

THE ETHICS OF ETHNOGRAPHIC ATTRACTION: REFLECTIONS ON THE PRODUCTION OF THE FINNO-UGRIC EXHIBITIONS AT THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL MUSEUM

SVETLANA KARM

Researcher

Estonian National Museum
Veski 32, 51014 Tartu, Estonia
e-mail: svetlana.karm@erm.ee

ART LEETE

Professor of Ethnology

University of Tartu
Ülikooli 18, 50090 Tartu, Estonia
e-mail: art.leete@ut.ee

ABSTRACT

We intend to explore* the production of the Finno-Ugric exhibitions at the Estonian National Museum. Our particular aim is to reveal methodological changes of ethnographic reproduction and to contextualise the museum's current efforts in ideologically positioning of the permanent exhibition. Through historical-hermeneutical analysis we plan to establish particular museological trends at the Estonian National Museum that have led curators to the current ideological position. The history of the Finno-Ugric displays at the Estonian National Museum and comparative analysis of international museological practices enable us to reveal and interpret different approaches to ethnographic reconstructions. When exhibiting indigenous cultures, one needs to balance ethnographic charisma with the ethics of display. In order to employ the approach of ethical attraction, curators must comprehend indigenous cultural logic while building up ethnographic representations.

KEYWORDS: Finno-Ugric • permanent exhibition • museum • ethnography • ethics

INTRODUCTION

At the current time the Estonian National Museum (ENM) is going through the process of preparing a new permanent exhibition space. The major display will be dedicated to Estonian cultural developments. A smaller, although still significant, task is to arrange the Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition. The ENM has been involved in research into the Finno-Ugric peoples as kindred ethnic groups to the Estonians since the museum was

* This research was supported by the European Union through the European Regional Development Fund (Centre of Excellence in Cultural Theory, CECT), and by the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research (projects PUT590 and ETF9271).

established at the beginning of the 20th century. Simultaneously, Finno-Ugric exhibition practices have been carried out through the whole period of ENM's existence.

Our aim is to discuss the ENM's Finno-Ugric exhibition practices in their historical-conceptual framework. We also intend to elaborate on ideas and strategy behind composing the new Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition, which is now in the final stage of preparation.

We employ historical analysis of the ENM's former Finno-Ugric ethnography displays. Our investigation concentrates on the evolution of museological ideas relating to ethnographic reconstructions. By discussing ideologies behind the ENM's exhibitions, we plan to reflect on the dialogue between domestic and international trends in exhibition making. Our method is based on principles of hermeneutic analysis that presume a continuous interpretation of the ideological mechanism of narrative production in order to reconstruct the line of thought that resulted in the creation of conceptually rather different exhibitions.

This article presents an effort of reflexive analysis, as the authors are members of the current ENM's team that prepares the new permanent exhibition of Finno-Ugric cultures. In addition, we have been involved in arranging a number of temporary exhibitions at the ENM over the last couple of decades. In this way, we carry with us considerable exhibition-making experience and responsibility for the upcoming permanent display. Through this article we reflect on our exhibition narrative and the theoretical principles behind our exhibition team's work.

MUSEOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

Museums are powerful tools of identity construction (Karp 1991: 15–16). New exhibitions are always prepared in the context of earlier ones. Museum collections actualise memories of older exhibitions that have influenced the exhibiting process.

Museums act on the crossroads of different cultures and perspectives. Cross-cultural exhibitions challenge and reorganise ethnographers' and visitors' knowledge through experience. An audience must be provided a choice when rearranging its knowledge and feelings (*ibid.*: 22–23). Museum exhibition strategies can be targeted to resemble or approach real-life cultural complexity and ambivalence. Although the classical idea that a museum collection can represent culture adequately is an illusion (see Clifford 1988: 227–228), restored pieces still reflect some sort of authenticity.

In the process of the strategic planning of a permanent exhibition, general questions about stability and change in the exhibition appear. Michael Belcher (1991: 45–47) argues that permanent exhibitions tend to longevity by employing conservative techniques of display that enable objects to remain on view for a long time. These exhibitions are usually overview exhibitions of cultural history that need significant investment of resources. Because of this, the permanent exhibitions tend to appear as metaphors of collective monographs, while temporary displays resemble essays or scholarly articles (Chistov 2007: 111–112; Zasetskaya 2013: 109). But this approach misleads visitors by claiming objectivity. If curators give up an image of authentic ethnographic reality, produced by scholars, new ways of avoiding the feeling of falsehood must be introduced (Baranov 2007: 24).

Temporary exhibitions are usually more innovative and depend less on the complexion of the collections (Arsen'yev 2007: 11). If temporary exhibitions can be created through the free flow of ideas, permanent exhibitions are often seen as more serious statements. The traditional, well-established, approach to exhibition making involves understanding the particularity of a museum object. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1991: 388) conceptualises the object as an ethnographic fragment that represents and embodies "a poetics of detachment" and enables appreciation. Object-fragment imitates and potentially reproduces an absent whole and enhances the aura of its 'realness'. Collection-centred exhibitions are created as isolated but amassed mimetic reflections of periods, rituals and environments (ibid.: 388–389; Kõiva 2007: 53). In classical museological strategy the mimetic approach presumes the display of a simple installation of things that are removed from authentic practices, thus making the exhibition environment a storage of stabilised and conserved commodities (Crew and Sims 1991: 159). Mimesis of display can be made more alive by employing the strategy of integrity. Copies of reality become meaningful if ethnographic objects and installations are contextualised through curators' strong and adequate cognitive control.

For instruction to redeem amusement, viewers need principles for looking. They require a context, or framework, for transforming otherwise grotesque, rude, strange, and vulgar artefacts into object lessons. In this way, curators ensure that copied fragment of culture will be rescued from triviality. (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1991: 390–393) It must become clear for a visitor that reconstructed pieces of culture represent something deeply meaningful and are solidly grounded by scholarly arguments. This approach does not exclude amusement but filters respectable impressions to a certain extent and aims to guarantee that behind every seemingly random object there is a scientific theory.

In many museums, curators are convinced by objectivism and display objects within this methodological approach. Visitors do not perceive objects as metaphors but as a direct reflection of reality (Baranov 2007: 23–24). In order to avoid the illusion of straightforward presentation, curators must employ other approaches, negotiating their specific ways of showing culture more or less explicitly.

Nuno Porto (2007: 176) suggests using the concept of 'ethnographic installation' to signify "experimental ethnographic production and exhibition-making processes". The installation-directed approach presumes the contextualisation of specific script and scenography, relating those uniquely to a particular theme and museum space. This installation experimentalism is related to the "interpretive turn" and subjectification of relationships in textual anthropology. (Ibid.: 175–177)

This line of thinking leads us to the question of experimentation in (permanent) exhibitions. Contemporary exhibitions embody experimental practices of meaning-making and are sites of knowledge generation (Basu and Macdonald 2007: 2–3). As a result of the "performative turn", exhibitions become mediums for enactment (ibid.: 12). Narrative serves as a "sense-making path" through exhibition landscape, revealing a succession of experiences (Basu 2007: 53). The museum can be understood as "a space of narrative potential" that generates labyrinthine "diversity of paths and stories", while associations "paradoxically take a unicursal form" for every single visitor (ibid.: 67–68; Basu and Macdonald 2007: 15).

As a new tendency, ethnographic museums abandon permanent exhibitions (Forum 2007). Even if permanent displays are not neglected, the character of those displays

changes considerably and classical difference between dominant exhibition genres starts to vanish. A vague distinction between permanent and temporary exhibitions has led contemporary museums to recognise the need to conceptualise permanent displays in a similarly way to temporary ones (Kotilainen 2007: 54). This strategy drives short- and long-term exhibitions closer to each other not only on the temporal, but also the conceptual, scale. The emerging ambivalent borderline between these two classical models of the museum display creates an innovative dialogue between curators and visitors and inspires experimentation.

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL MUSEUM'S PERMANENT EXHIBITIONS

The composition of museum collections indicates how collective cultural identities are envisioned and structured, the subjective domain of the self, culture and authenticity marked, value and meaning systems governed by national politics and encodings of the past and the future restricted (Clifford 1988: 217–218). Through the whole history of the ENM, collecting ethnographic items of kindred peoples and producing Finno-Ugric exhibitions has been a prominent task. Historical analysis of these efforts enables one to establish a conceptual framework for current preparation of the new ENM Finno-Ugric exhibition. Ideas concerning the importance of Finno-Ugric cultural efforts were presented from the very beginning of the ENM's existence, simultaneous to the early collecting initiatives.

The ENM obtained its first Finno-Ugric items in 1913 when a collection of Mordvinian objects was donated to the museum.¹ In the same year, prominent Estonian politician and member of the museum's society, Jaan Tõnisson, suggested establishing a department that would revitalise handicrafts and collect foreign (including Finno-Ugric) items for the new department. Interest in the Finno-Ugric theme was articulated following the example of the Finnish museums. The manager of the ENM, Oskar Kallas, presented the Finnish ethnographers Uno Taavi Sirelius and Axel Olai Heikel as examples for future Estonian Finno-Ugrists. In 1915, on the basis of proposal by Kallas, the Department of Foreign Peoples was initiated at the ENM. At that time the museum did not have the resources to organise the collection of Finno-Ugric or other peoples' objects and items were obtained only as donations. (Linnus 1970: 229)

After WWI the Finno-Ugric work of the ENM became more active, with Finnish scholars and politicians providing support for this. In 1925, Finland's Minister of Education, Professor Emil Nestor Setälä, visited Tartu and encouraged Estonian scholars to collect linguistic and folklore evidence in order to build a picture of "systematic proto-culture" both in Finland and Estonia (Setälä 1925: 162–163).

Leaders of the ENM formulated strategic visions concerning the Finno-Ugric research that must be initiated in Estonia. The first director of the ENM, Ilmari Justus Andreas Manninen (1894–1935), wrote in the museum's annual account for 1922 that the ENM must become "the prominent workshop, dedicated to research of the Finno-Ugric peoples" (ERM A, n 1, f 521, l 6). In his public presentations, Manninen also stressed that ethnography of the Finno-Ugric peoples must be present at the ENM (ERM A. Sissetlud kirjad 1925–1926, vihik 44, l 26–29) because the Estonians, as a civilised nation,

cannot forget their kindred peoples, especially those “who are deprived from education and are not able to study their culture by themselves” (ERM A. Väljasaadetud kirjade ära kirjad 1924–1925, vihik 49/ 572, dets 1924). Professor of archaeology at the University of Tartu, and chairman of the ENM’s council, Aarne Michaël Tallgren (1885–1945) also emphasised the need to establish a Finno-Ugric Department at the museum (Tallgren 1921; 1923).

Organising a special unit for the Finno-Ugric peoples’ cultural heritage was a decisive moment in museum’s strategic approach towards the kindred peoples. In 1924, the ENM’s board and later also the general meeting adopted

the decision to establish the Finno-Ugric Department, separated from the Department of Domestic Ethnography. The aim of the Finno-Ugric Department will be to obtain ethnographic and archaeological collections among the closer and more distant kindred peoples and to study the old treasures of these peoples. (ERM A, n 1, f 521, lk 4–5)

Before the department was opened, ENM director Manninen travelled to different museums and analysed (Manninen 1928) the ways they displayed indigenous culture, especially concentrating on the Finno-Ugric exhibitions.

In 1928, four years after this principal decision, the Department of Kindred Peoples Ethnography was opened at the museum. As the department was embodied only in the exhibition, it was also called the Finno-Ugric Ethnographic Collection Display. This first permanent Finno-Ugric exhibition was displayed in two rooms of the ENM building at Raadi Manor in the outskirts of Tartu. In the bigger room textiles were displayed along with wooden items belonging to the Ingrian Finns, Livonians, Karelians, Mordvins, Udmurts, Maris and Hungarians. Apart from single objects, 14 mannequins were installed at the exhibition. The smaller room was dedicated to the Sámi people. The central composition in this room was arranged as a summer tent that became rather popular among the visitors. The exhibition included the museum’s entire Finno-Ugric collection of that time – 545 ethnographic objects. For the ENM this first display has been the only permanent exhibition relating to the Finno-Ugric peoples so far. The exhibition was closed in 1936 and since then the museum has made only temporary exhibitions on Finno-Ugric subject matter.

The exhibition of the Finno-Ugric ethnographic culture was arranged according to the museological standards of the period. The aesthetic of the display was focused on the art-likeness of ethnographica and the illusion of the representation of culture when cut off from its specific context. This way of constructing ethnographic displays was an international trend in the 1920s. This performance strategy also involved realistic representation of the “plastic capacities of the primitive people” (cf. Clifford 1988: 220; Porto 2007: 182). Similarly, at the ENM’s exhibition some mannequins were designed very carefully taking into account contemporary scholarly views on the typical anthropological types of different peoples. This approach, concentrating on hyper realistic likeness of ethnographic replications, dates back to the 19th century. At that time, the public became obsessed with wax mannequins at ethnographic displays. These wax figures captured all the attention, and some scholars (for example, Franz Boas²) started to protest against these attempts to copy reality. (Cf. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1991: 400–401; Conte 2007: 43)



Photo 1. Sámi conical tent at the Estonian National Museum's first Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition. Photo by Eduard Selleke, before 1932, ERM Fk 668:14.

The Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition of the 1920s and 1930s was created on the methodological basis introduced by the first permanent ENM exhibition opened at Raadi Manor in 1923 and on public display until 1944. On this first permanent display a holistic approach to Estonian cultural traditions was applied. Departing from national idea that grounded the establishment and earlier strategic developments of the ENM, the exhibition was created as a collage of different cultures that were meaningful to Estonians. Together with Estonian peasant material culture, Baltic German heritage and art objects were displayed. Although rather wide cultural plurality was articulated by the first permanent exhibition, Estonian ethnography dominated the display as a whole. The Finno-Ugric department was opened only for eight years as part of the first permanent exhibition of the ENM. The kindred peoples were seen as a cultural colony of the Estonians (cf. Tallgren 1923). Thus, they proved that, in a certain

sense, Estonian culture is actually spread across vast territories of north eastern Europe and has deep historical roots. For the Finno-Ugric exhibition makers the Estonian permanent display meant that there was no need to invent a style of presentation.

During WWIL, the ENM's building at Raadi was destroyed. After the war, the museum moved temporarily to a former courthouse that still serves as the ENM's main building today. In that building there is no space available for permanent display as it serves mainly as the museum's office and storage. Until the early 1990s, the ENM had only one 110 m² room for temporary exhibitions.

In 1994, the next ENM permanent exhibition, entitled *Estonia. Land, People, Culture*, was arranged in a new exhibition house at the museum and was opened for visitors until summer 2015. The exhibition was produced with predominantly Estonian cultural needs in mind. Shortly after Estonia regained independence, it seemed natural that the Estonian ethnography must be put on display in an extensive way. Ethnography was one of the possible ways to publically represent Estonian national ideals, somehow metaphorically embodied in the materiality of folk cultural history. In this situation, the museum curators concentrated purely on an ethno-romantic display of Estonian ethnographic heritage (Runnel et al. 2010: 328). Of 1,000 m² of permanent exhibition, 10 m² were dedicated to the Baltic Germans, one small display case to the Coastal Swedes and another to the other Estonian traditional minority, the Russian Old Believers. The Finno-Ugric collections were not presented at all, despite the issue of linguistic (and supposedly cultural) proximity and the fact that the ENM collections included

10,000 Finno-Ugric ethnographic items and a huge number of photos, ethnographic drawings and manuscripts. However, this recent permanent exhibition of Estonian traditional culture served as a meaningful contextual tool for Finno-Ugric ethnography at the ENM. This permanent exhibition, the last at the ENM's old exhibition house, demonstrated the framework of museological thinking that the Estonian scholars had reached by the early 1990s.

Since the mid-2000s, the ENM's staff has been in the middle of the process of preparing new permanent exhibitions for the museum's new building, which will open in 2016. The Estonian exhibition of cultural history is conceptualised around the title *Estonian Dialogues*. The idea of the Estonian exhibition team is to demonstrate different, sometimes competing viewpoints on and interpretations of various significant periods and events in the history of Estonia. The other permanent exhibition is dedicated to the Finno-Ugric peoples and is entitled *Uralic Echo*. The new ENM building will be constructed in the Raadi area near the old manor house (where the pre-war exhibitions were arranged). Without a doubt, this new building will provide much better possibilities for representing different themes of Finno-Ugric culture.

THE FINNO-UGRIC TEMPORARY EXHIBITIONS AT THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL MUSEUM DURING THE SOVIET PERIOD

The process of arranging temporary displays has been the way in which the new permanent exhibition³ team has obtained expertise in exhibiting Finno-Ugric culture. During earlier temporary exhibitions at the ENM, this preparatory purpose was present only rather vaguely. However, since the 1990s most of the temporary exhibitions have been conceptualised (among other purposes) as an introduction for the future permanent exhibition. An overview of these exhibitions enables one to reconstruct a conceptual history of the ENM's approaches to negotiating Finno-Ugric themes with the public.

Since the 1970s, temporary Finno-Ugric displays have been constantly represented at the ENM. The majority of the Soviet Finno-Ugric exhibitions were compendious in character and concentrated on folk art. From these projects the most significant were a few major exhibitions. The first among these enterprises was the collaborative exhibition entitled *Examples of the Finno-Ugric Folk Art from the 19th Century*, carried out together with the State Ethnographic Museum of the Peoples of the USSR and the Institute of Ethnography of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR between 1957 and 1960. The next exhibition project, prepared in cooperation with the Latvian Museum of History and State Ethnographic Museum of the Peoples of the USSR, was entitled *Finno-Ugric Folk Art* and ran for eight months in 1970 (the main curator of the exhibition was Tiina Vöti from the ENM). The third general exhibition, *Finno-Ugric Ethnic Culture from the Museum's Collections*, was displayed in 1985, constructed under supervision of ENM scholar Heno Sarv and composed on the basis of the museum's collections. (Sikka 1997)

The most successful of these exhibitions was prepared for the international *Baltica* folklore festival in 1989 on the 2,000 m² main pavilion of the Estonian Fairs residence in Tallinn. This major display was titled *About Finno-Ugric Folk Art* and prepared by a team of ENM curators under the supervision of Vaike Reemann. Over two months



Photo 2. Finnish and Karelian clothes at the exhibition *Examples of the Finno-Ugric Folk Art from the 19th Century*. Photo by Hudo Rips, 1957, ERM Fk 1263:7.

60,000 people visited the exhibition. The exhibition became significant as the most popular display of Finno-Ugric culture in the history of the ENM. The exhibition was prepared in cooperation with several Finno-Ugric central museums. Apart from the ENM, major museums from Hungary, Finland, and Komi, Mari, Mordovian and Udmurt republics of the USSR were involved in this major collaborative effort. This exhibition was built upon ideas of language kinship and similarities in the Finno-Ugric way of life and material culture. (Reemann 1994)

During the Soviet period, apart from these Finno-Ugric compendium-exhibitions, the ENM organised smaller temporary displays dealing with particular ethnic groups. These exhibitions were also often arranged in collaboration with other Finno-Ugric central museums as exchange exhibitions, concentrating on folk art. Such exhibitions were produced for the Komi (1973), Mari (1975), Udmurts (1977), Hungarians (1979), Mordvins (1982) and Karelians (1983), as well as the Uralic peoples of Western Siberia (1984)⁴ and rock carvings from Lake Onega (1985).⁵ (Konsin 1984: 147; Sikka 1997; Konksi 2009: 350–351)

These Finno-Ugric exchange exhibitions of the 1970s and 1980s were organised under the aegis of the official policy that encouraged presentation of the ethnography of different Soviet ethnic groups. During the same period, other travelling exhibitions from various parts of the Soviet Union were brought to the ENM for display. For exam-



Photo 3. Sámi display at the exhibition *Examples of the Finno-Ugric Folk Art from the 19th Century*. Photo by Hudo Rips, 1957, ERM Fk 1263:15.

ple, only during the late 1970s were exhibitions presenting the folk art of the Kabardins and Balkars, Lithuanians, Belorussians, Armenians and Uzbeks organised at the museum (Konsin 1984: 147). The scientific secretary of the ENM of that time, Kalju Konsin, explained the need to bring in exhibitions from different parts of the USSR through an exchange of experiences between artisans:

The adept craftsmen and amateur artisans have always indicated lively interest towards this kind of exhibition. Contacts with the other peoples' folk creativity sharpen visitors' eyes for comparative estimation of their own cultural values and provide new inventive ideas for the hobbyist in order to introduce innovative techniques and new variants of ornamentation. (Ibid.)

Apparently, the Finno-Ugric visiting exhibitions were organised in the official framework of a much larger strategy of cultural exchange of practical nature. The Finno-Ugric exhibitions constituted a significant proportion of overall amount of these imported ethnographic presentations. This tendency is hardly a coincidence, although one must acknowledge that reproductions of Finno-Ugric ethnography in the ENM were conceptualised during the Soviet period in a rather different official framework from that of the 1920s and 1930s (cf. Konksi 2007: 30).

Furthermore, the exchange of experiences was supposed to be useful not only for artisans but also for the museum curators themselves. Sharing knowledge of collecting and exhibition practices was also supposed to contribute to an improvement in the ENM's own exhibitions. The general collection policy of socialist museums was reflected in the topics of these exhibitions. According to the dominant approach, "first of all, working tools and household items were collected as folk art objects" (Jaagosild 1971: 3).

At the same time, the conceptual framework of the ENM's Soviet Finno-Ugric exhibitions resembles the first pre-war permanent exhibition to a certain degree. Apart from attempting to stress the aesthetic achievements of working people, these exhibitions had another practical purpose for the curators. Through the Finno-Ugric exhibitions, ENM curators improved and maintained their practical knowledge of the museum's collections.

RECENT FINNO-UGRIC DISPLAYS AT THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL MUSEUM

At the beginning of the 1990s, museological discourse on collecting methodology and exhibition practice, as well as the role of scholarly discourse in society, changed in Estonia. In recent decades the range of exhibition topics has widened considerably at the ENM. Museum ethnographers have started to search for new concepts, themes and approaches. When organising the Finno-Ugric temporary displays, we have considered the production of the Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition as the eventual aim of all smaller displays. (The Estonian Parliament decided in 1996 that a new ENM building must be constructed, and work in this direction had already begun a few years earlier.) Preparation for the permanent exhibition has continued because the new challenge has entailed the testing of different conceptual approaches. In addition to which, together with other museum researchers and curators, we needed to foster our exhibition making skills.

Several recent temporary Finno-Ugric displays at the ENM have been targeted towards the search for new ways of modelling relationships between the Finno-Ugric peoples. Heno Sarv prepared the very first of these exhibitions in 1998. The exhibition was titled *The Finno-Ugric Wall* and it was concentrated on reconstruction of a shared Finno-Ugric way of life. The display was inspired by the idea, proposed by Finnish historian and professor Kyösti Julku in 1993 at the First Congress of Finno-Ugric History (Julku 1996), that Finno-Ugrians constituted the historically indigenous population across the vast territories of the East European forest zone, and that through millennia they developed a completely autochthonic culture that was perceived by their southern neighbours as rather strange.

The next attempt to find a meaningful way of presenting the Finno-Ugric peoples in the museum's display was made in 2001 by the exhibition, *The Finno-Ugric World and Soul* (curators Art Leete, Svetlana Karm, Ülle Tamla and Heiki Valk). The exhibition was prepared in cooperation with archaeologists and served as an attempt to interpret the archaic worldview of the Finno-Ugrians by concentrating on the beliefs about the Other World, displaying funeral and commemoration rituals and modelling the possible presentation of the World Beyond for different Finno-Ugric peoples.

Another of ENM's exhibition that involved simultaneous representation of different Finno-Ugric cultures was *The Bridal Chest*, installed in 2004 (curator Svetlana Karm). In the exhibition, visitors were able to observe the material side of wedding customs of different Finno-Ugric peoples. The display presented various objects that were used in wedding rituals, or were made especially for a bridal chest or as wedding gifts. Exhibition objects were chosen on the basis of available descriptions of how these artefacts were used in wedding rituals. It appeared that there were relatively few such objects in the ENM's collections as people tend to keep their wedding memorial items rather carefully and usually refused to give them away to museum ethnographers. These items were often inherited from the older generation because losing or giving away these things was understood as bad omens that may predict the fading of marriage luck.

In 2008, the exhibition *A Matter of Honour: The 80th Anniversary of the Opening of the Finno-Ugric Department at the Estonian National Museum* was prepared at the ENM, remaining open for visitors until the late summer of 2009. This exhibition provided an opportunity to travel back in time, bringing fragments of the first ENM Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition to a contemporary audience. In addition, the ethnographic fieldwork milieu of different decades was reconstructed in the display. Curators Svetlana Karm, Marleen Nõmmela and Piret Koosa reintroduced the story of how the Finno-Ugric collections were assembled for the ENM, and outlined different aspects of the museologist's job.

Similarly to earlier decades, the ENM also continued to arrange displays of the Finno-Ugric folk costumes, folk art and handicraft. Some such presentations were organised collaboratively by several parties: the ENM and the Udmurt National Museum, the National Museum of the Finnish Sámi (Siida) and Sámi Duodji (the Sámi Handicraft Association), the Museum of Central Finland and the Hungarian Ethnographic Museum (Sikka 1997). A few other Finno-Ugric exhibitions have concentrated on particular Finno-Ugric groups and sometimes carried out in cooperation with representatives of these groups (for example, Komi and Livonian exhibitions).

One can easily notice that the Finno-Ugric theme has become rather prominent in the ENM's exhibition practice. One of the reasons behind this intensification was a considerable extension of exhibition space at the ENM in the mid 1990s. Exploitation of new exhibition rooms resulted in an overall increase in the number of exhibitions, with



Photo 4. Hill Mari display at the exhibition *The Finno-Ugric Folk Culture*. Photo by Tõnu Kerge, 1985, ERM Fk 2130:11.

the Finno-Ugric efforts forming part of this process. One important motivation here was the decision, made by the museum in the mid 1990s, to start celebrating Kindred Peoples Days with regular Finno-Ugric temporary exhibitions.⁶

This historical overview of the ENM's Finno-Ugric exhibitions indicates that ethnographic displays have become more numerous in recent decades. Apart from quantitative growth, significant change in the character of exhibitions is apparent with, behind this development, a notable ideological shift.

ETHICAL CHANGE IN MUSEUM COLLECTION AND REPRESENTATION IDEOLOGY

As already touched upon, the overall strategic aim of the Finno-Ugric displays over the last two decades has been the preparation of ENM staff for the future permanent exhibition. This task has been fulfilled to a somewhat contradictory extent and fashion. Several conceptual tests with experimental displays have proved that some ways of conceptualising exhibitions are not the most successful. The Finno-Ugric World and Soul display forced us to acknowledge that concentrating an exhibition on sensitive aspects of worldview pushes the exhibition towards cognitive-ethical limits. During the exhibition construction process we found ourselves with a dilemma – to demonstrate intriguing but ethically loaded objects or to arrange an ethically safer but at the same time less interesting display. As the preparation period for the temporary display was short, it was too late to propose a new concept for the exhibition and to rearrange the whole design.

We decided to remove from the World and Soul exhibition objects that originally had direct ritual or sacred meaning. We made this choice as a result of information that some items in the museum collection were, perhaps, gathered in doubtful circumstances. In earlier times, ethnographers were sure that they had the ultimate scientific right to study and collect everything, and that nothing could stop them in this (cf. Sandahl 2007: 89). We had the same impression of some aspects of former ENM collecting practices. During the preparation of the World and Soul display we started to realise that this issue might seriously damage our future efforts to exhibit items.

At the end of 2000, the Forest Nenets poet and reindeer herder Yuri Vella visited the ENM. When Vella saw a few spirit figures from his home region in the collection, he became rather confused as there was no way that anybody could give these figures away in a culturally acceptable way. After witnessing this and some other statements or evidence about the conflict between the traditional museological imperative of collecting and exhibiting culture, and indigenous understanding of spiritual logic, we decided to be rather careful when exhibiting indigenous sacred items.

Our decision to avoid exhibiting sacred items is also based on some discussions in ethnographic literature. The problem of ethically doubtful treatment of sacred items by ethnographers and other travellers has deep historical roots. Already at the beginning of the 20th century, a few authors were criticising the methods that ethnographers used to obtain sacred objects, especially from among the Finno-Ugric peoples (see, for example, Ostroumov 1904: 22; Prokoshev 1909: 42–44, 87–88; Kuznetsov 2009 [1906–1907]: 243–244).

The history of collecting and displaying exotic culture has sometimes been rather radical,⁷ if we judge by our contemporary ethical standards. The part of this ethnographic tradition concerning objects that we have in our museums now needs to be addressed not only theoretically but also in practical museum work. We have these objects at our disposal and it is unavoidable that we will need to decide how to treat them.

The Khanty ethnographer Tatyana Moldanova has argued that according to Khanty cultural rules, access to sacred object is strictly limited. Moldanova (2013: 133–134) claims that ritual objects are desacralised through public display. The reaction of the indigenous population to the practice of displaying sacred objects in museums is ambivalent. Apart from cultural limitations on acceptable access to these objects, the issue of forced or suspicious conditions of collection is a source of uncertainty. In local museums in Western Siberia the indigenous visitors perceive museum objects and stuffed animals (especially bears⁸) as sacred, carrying traditional meanings and assuming ritual behaviour. Local Russian inhabitants react similarly to the Orthodox icons that were displayed at the same museums (Lysenko 2007: 70–71).

While arranging ethnographic exhibitions, curators must recognise the issue that sacred objects may still have an intimate religious value for the people. Although these items may have been stored for decades, they cannot be treated as fully owned by museums. The ambivalent history of collection and contradictory cultural dialogue we may initiate by exhibiting these objects seriously challenges ethnographers ethically as we prepare these exhibitions.

Old museums with huge collections face the challenge of overcoming their historical legacy of collection practice and ways of interpretation (Kupina 2007: 58–59). Over time, the general emphasis of the ENM Finno-Ugric exhibitions has changed remarkably. Instead of presenting anonymous typologies of material culture, today curators concentrate more intimately on people and their stories. The original owners of museum items and cultural themes are always peoples themselves (Sandahl 2007: 92). If curators intend to honour indigenous world perception, they need to be rather careful in how they treat all objects, not only those items the sacred functions of which have been clearly documented.

All ethnographic items collected and given to museums long ago have a complicated character because of the colonial consequences (Chistov 2007: 109; Engelsman 2007: 118–119; Forum 2007: 125–127; Sandahl 2007: 87–88; Viatte 2007: 25). This suspicion is rooted in the historical legacy of ethnographic museums whose old collections have been gathered in accordance with the ethical circumstances of the period. Eija-Maija Kotilainen (2007: 48–49) argues that this colonial agenda is not applicable in the case of the museums of the smaller peoples (for example, the Finns) in the same sense and extent. The increasing crisis at ethnographic museums since the 1960s was partly related to these “doubts concerning collections” (Viatte 2007: 25–26). These discussions did not touch the ENM until the 1990s and objective displays without possible ethical considerations were made throughout the Soviet period. However, these doubts may already be over as ethnographers can critically assess the situation and make ethically appropriate and thematically intriguing displays. Emphasis on exploring the meaningfulness of collections enables one to include ethical questions in the exhibition process, problems that do not serve as resolute obstructions or demands to exclude objects (ibid.: 26–27).

Recently, discussions concerning the ownership of cultural heritage and the right to interpret collections have become intensive among museum professionals (cf. Kotilainen 2007: 50; Leete 2008). Bente Gullveig Alver and Ørjar Øyen (2007: 18) argue that ethical reflection “invites choice among alternative courses of action”. Although there are no precise rules for making choices, one must try to follow appropriate practice and avoid straightforward announcements when dealing with representation of different cultures. Margaret Mills (2007: 56) also claims that a specific relationship between ethics and truth directs ethnographic presentation away from any simple linearity.

In the case of the *World and Soul* exhibition we decided in advance to recognise our failure. In order to maintain ethical standards, we tried not to violate indigenous rules for the treatment of religious issues. At the exhibition, we marked some Finno-Ugric otherworldly ideas metaphorically. For example, we presented the road to the *Finno-Ugric Other World* as a row of fishing traps, hung through the exhibition room. By doing so, we avoided putting on display items that are considered interesting and eye-catching but which may be heavily loaded in ethical terms.

These ethical considerations were also addressed during the preparation of the ENM’s new permanent exhibition, in which we have generally avoid exhibiting explicitly religious items. Despite this, our exhibition team aims to touch upon a few moments of Finno-Ugric vernacular religious practice that will reflect some wider cultural developments.

THE NEW FINNO-UGRIC PERMANENT EXHIBITION AT THE ESTONIAN NATIONAL MUSEUM

Over the last two decades most of the ENM’s exhibitions have resulted in constructive experiences in regard of the preparation of the new Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition. When putting together different temporary displays the curatorial team (and we among them) of the permanent exhibition gathered practical knowledge of the content and condition of the ENM’s Finno-Ugric collections and developed competence in material culture as well as the everyday living conditions of these ethnic groups. Additionally, several temporary exhibitions have related to themes that have been developed into sub-topics for the future permanent exhibition. For example, the *Bridal Chest* exhibition revealed that there are relatively few Finno-Ugric wedding-related ethnographic items in the ENM’s collections. The topic itself proved to be both attractive and distinctive for Finno-Ugric cultural connections as wedding rituals articulate peculiar cultural dominants and so we plan to use the wedding topic at our prospective display.

At the same time, it must be admitted that these recent temporary displays have fulfilled this task of preparation unevenly and in a somehow ad-hoc way. Yuri Chistov (2007: 110) argues that museums often search for innovative solutions because of the failure in exhibition policies of recent decades. Even during the 1990s it was rather unrealistic to foresee the actuality of a permanent exhibition or to be sure that a new building would be constructed for the museum at all. However, since the mid 2000s, using temporary exhibition practices, we have systematically concentrated on testing different ideas and technical solutions in order to be ready for the exhibition in the new building.

In 2016, the new ENM building will be opened to visitors. Discussions concerning the overall idea of the display already started more than ten years ago, even before a location for a new building was chosen and the international architectural competition initiated. The competition was started in June 2004 and its results were presented to the public in January 2006.⁹ Around the same time, doubts concerning the suitability of the ethnically oriented Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition for the European museological landscape were expressed in public discussions while, at the same time, ethnographic focus was suggested (Runnel *et al.* 2010: 328–329). In the autumn of 2006, a roundtable was organised entitled *Does the ENM Need a Kindred Peoples Permanent Exhibition at the Museum New Building in Raadi and what Kind of Exhibition Must it Be? A wide range of specialists and enthusiasts for the Finno-Ugric theme (ethnologists, linguists, writers, artists, museum curators, students, etc.) discussed the special role of the ENM in providing support to our language relatives in developing their cultures. Participants in the roundtable also emphasised the importance of study of the Finno-Ugric ethnic groups by Finno-Ugric scholars themselves. Public discussions on the prospective permanent exhibition were also organised later. Ethnographers, artists, writers and Finno-Ugric students studying at Estonian universities participated in designing and negotiating the conceptual framework of the exhibition. In addition, museum specialists from Finno-Ugric areas with whom we have met in the course of fieldwork trips in recent years were also involved in these discussions.*



Photo 5. Bears, Õ and Yoshkin Kot: Finno-Ugric Brand Exhibition (2014–2015) at the Estonian National Museum. Photo by Arp Karm 2014.

While the public contributed to the museum’s authenticity by supplying information and opinions, the conceptualisation was under control of the exhibition teams, leaving little “space for active interpretation by the audience or shared authorship” (Runnel *et al.* 2010: 333). Today it is a rather normal practice to involve an audience in the construction of a museum’s narratives (*ibid.*: 326; Tatsi 2011: 65). If museum professionals do not seek dialogue with prospective visitors, the exhibition turns into guesswork (Runnel *et al.* 2010: 335). The participation of amateur and expert audiences is always a process with an uncertain nature and outcome. However, various modes of participation are gradually integrated into exhibition practices (Tatsi 2011: 76). In a somewhat modest way the ENM’s Finno-Ugric exhibition team has attempted to keep in contact with both specialists and enthusiasts. In principal the Finno-Ugrians are imagined as becoming

our most important audience, although their involvement in the permanent exhibition process can be fragmentary at best. Although there are plenty of options to negotiate our work with the Estonian audience, it is not clear how much it helps us to get closer to culturally appropriate solutions for the exhibition.

We have been working intensively with the Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition since 2008. The main narrative lines and a scheme of exhibition design have now been established. The model of the prospective exhibition is arranged in a labyrinth-like way in three rooms on two floors with an overall surface area of 1,100 m². As continuous negotiations between scholars, architects, designers, cultural insiders and enthusiasts have revealed, narrating supposedly trivial moments in life as thick and meaningful in a vaguely mystical way serves as a heuristic impulse for people who have no special academic practice in studying Finno-Ugric culture. Indigenous cultures are popularly perceived as natural, authentic and “representing alternatives to the negative consequences of a modern, contemporary way of life” (Mathisen 2004: 17). We aim to display the Finno-Ugric peoples as normal human beings with distinctive cultural heritage. The exhibition team avoids overstressing an exotic image of these people but intends to demonstrate that their culture enables us to negotiate cross-cultural human values.

Our curators’ team decided to concentrate the ENM’s Finno-Ugric exhibition on seemingly usual objects and actions of the Finno-Ugrian peoples through the prism of gender roles (Karm 2011).¹⁰ Concentrating on gender roles enables to keep the idea of the permanent exhibition simple but also socially relevant. The issue of gender-balanced development of a society is a raising topic of discussions in the Estonian public sphere. A few years ago, this theme reached the Estonian museums and made the curators consider the way in which they present male and female issues more carefully.¹¹ We became intrigued by this emerging discourse in which indigenous or historical traditions may become targets of critique from the viewpoint of contemporary understanding of social correctness.

We plan to display different aspects of gender dialogue among the Finno-Ugric peoples. We attempt to contribute to the social discourse about gender issues by demonstrating that different peoples have generated various balanced models for treating female-male relations’ problem. Many traditional rules appear in the contemporary western social context as rather challenging. People have been traditionally very strict in dividing occupations but, at the same time, folk narratives depict connections between women and men rather ambivalently. This way, we aim to negotiate traditional ethnography and modern gender discourse. Hopefully, this ambivalent dialogue between conservatively gathered material and novel conceptual narratives enables to compose intriguing performative display.

After years of discussing the theme, our team concluded in understanding that there are several reasons for choosing the gender topic for our permanent exhibition. It is relevant in the contemporary public discussions in Estonia and Europe. At the same time, gender rules exist in every society and these norms enable to present different peoples at the museum display in a meaningful way. Besides, there are also practical museological considerations for establishing the topic as one can always find from museum collections ethnographic objects that can be related to female and male agents of culture.

The theme of gender-related cultural behaviour is not unique among the Finno-Ugrians although this topic enables us to demonstrate a wide range of cultural par-

ticularities. It is an attempt to metaphorically turn the museum into “a real cradle of searching for solutions to actual problems of social practice” (Arsen’yev 2007: 14). Gender relations will be ethnographically reflected in material items, photographs and folk narratives. This cognitive connection is supported by the idea that, at the museum, an object becomes a metaphor (cf. Baranov 2007: 22).

At the museum, the Finno-Ugric connections will be articulated by the interactive image of the language tree, the presentation of the history of ideas about the Finno-Ugric peoples and a number of dialogic moments in the prospective display of ethnographic objects. Contemporary social problems (articulated through a gender paradigm, again) will be mediated by a collage-like video display. The exhibition space will be arranged in the form of three-dimensional labyrinth.¹² By employing a kind of a labyrinthine aesthetic we partly reflect these attempts to negotiate contemporary developments in the understanding of Finno-Ugric identity.

By the spring season of 2014, the exhibition team had settled the conceptual discussions. Next our group will deal with the textual and practical design of the chosen ideas. We suppose that the historical legacy of the ENM’s Finno-Ugric exhibitions and dialogue with contemporary museological thinking will result in a display that supports the Finno-Ugric indigenous groups’ dignity and enables visitors to enjoy the presentation.

DISCUSSION

The preparation of the ENM’s new Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition has evolved from the historical legacy of scientific and museological efforts made by the museum ethnographers over decades. In addition to searching for a good idea for the future permanent display, the ambivalent connection between the ethical dimension of cultural logic and a demand for ethnographic charisma has been the focus of our discussions. When preparing cultural reproduction at a museum, impression and respect may easily contradict to each other. Strategically, the aim of the future display is to depart from contemporary development of museum philosophies while at the same time avoiding imitation of other permanent exhibitions in similar museums.

Preparing exhibitions always involves an ambivalent play on the borderlands of academic solidity and artistic playfulness, emotion and conceptualisation (Conte 2007: 44). These ethnographic manifestations employ and detect an uncertain cognitive area in search of something unsettled and illuminating. Philosophical museums encourage visitors to recognise the intended conceptual vagueness as the foundation of any human knowledge. These museums also demonstrate continuation and fragmentation in development of culture, evolution of various self-identifications and cultural distinctiveness. Ethnographic museums connect people and constitute points of social synthesis, relativising immediate reactions and impressions in order to discover the diversity of the world and to locate questions that provoke thought. (Ibid.: 44–47)

Our historical analysis revealed that the first exhibition efforts in the 1920s and 1930s indicate that ENM curators were well aware of contemporary museological trends. They followed good exhibition practices of the time and produced solid ethnographic displays that reflected reality in a way that was supposed to dispose structural taxonomies of culture and create an aura of lifelikeness. After WWII, the Finno-Ugric dis-

plays were reintroduced at the ENM predominantly from the 1970s. Until the end of the Soviet period, the museum's exhibitions reflected a conservation of the style of the 1920s. Public policy avoided emphasising issues of shared cultural identity (cf. Kõiva 2007: 49–51), thus the need for inter-cultural exchange of experience was stressed. This approach enabled the museum ethnographers to reject political pressure and to praise contemporary socialist developments (Konksi 2007: 33). At the same time, the topic of related cultural identities remained semi-hidden. During the 1990s, exhibition experiments and testing of mixed displays with classical and postmodern approaches began. The new permanent exhibition is still in the process of preparation but conceptual condensation points are now clarified. This enables us to analyse the visionary aspect of this exhibition-making in its century-long historical context.

In this article, we touched upon the problem of the historical frame and contemporary efforts to create Finno-Ugric ethnographic displays at the ENM. Our team's contextualisation attempt aims to move towards the new permanent exhibition through continuous reconceptualisation of displays and experimentation that have enabled a style of production that takes into account the entire historical legacy available. However, this historically rooted approach introduces the problem of innovation and the question of the possibility of radical changes in this long-term development.

In the course of the preparation of the ENM's new permanent exhibition, an ideological conflict of choice appears between conservative and experimental approaches. According to the traditionalist museological view, permanent exhibitions tend to be more conservative than temporary displays. Anyhow, in some museums, permanent exhibition curators also employ experimental conceptual frames and artist design. The ENM's Finno-Ugric permanent exhibition team stays at the crossroads of traditional museology and innovation by trying to involve both to some degree. This effort is not an ill-defined museological fumbling but a conscious choice that involves intensive thinking and decision-making on every aspect of prospective ethnographic representation. We are aware that it is complicated to forecast the actual intellectual and emotional results of this combination of conservatism and originality.

Our performative strategy also involves intellectual and perceptual conflict between selections of attractive and/or ethical styles of representation. Our team has recognised this ideological area as the domain of some crucial choices and has decided to follow ethical demands unconditionally. At the same time we attempt to develop solutions that enable us to maintain high standards of ethnographic charm without violating any ethical imperatives. In order to meet the challenge of combining expected conservative systematics and desired innovation, as well as managing our ethical approach and elaborating on aesthetic qualities, our aim is to develop a strategy of ethical attraction.

This study represents an attempt at partly auto-ethnographic reflection and analysis regarding the practice of ethnographic representation. We completed this examination before we could see the final result of the analysed exhibition-making process. At this moment, our analysis enables us to detect troubles, doubts, and uncertainties in exhibition production.

In the course of this inconclusive phase in exhibition making, uncertainty and doubt are good tools that stimulate an ethical approach and nurture our quest for innovation in ethnographic display. This situation involves the potential of conceptual fragmentarity, hopefully urging our future audience to think along with us. Further analysis of

the permanent exhibition production from a temporal distance will enable us to contextualise this process differently. However, the incompleteness of the exhibition process enabled us to employ our currently unique cognitive position, although it may be carried along by somewhat naïve hopes and anticipation of the potentially enchanting influence our exhibition will have.

NOTES

1 Today the ENM's Finno-Ugric collections include 10,000 ethnographic objects. 90 per cent of these items have been collected since the 1960s and originate from the first half of, or the mid, 20th century. As the collecting strategy dictated that attention was paid predominantly to classical ethnography, the objects that were obtained were mainly classified as traditional. In the Estonian context, traditional ethnography means that these items were supposed to represent the culture of the 19th and early 20th centuries.

2 In his correspondence Franz Boas criticised the overly perfect resemblance of museum wax figures to real people. According to Boas, there must be a demarcation line between nature and the copy. The difference between plastic art and nature must be stressed, not hidden. (Rony 1996: 243)

3 The exhibition team includes ethnographers, collection managers and ENM pedagogs, scholars from the University of Tartu, the Jan&Ken architect studio and the Velvet design agency.

4 The exhibition was brought from the Tomsk Museum of Regional History. The Tomsk Museum is not a Finno-Ugric museum although Tomsk ethnographers focus very much on the Ob-Ugrian and Samoyed people and thus this exhibition can be presented in this list. It was hardly a coincidence that the Tomsk exhibition was brought to the ENM – the Finno-Ugric motivation played its role.

5 The rock carving display was made in collaboration with the Estonian Department of the All-Union Society of Geodesy and Astronomy. These rock carvings are considered early evidence of the Uralic people's art and cosmology.

6 Kindred Peoples Days have been celebrated in Estonia every October since 1989. At every festival the Finno-Ugric indigenous folklore groups present performances. Since 2011, Kindred Peoples Day (the third Saturday of October) has been a national holiday in Estonia.

7 Early Soviet collecting practices could be even harsher as they were combined with repressions. For example, Il'yakhov (1998) describes a case in Yakutia where, in 1932, during the massive persecution of shamans, a local culture house room was full of shamanic garments, confiscated from repressed shamans.

8 The bear is a highly honoured animal in the Khanty and Mansi religion. The bear is considered a son of the main god, Numi Torem, who was sent to the peoples. In addition, all images with faces are considered alive (Chernetsov 1987).

9 The museum's new building is based on the Memory Field project (architects Dan Dorell, Lina Ghotmeh, Tsuyoshi Tane). They related the idea of the ENM's new home to Estonia's dramatic past. The former Soviet military airport runway is included in the project as a sign of occupation. The slightly inclined roof of the new building symbolises rising to the sky, moving towards the future. (New Building)

10 Target group inquires revealed that people considered genderly division of everyday culture 'sexy' (Runnel et al. 2010: 333), however, the Finno-Ugric exhibition team made the choice of a theme independently from this audience-related opinion.

11 In 2007, the Tartu Toy Museum and the ENM were investigated by the Estonian Gender Equality and Equal Treatment Commissioner. The toy museum was accused of organising

Boys' Day. During this gathering, children could play with toys that were historically considered appropriate for boys. The ENM was blamed for arranging a workshop for boys who could study traditional male handicrafts. The Commissioner demanded that museums not advertise any events by using gender-related messages, neither could they place any gender-based restrictions on access to these events. In the Estonian daily newspapers the problem of sexism at museums was discussed in a rather lively way. The Commissioner's act was evaluated as the initiation of irreversible changes in Estonian society (Ojakivi 2007; SLÖL 2007). The dominant force of the Estonian political opposition, the Centrist Party, treated this case as an example of the government's political failures (Osa 2008).

12 The Finno-Ugric folk art exhibition of 1989 was also designed by an "in a way labyrinthine composition" (Reemann 1994: 62), although this resemblance is merely coincidental.

SOURCES

ERM A – Estonian National Museum archive.

REFERENCES

- Alver, Bente Gullveig and Ørjar Øyen. 2007. Challenges of Research Ethics: An Introduction. – *Research Ethics in Studies of Culture and Social Life. Folklore Fellows' Communications 292*, edited by Bente Gullveig Alver, Tove Ingebjørg Fjell and Ørjar Øyen. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeseura, 11–55.
- Arsen'yev, Vladimir Romanovich. 2007. Krizis muzeyev? Krizis etnografii? Krizis civilizatsii? – *Antropologicheskii forum 6*: 9–19. [Арсеньев, Владимир Романович. 2007. Кризис музеев? Кризис этнографии? Кризис цивилизации? – *Антропологический форум 6*: 9–19.]
- Baranov, Dmitriy Aleksandrovich. 2007. Мне predstavlyaetsya... – *Antropologicheskii forum 6*: 21–25. [Баранов, Дмитрий Александрович. 2007. Мне представляется.... – *Антропологический форум 6*: 21–25.]
- Basu, Paul. 2007. The Labyrinthine Aesthetic in Contemporary Museum Design. – *Exhibition Experiments*, edited by Sharon Macdonald and Paul Basu. Malden, MA; Oxford; Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 47–70.
- Basu, Paul and Sharon Macdonald. 2007. Introduction: Experiments in Exhibition, Ethnography, Art, and Science. – *Exhibition Experiments*, edited by Sharon Macdonald and Paul Basu. Malden, MA; Oxford; Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 1–24.
- Belcher, Michael. 1991. *Exhibitions in Museums. Leicester Museum Studies Series*. Leicester and London; Washington, DC: Leicester University Press; Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Chernetsov, Valeriy Nikolayevich. 1987. *Istochniki po etnografii Zapadnoy Sibiri*. Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo Tomskogo universiteta. [Чернецов, Валерий Николаевич. 1987. *Источники по этнографии Западной Сибири*. Томск: Издательство Томского университета.]
- Chistov, Yuriy Kirillovich. 2007. Dlya togo chtoby otvetit'... – *Antropologicheskii forum 6*: 108–114. [Чистов, Юрий Кириллович. 2007. Для того чтобы ответить... – *Антропологический форум 6*: 108–114.]
- Clifford, James. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge; Massachusetts, MA; London: Harvard University Press.
- Conte, Francic. 2007. Ot etnograficheskikh muzeyev k muzeyam obshchestva. Razmyshleniya po povodu frantsuzskogo opyta. – *Antropologicheskii forum 6*: 41–47. [Конт, Франсис. 2007. От этнографических музеев к музеям общества. Размышления по поводу французского опыта. – *Антропологический форум 6*: 41–47.]

- Crew, Spencer R. and James E. Sims. 1991. Locating Authenticity: Fragments of a Dialogue. – *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine. Washington, WA; London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 159–175.
- Engelsman, Steven. 2007. Muzeinye kollektsii, zadachi, deystviya. – *Antropologicheskii forum* 6: 118–124. [Энгелсман, Стивен. 2007. Музейные коллекции, задачи, действия. – *Антропологический форум* 6: 118–124.]
- Forum 2007. Forum “Etnograficheskiye muzei segodnya”. – *Antropologicheskii forum* 6: 6–132. [Форум «Этнографические музеи сегодня». 2007. – *Антропологический форум* 6: 6–132.]
- П’яkhov, P. N. 1998. Repressii protiv severnykh shamanov (1920–1935 gg.). – *Istoriko-etnosotsial’nye issledovaniya. Regional’nye problemy*, edited by V. N. Ivanov. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 88–97. [Ильяхов, П. Н. 1998. Репрессии против северных шаманов (1920–1935 гг.) – *Историко-этносоциальные исследования. Региональные проблемы*, ред. В. Н. Иванов. Новосибирск: Наука, 88–97.]
- Jaagosild, Ildike. 1971. *Soome-ugri rahvaste kogud. Kataloog*. Tallinn: Kunst.
- Juku, Kyösti. 1996. Suomalais-ugrilainen muuri. – *Historia Fenno-Ugrica, I:1. Congressus Primus Historiae Fenno-Ugricae*. Oulu: Societas Historiae Fenno-Ugricae, 421–428.
- Karm, Svetlana. 2011. Ekho Urala v Estonskom natsional’nom muzeye, ili muzeologicheskii aspekt estonskogo kontsepta “finno-ugorskiy mir”. – *Ezhegodnik finno-ugorskiikh issledovaniy* 3, edited by N. I. Leonov, A. E. Zagrebin, A. V. Ishmuratov, R. V. Kirillova and D. I. Cherashnyaya. Izhevsk: Izdatel’stvo Udmurtskiy universitet, 98–110. [Карм, Светлана. 2011. Эхо Урала в Эстонском национальном музее, или музееологический аспект эстонского концепта «финно-угорский мир». – *Ежегодник финно-угорских исследований* 3, ред. Н. И. Леонов, А. Е. Загребин, А. В. Ишмуратов, Р. В. Кириллова, Д. И. Черашняя. Ижевск: Издательство Удмуртский университет, 98–110.]
- Karp, Ivan. 1991. Culture and Representation. – *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine. Washington, WA; London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 11–24.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1991. Objects of Ethnography. – *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Display*, edited by Ivan Karp and Steven D. Lavine. Washington, WA; London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 386–443.
- Kõiva, Mare. 2007. The Contemporary Museum as a Site for Displaying Values. – *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 1 (1–2): 49–62.
- Konksi, Karin. 2007. Sovietisation and the Estonian National Museum during 1940s–1950s. – *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 1 (1–2): 29–38.
- Konksi, Karin. 2009. Etnograafiamuuseumina Nõukogude Eestis. – *Eesti Rahva Muuseumi 100 aastat*, edited by Piret Õunapuu. Tartu: Eesti Rahva Muuseum, 250–355.
- Konsin, Kalju. 1984. Etnograafiamuuseumi massikultuuritööst 1976–1980. – *Etnograafiamuuseumi aastaraamat* 34, edited by Jüri Linnus. Tallinn: Valgus, 146–150.
- Kotilainen, Eija-Maija. 2007. Novye problemy predstavleniya mirovykh kul’tur v muzeye. – *Antropologicheskii forum* 6: 48–56. [Котилайнен, Эйя-Майя. 2007. Новые проблемы представления мировых культур в музее. – *Антропологический форум* 6: 48–56.]
- Kupina, Juliya Arkad’yevna. 2007. Etnograficheskiiye kollektsii v sovremennom muzeye: razmysshleniya na zadannye temu. – *Antropologicheskii forum* 6: 56–65. [Купина, Юлия Аркадьевна. 2007. Этнографические коллекции в современном музее: размышления на заданные темы. – *Антропологический форум* 6: 56–65.]
- Kuznetsov, Stefan Kirovich. 2009 [1906–1907]. Iz vospominaniy etnografa. – *Svyatyni. Kul’t predkov. Drevnyaya istoriya*, edited by Laid Shemyer (V. N. Kozlov). Yoshkar-Ola: Tsentru-muzei im. Valentina Kolumba, Mariyskoe Knizhnoye Izdatel’stvo, 203–251. [Кузнецов, Стефан Кирович. 2009 [1906–1907]. Из воспоминаний этнографа. – *Святыни. Культ предков. Древняя история*, ред. Лайд Шемйэр (В. Н. Козлов). Йошкар-Ола: Центр-музей им. Валентина Колумба, Марийское Книжное Издательство, 203–251.]

- Leete, Art. 2008. Notes about Possessing a Heritage in a Komi Village. – *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 2 (2): 13–24.
- Linnus, Jüri. 1970. Eesti Riikliku Etnograafiamuuseumi soome-ugri rahvaste etnograafilised kogud. – *Läänemeresoomlaste rahvakultuurist*, edited by Jüri Linnus. Tallinn: Valgus, 226–245.
- Lysenko, Oleg Viktorovich. 2007. Как pokazali doklady... – *Antropologicheskii forum* 6: 65–72. [Лысенко, Олег Викторович. 2007. Как показали доклады... – *Антропологический форум* 6: 65–72.]
- Manninen, Ilmari Justus Andreas. 1928. Wene muuseumid. Etnograafilised muuseumid Leningradis ja Moskvast. – *Postimees*, September 26, 1928: 7; September 27, 1928: 5.
- Mathisen, Stein R. 2004. Hegemonic Representations of Sámi Culture: From Narratives of Noble Savages to Discourses on Ecological Sámi. – *Creating Diversities: Folklore, Religion and the Politics of Heritage*. *Studia Fennica Folkloristica* 14, edited by Anna-Leena Siikala, Barbo Klein and Stein R. Mathisen. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 17–30.
- Mills, Margaret A. 2007. On the Problem of Truth in Ethnographic Texts and Entextualisation Processes. – *Research Ethics in Studies of Culture and Social Life*. *Folklore Fellows' Communications* 292, edited by Bente Gullveig Alver, Tove Ingebjørg Fjell and Ørjar Øyen. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 56–75.
- Moldanova, Tat'yana Aleksandrovna. 2013. Izdeliya narodnogo iskusstva obskikh ugrov: stepen' sokhrannosti na sovremennom etape. – *Vestnik ugrovedeniya* 2 (13): 130–136. [Молданова, Татьяна Александровна. 2013. Изделия народного искусства обских угров: степень сохранности на современном этапе. – *Вестник угроведения* 2 (13): 130–136.]
- New Building. Estonian National Museum – What Is This? Where Is This? <http://www.erm.ee/en/about-us/new-building> (accessed July 23, 2014).
- Ojakivi, Mirko. 2007. Võrdõiguslikkuse volinik võitleb poiste mänguasjadega. – *Eesti Päevaleht*, December 17, 2007. <http://epl.delfi.ee/news/estivi/vordoisuslikkuse-volinik-voitleb-poiste-manguasjadega?id=51112819> (accessed July 23, 2014).
- Osa, Eve. 2008. Riik on paks nagu vana siga. – *Kesknädal*, January 30, 2008. http://www.kesknadal.ee/g2/uudised?id=9756&sess_admin=b5713590f0c27dd571f98b680ecdedd7 (accessed July 23, 2014).
- Ostroumov, I. G. 1904. *Voguly-mansi. Istoriko-etnograficheskiy ocherk. Materialy dlya izucheniya Permskogo kraja* 1. Perm': Permskiy kraj. [Остроумов, И. Г. 1904. *Возулы-манси. Историко-этнографический очерк. Материалы для изучения Пермского края* 1. Пермь: Пермский край.]
- Porto, Nuno. 2007. From Exhibiting to Installing Ethnography: Experiments at the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Coimbra, Portugal, 1999–2005. – *Exhibition Experiments*, edited by Sharon Macdonald and Paul Basu. Malden, MA; Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing, 175–196.
- Prokoshev F. D. 1909. *Poezdka po Vologodskoy gubernii v Pechorskiy kraj k budushchim vodnym putyam na Sibir'*, composed by B. V. Bezsonov. Sankt-Peterburg: T-vo R. Golike i A. Vil'borg. [Прокошев, Ф. Д. 1909. *Поездка по Вологодской губернии в Печорский край к будущим водным путям на Сибирь*, сост. Б. В. Безсонов. Санкт-Петербург: Т-во Р. Голике и А. Вильборг.]
- Reemann, Vaike. 1994. Näitus "Soomeugrilaste rahvakunst" Tallinnas 1989. aastal. – *Eesti Rahva Muuseumi aastaraamat* 40, edited by Heiki Pärdi, Toivo Sikka and Ivi Tammaru. Tartu: Eesti Rahva Muuseum, 60–74.
- Rony, Fatimah Tobing. 1996. *The Third Eye: Race, Cinema, and Ethnographic Spectacle*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Runnel, Pille; Taavi Tatsi and Pille Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt. 2010. Who Authors the Nation? The Debate Surrounding the Building of the New Estonian National Museum. – *National Museums: New Studies from around the World*, edited by Simon J. Knell, Peter Aronsson, Arne Bugge Amundsen, Amy Jane Barnes, Stuart Burch and Jen Carter. London; New York, NY: Routledge, 325–338.

- Sandahl, Etta. 2007. Vključennyj Drugoj – oksjumoron covremennykh etnograficheskikh kollektсий? Muzei kak institutsii kolonializma. – *Antropologičeskij forum* 6: 87–97. [Сэндал, Етта. 2007. Включенный Другой – оксюморон современных этнографических коллекций? Музеи как институции колониализма. – *Антропологический форум* 6: 87–97.]
- Setälä, Emil Nestor. 1925. Soome-Eesti kultuurilised ühispuüded. Soome haridusministri, professor E. N. Setälä eestikeelne kõne Tartu Ülikooli aulas 23. mail 1925. – *Eesti Kirjandus* 19 (5): 161–163.
- Sikka, Toivo. 1997. Eesti Rahva Muuseum ja soome-ugri rahvad: ülevaade kogudest, ekspeditsioonidest, konverentsidest ja näitustest. – *Hõimused. Fenno-Ugria 70. aastapäeva album*. Tallinn: Fenno-Ugria. <http://www.suri.ee/hs/sikka.html> (accessed July 19, 2014).
- SLÕL 2007 = Seelikus võrdõigusvolinik ahistab mehi. – *Õhtuleht*, December 20, 2007. <http://www.oh tuleht.ee/259396/seelikus-vordoigusvolinik-ahistab-mehi> (accessed July 19, 2014).
- Tallgren, Aarne Michaël. 1921. Missugune Eesti rahvuslik muuseum peaks olema. – *Postimees*, October 27, 1921: 5–6.
- Tallgren, Aarne Michaël. 1923. Eesti muuseum ja soome-ugri teaduse alad. – *Odamees* 2: 41–43.
- Tatsi, Taavi. 2011. Identity Struggles of Museum Professionals: Autonomous Expertise and Audience Participation in Exhibition Production. – *Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics* 5 (2), 65–80.
- Viatte, Germain. 2007. Etnograficheskiye sobraniya v sovremennom muzeye. – *Antropologičeskij forum* 6: 25–31. [Вьят, Жермен. 2007. Этнографические собрания в современном музее. – *Антропологический форум* 6: 25–31.]
- Zasetskaya, Marina L'vovna. 2013. Vremennaya vystavka "I. A. Gal'nbeek – issledovatel' estonskoj etnografii". – *Muzey. Traditsii. Etničnost'* 1: 106–118. [Засецкая, Марина Львовна. 2013. Временная выставка «И. А. Гальнбек – исследователь эстонской этнографии». – *Музей. Традиции. Этничность* 1: 106–118.]