 22: 101-113.

Beljkašić-Hadžidedić, Ljiljana. 2007. *Susreti sa ljudima: iz etnografskog terenskog dnevnika*. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine.

Biehl, João and Peter Locke. 2010. "Deleuze and the Anthropology of Becoming". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 51, No. 3: 317-351.

Bollens, Scot A. 2001. "City and Soul: Sarajevo, Johannesburg, Jerusalem and Nicosia". *City* Vol. 5, No. 2: 169-187.

Bollens, Scot A. 2007. *Cities, Nationalism and Democratization*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bougarel, Xavier, Elissa Helms and Ger Duijzings (eds). 2005. *The New Bosnian Mosaic: Identities, Memories and Moral Claims in a Post-War Society*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Brković, Čarna. 2012. "Potraga za vezama kao konstitutivni element biološkog aspekta državljanstva u bosanskom gradu na granici". *Antropologija* 12.2: 123-144.

Brković, Čarna. 2014. "Surviving in a Moveopticon: Humanitarian Actions in Bosnia and Herzegovina". *Contemporariz Southeastern Europe* 1 (2): 42-60.

Brković, Čarna. 2016. "Scaling Humanitarianism: Humanitarian Actions in a Bosnian Town". *Ethnos: Journal of Anthropology* 81 (1): 99-124.

Bugarski, Astrida. 2009. *Bosanske brvnare: drvo-čuvar najstarijih graditeljskih vještina stanovnika Bosne*. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine.

Carabelli, Giulia. 2013. "Living (Critically) in the Present: Youth Activism in Mostar (Bosnia Herzegovina)". *European Perspectives – Journal on European Perspectives of the Western Balkans* Vol. 5, No. 1 (8): 48-63.

Carabelli, Giulia. 2014. "'Gdje si? Walking as a Reflexive Practice' ". In *Walking the City: Quotidian Mobility and Ethnographic Methods*, eds. Timothy Shortell and Evrick Brown, 191-207. London: Routledge.

Carabelli, Giulia. 2016. "Rubbers, pens and crayons: Rebuilding Mostar through art interventions". In *Politics of Identity in Post-Conflict States. The Bosnian and Irish Experience*, eds. G. Vojvoda-Engstler and E. O' Ciardha, 116-128. London and New York: Routledge.

Coles, Kimberley. 2007. "Ambivalent Builders: Europeanization, the production of difference, and internationals in Bosnia-Herzegovina". In *The New Bosnian Mosaic: Identities, Memories and Moral Claims in a Post-War Society*, eds. Xavier Bougarel, Elissa Helms and Ger Duijzings, 255-272. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Čapo, Jasna and Valentina Gulin Zrnić. 2014. "Croatian Ethnology as Cultural Anthropology at Home". *Ethnologica Balcanica* 17: 49-62.

Čvrlijak, Krešimir. 1984. "Natko Nodilo (1834-1912) i njegova rekonstrukcija hrvatskog i srpskog pravovjerovanja. Stariji i novi prosudbeni odjeci". *Prilozi* 10 (1-2): 97-124.

D'Alessio, Vanni. 2013. "Divided and Contested Cities in Modern European History. The Example of Mostar, Bosnia-Herzegovina". In *Beyond the Balkan:*

Toward an Inclusive History of Southeastern Europe, ed. Sabine Rutar, 451-480. Zürich and Münster: Lit Verlag.

Duranović, Elvir. 2011. *Elementi staroslavenske tradicije u kulturi Bošnjaka*. Bugojno: autor.

Dukić, Danijela, Ana Popović and Vesna Vučinić Nešković. 2014. "Ethnology in Montenegro: an Overview from 1990 to the Present". *Ethnologica Balcanica* 17: 199-207.

Efendić, Nirha. 2015. *Bošnjačka usmena lirika – kulturnohistorijski okviri geneze i poetička obilježja*. Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet, Sarajevo i Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine.

Filipović-Fabijanić, Radmila. 1970. "Kratak pregled i karakteristike etnološkog rada u BiH u vremenu 1945-1969". U *Radovi XI savjetovanja etnologa Jugoslavije*, ur. Fikret Ibrahimpašić, 155-169. Zenica: Izdanja Muzeja grada Zenice.

Gilbert, Andrew. 2017. "The Limits of Foreign Authority: Publicity and the Political Logic of Ambivalence in Postwar Bosnia and Herzegovina". *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 59 (2): 415-445.

Gorunović, Gordana. 2006. "Pseudomarksizam i protofunkcionalizam u srpskoj etnologiji: Kulišić vs. Filipović". *Етноантрополошки проблеми*, н.с. 1.2: 185-208.

Hayden, Robert M. 2002. "Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites in South Asia and the Balkans". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 43, No. 2: 205-231.

Hayden, Robert M. 2007. "Moral Vision and Impaired Insight: The Imagining of Other Peoples' Communities in Bosnia". *Current Anthropology* Vol. 48, No. 1: 105-131.

Hayden, Robert M, Tuğba Tanyeri-Erdemir, Timothy D. Walker, Aykan Erdemir, Devika Rangachari, Manuel Aguilar-Moreno, Enrique López-Hurtado and Milica Bakić-Hayden. 2016. *Antagonistic Tolerance: Competitive Sharing of Religious Sites and Spaces*. London: Routledge.

Helms, Elissa Lynelle. 2003. "Gendered Visions of the Bosnian Future: Women's Activism and Representation in Post-War Bosnia-Herzegovina". PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh.

Hromadžić, Azra. 2011. "Bathroom Mixing: Youth Negotiate Democracy in Postconflict Bosnia and Herzegovina". *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 34 (2): 268-289.

Hromadžić, Azra. 2012. "Once We Had a House: Invisible Citizens and Consociational Democracy in Post-war Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina". *Social Analysis* Vol. 56, Issue 3: 30-48.

Hromadžić, Azra. 2015. "Dissatisfied Citizens: Ethnonational Governance, Teachers' Strike and Professional Solidarity in Mostar, Bosnia-Herzegovina". *European Politics and Society, Special Issue Europeanizing the spaces for lived citizenship in the post-Yugoslav states* 16 (3): 429-446.

Hromadžić, Azra. 2017. *Samo Bosne nema*. Beograd: XX vek.

Ibraković, Dželal. 2008. *Bosna, Islam – Bošnjaci (etnološko-povijesne skice)*. Sarajevo: Fakultet političkih nauka.

Jansen, Stef. 2013. "People and things in the ethnography of borders: materialising the division of Sarajevo". *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 21 (1): 23-37.

Jansen, Stef. 2015. *Yearnings in the Meantime. 'Normal Lives' and the State in a Sarajevo Apartment Complex*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Jansen Stef, Čarna Brković and Vanja Čelebičić (eds.). 2017. *Negotiating Social Relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. London and New York: Routledge.

Jašarević, Larisa. 2014. "Interplanetary Present: On a Spectacle of Mass Healing and Gifting in Bosnia". *Anthropological Forum* Vol. 24, No. 4: 427-439.

Jašarević, Larisa. 2017. "Excavating the Common Ground: Bosnian Pyramids and Post-National Communities". In *Negotiating Social Relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, eds. Stef Jansen, Čarna Brković and Vanja Čelebičić, 179-193. London and New York: Routledge.

Jolić, Friar Robert. 2012. "Fabrications on Medjugorje: on Mart Bax'Research". Review of *Medjugorje: Religion, Politics, and Violence in Rural Bosnia*, by Mart Bax. *Studia ethnologica Croatica*, Vol. 25, No. 1: 309-328.

Kajmaković, Radmila. 1974. "Semberija – etnološka monografija". *Poseban otisak iz Glasnika Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu, Etnologija*, Nova serija sveska XXIX. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej u Sarajevu.

Katić, Mario (ur.). 2011. *Usora: prošlost, običaji, životna svakodnevnica*. Zagreb: Zavičajni klub Usorskog kraja.

Katić Mario i Stjepan Marčetić 2014 (ur.). *Ravne-Brčko: prošlost, običaji, životna svakidašnjica*. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru. Boće: Župa Boće.

Katić, Mario i Velimir Bugarin (ur.). 2016. *Novi Travnik – između utopije i nostalgije*. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, Udruga „Baština” Novi Travnik i HKD „Napredak” Sarajevo.

Križanec-Beganović, Danijela. 2017. "Pogrebni običaji Bošnjaka u Mahali kod Breze – običajne prakse i vjerski propisi". *Studia Mythologica Slavica* 20: 233-253.

Kurtović, Larisa. 2011. "Etnografski eksperimenti: Manifest za podršku razvoja društvenokulturne antropologije u Bosni i Hercegovini i kratak pregled studentskih radova". *Godišnjak Fakuleta političkih nauka u Sarajevu* 5 i 6: 359-390.

Kurtović, Larisa. 2014a. "Conundrums of Ethnological and Anthropological Research in Bosnia-Herzegovina". *Ethnologica Balcanica* 17: 45-54.

Kurtović, Larisa. 2014b. "Cataloguing tradition in a socialist republic: ethnology in Bosnia-Herzegovina 1945-1990". In *Anthropological Field on the Margins of Europe, 1945-1991*, eds. Chris Hann and Aleksandar Bošković, 305-339. Berlin: Lit Verlag.

Kurtović, Larisa. 2015. "The Paradoxes of Wartime "Freedom": Alternative Culture during the Siege of Sarajevo". U *Opiranje zlu: (Post)Jugoslavenski anti-ratni angažman*, ur. Bojan Bilić i Vesna Janković, 197-224. Zagreb: Jesenski i Turk.

Leka, Alma. 2017. *Muzeji, zbirke i galerije u Bosni i Hercegovini*. Sarajevo: Udruženje ICOM, Nacionalni komitet Bosne i Hercegovine.

Lockwood, William G. 1975. *European Moslems: Economy and Ethnicity in Western Bosnia*. New York and London: Academic Press, Inc.

Lofranco, Zaira Tiziana. 2012. "Minorities and housing entitlements in shifting political systems: legal provisions and the experience of displaced Sarajevans". In *Changing Urban Landscapes: Eastern European and Post-Soviet Cities, Since 1989*, ed. Marco Buttino, 179-209. Roma: Viella.

Maček, Ivana. 2009. *Sarajevo Under Siege: Anthropology in Wartime*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Malinov, Zorančo. "The Influence of Serbian Ethnological Scientific Thought on the Development of Macedonian Ethnology". *Гласник Етнoгpафскoг института САНУ* LXVI (1): 101-116.

Markovitz, Fran. 2010. *Sarajevo. A Bosnian Kaleidoscope*. Urbana, Chicago and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.

Moore, Adam. 2008. "Iza Dejtonske Bosne". *Odjek – Revija za umjetnost, nauku i društvena pitanja* 2: 23-28.

Moore, Adam. 2013. *Peacebuilding in practice: Local experience in two Bosnian towns*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Moore, Adam. 2016. "Ethno-territoriality and Ethnic Conflict". *Geographical Review* 106 (1): 92-108.

Muršič, Rajko. 2003. "Teaching anthropology in Slovenia: 'Small languages' – chaos in the field". In *Educational histories of European social anthropology, (Learning fields, Vol. 1)*, ed. Schippers, Thomas K, 113-125. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Muršič, Rajko. 2017. "Power, knowledge and freedom: persisting continental ethnologists". In *Against all odds: ethnology and anthropology between theory and praxis*, eds. Risteski, Ljupčo S. and Ines Crvenkovska-Risteska, 55-69. Skopje: Faculty of natural sciences and mathematics, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology.

Naumović, Slobodan. 2002. "The Ethnology of Transformation as Transformed Ethnology: The Serbian Case". *Ethnologica Balcanica* 6: 7-37.

Nettelfield, Lara J. and Sarah E. Wagner. 2015. *Srebrenica nakon genocida*. Sarajevo: Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu.

Palmberger, Monika. 2016. *How Generations Remember. Conflicting Histories and Shared Memories in Post-War Bosnia and Herzegovina*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Popić Filipović, Marica. 2012. "Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine u postdaytonskoj Bosni i Hercegovini". *Informatica museologica* Vol. 43, No. 1-4: 185-188.

Povržanović Frykman, Maja. 2003. "The War and After. On War-Related Anthropological Research in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina". *Etnološka tribina* Vol. 33, No. 26: 55-74.

Rand Bringa, Tone. 1991. "Gender, Religion and the Person: The 'Negotiation' of Muslim Identity in Rural Bosnia". PhD diss., University of London.

Rithman-Auguštin, Dunja. 1994. "Etnologija između etničke i nacionalne identifikacije". *Studia ethnologica Croatica*, Vol. 6, No. 1: 151-158.

Risteski, Ljupčo. 2017. Introduction. 10 years Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology (2005-2015). In *Against all odds: ethnology and anthropology between theory and praxis*, eds. Risteski, Ljupčo S. and Ines Crvenkovska-Risteska, 7-17. Skopje: Faculty of natural sciences and mathematics, Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology.

Roberts, Julie Ann. 2011. "An anthropological study of war crimes against children in Kosovo and Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 1990s". PhD diss., University of Glasgow.

Softić, Aiša. 2005. *Zbornik bošnjačkih usmenih predaja*. Sarajevo: Sarajevo Publishing.

Softić, Aiša. 2009. "Tragom bošnjačkih narodnih običaja". U *Život i običaji muslimana u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Antun Hangi, 459-533. Sarajevo: Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine.

Stefansson, Anders. 2007. "Urban Exile: Locals, Newcomers and the Cultural Transformation of Sarajevo". In *The New Bosnian Mosaic: Identities, Memories and Moral Claims in a Post-War Society*, eds. Xavier Bougarel, Elissa Helms and Ger Duijzings, 59-77. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Stefansson, Anders. 2010. "Coffee after cleansing? Co-existence, co-operation, and communication in post-conflict Bosnia and Herzegovina". *Focaal – Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology* 57: 62-76.

Tarabusi, Federica. 2010. "Towards educational inclusion in Bosnia-Herzegovina. 'Project ethnography' in development anthropology". *Ricerche di Pedagogia e Didattica* Vol. 5, No. 2: 1-20.

Wien, Jørgen. 2017. "My Parents Never Taught Me to Hate": A Study of Inter-ethnic Relations and Reconciliation among Youth in Brcko, Bosnia and Herzegovina". Master Thesis, Univeristy of Oslo.

Žila, Ondrej. 2013. "Ethno-demographic development in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1971-1991 and its propensity for ethnic conflict". *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis – Geographica* Vol 44, No. 1: 5-25.

Žila, Ondrej. 2015. "The Myth of Return: Bosnian Refugees and the Perception of 'Home'". *Geographica Pannonica*, Vol. 19, Issue 3: 130-145.

