Masaryk University
Faculty of Art
Department of European Ethnology

Ethnology for the 21st Century

Bases and Prospects

Marta Botiková & Miroslav Válka et al.

Masaryk University
Faculty of Art
Department of European Ethnology

Ethnology for the 21st Century
Bases and Prospects

Marta Botiková & Miroslav Válka et al.

Etnologické studie 22
Brno 2017

Ethnological studies 22

The publication was written within specific research of the Institute of European Ethnology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University.

Reviewed by: Associate Professor Kornélia Jakubíková
Associate Professor Martina Pavlicová

ISBN 978-80-210-8860-3
ISBN 978-80-210-8861-0 (online : pdf)

List of Contents

Foreword

The following publication reflects our intention to tackle themes in teaching ethnology, which may, survive the changes of generations as well as social changesmon the threshold of the millennium. Our ideas, intentions and uncertainties are concentrated in the vision of themes which are included in the publication "Ethnology for the 21st Century. Bases and Prospects".

The monograph is compiled as a team work written by university teachers, Ph.D. students and experts from academic institutions, who take part in lecturing, about the future direction in ethnology teaching at universities. We are aware of the fact that it is the university ethnology teaching and the high-quality education of university graduates that guarantee the future development of the discipline and its place among humanities and social sciences. Our major goal is to assess discipline's position and mission in nowadays society, and to think of the concept of discipline teaching, the teaching methods, the themes that will have to be included in study programmes, and of how to present different concepts of the discipline.

The themes traeted from the field of historical and urban ethnology, folklore and folklorism, study of migrations, and medical anthropology are diverse. Their independent benefit consists in the fact that while studying them we found ourselves both in the rural and the urban environment, and that we, ethnologists from the Czech Republic and from Slovakia, met while working on them. It is not a programme declaration, as a mosaic could only hardly form a common line, but in its diversity it may represent and truly represents the common programme based on traditions and ongoing discourse of the discipline. Another benefit and uniqueness of our approach to the theme is that a single publication space brought together experts with long-years of professional practical experience, our beginning colleagues, and Ph.D. students discovering actual dimensions of our science for them and their audience.

The cohort of senior lecturers and professors, who have been acting as teachers for the longest period of time, includes the generation of people born in the 1950s. They slowly go into retirement, but pay attention to how our discipline has developed and what it can offer to social practice. This generation

grew – in a certain sense of the word – in a setting of privileged education. Not from the perspective of its content, but from the perspective of the time destined for studies, as in the biodromal section of their studies they could concentrate only on their study interests. Society declared that it was heading to "better times". Although these did not come, it might have been the reason why the will to overcome obstacles developed willingly and resolutely. This generation features delight in political liberation, opened borders and new possibility of getting to know the near and far world. In the realm of additional education, the time came to understand new ways of organization and funding of science, to get computer skills and other new knowledge. While going forward, the view often focuses on the foothold of past phenomena and processes, through which they try to explain many process changes of the present; these are some of the common features.

The colleagues, who are one generation younger and who began their social practice two or three decades later, after the year 1989, had many skills interiorized, and the global outlook and communication was not so unbelievable for them. On the other hand, the life exposed them to many existence insecurities, which were not common earlier. Notwithstanding the forgoing, these people who are middle-aged today look calm but often also exhausted, while following and pursuing their goals.

And who are our young Ph.D. students and our students? Today, they are young people born at the turn of the millennium, for whom it is significant to use internet technologies, with which they are identified, as well as social media, which represent an important portion in their social life. However, many life contexts have caused their feeling of mental imbalance and jeopardy. All of us, moreover filled with our personal stories and experience, meet at one or the other side of teacher's desk or at round tables. This is also one of the reasons why this team monograph has been written – with the intention to express our mutual understanding, and harmony of possibilities and expectations; and that no group of us would be afraid of accepting modern-day challenges as well as of safeguarding the best results of earlier knowledge.

As resulting from the title "Ethnology for the 21st Century. Bases and Prospects," our publication tries to summarize the past development when the discipline was understood as a historical discipline, and to outline contemporary development trends, which bring ethnology nearer to sociocultural anthropology and social sciences. We respect this development line when dividing the publication into particular chapters. The "Bases" include chapters

which focus on historiography, while summarizing the hitherto development in different research themes. The two introductory texts contemplate the sense and mission of historical ethnology within contemporary research and lessons for beginners in the discipline (Miroslav Válka, Juraj Janto). Modern-day folkloristics deals with similar issues, even though folkloristics has developed in an independent discipline, however, with close ties to ethnology (ethnography). The chapter about the development of folkloristics in Slovakia and at Comenius University in Bratislava (Hana Hlôšková) shows many common points with the development in the Czech Republic. A similar thesis can be applied in the case of ethnomusicology, which – as a sub-discipline of ethnology – focuses on transformations in ethno-cultural traditions in general, in addition to its traditional music-folkloristic attitude (Klára Císaríková).

The section "Prospects" includes chapters which open up and explain new themes of ethnological investigations in current "post-modern" period. As written above, traditional folk culture as well as phenomena rooted in it and termed "ethno-cultural traditions" should retain their place in discipline teaching. Applied folkloristics required by current social practice can find its place in ethnology teaching at universities, when this is provided by a group of high-quality teachers (Jana Ambrózová, Zuzana Beňušková, Margita Jágerová). Folkloristic investigations open up new themes, such as buskers, street artists (Martina Hanáková), and methodological procedures submitting new knowledge about how tradition works at present; diachronic (repeated) research is one such (Jana Pospíšilová).

In addition to traditional folk culture, Czech and Slovak ethnology (ethnography) committedly focused on the research into working-classes, urban culture and modern-day village (with cooperative farming) after World War II. The ethnological research in socialist era (1948–1989) opens-up a methodological problem whether it is possible to speak about contemporary or historical ethnology (Oto Polouček). The research into urban culture resulted in a lot of high-quality publications at the Brno branch of the Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences. The research into the ways or communication and association of city residents in the Czech Republic has been for many years presented as a specific direction in ethnological investigations, which in last decades are considered to be a partial discipline – urban ethnology (Karel Altman). The contemporary research into city as an independent professional focus within modern-day ethnology is promising and it should have its firm place in teaching the discipline at universities (Jan Semrád).

Migration as a consequence of world globalization processes and war conflicts is a serious societal phenomenon and a political problem which concerns not only the Czech and Slovak Republics, but also other European countries. The above issue can be approached from different angles of view from the perspective of ethnology. We can perceive migration as a socio-economic phenomenon that relates to the formation of the European Union and open labour market, and for this reason it is a lifestyle for a part of the young generation (Joanna Maurer). On the other hand, migration of inhabitants and integration of foreigners arriving from countries with a different culture become a serious problem for state administration. There is a great deal of scope for ethnology and possibilities of using the results of research into foreigners in practice (Stanislav Brouček). Other possibilities of ethnological research are provided by alien police rooms, which – based on communication between foreigners and representatives of state institutions – imply the possibilities of integrating the foreigners into majority society (Marta Botiková, Lenka Koišová). Ethnological research relating to migration and inter-cultural communication requires a specific type of research preparation. Within the lectures and lessons for students, it is necessary to acquire pieces of knowledge that lead to changes in attitudes towards dissimilarity (Helena Tužinská).

The issues of body and corporeality are a multi-disciplinary theme. Ethnological approach in historical context deals with the aesthetics in body expressions, clothing and embellishment alongside the history of culture, as Alena Křížová states. Gender studies are becoming a new and quite frequent research subject-matter. They can be aimed at different directions. In our book, this theme is opened up by a chapter about the lineage theory where the author states that ethnology has dealt with family diversities and family roles since the beginning of its existence, but with focus on relatives and the family itself. Currently, the lineage theory serves for the interpretation of culture and social behaviour. Therefore, the lineage concept should be an obligatory part of ethnology graduates' knowledge (Tatiana Bužeková). Biological aspects of human existence are interrelated with social and cultural forms of human's life. For this reason, students of ethnology would be well-advised to have knowledge from the realm of evolutionary anthropology (Michal Uhrín). In Western Europe and in the United States, medical anthropology is one of well-established anthropological sub-disciplines. Due to a significant dimension of application, it can be used for ethnological research in the environment of socially disadvantaged groups, migrants, etc. (Danijela Jerotijević).

The team monograph "Ethnology for the 21st Century. Bases and Prospects" tries to assess the position and mission of our discipline in the present-day society, and to bring up the concept of ethnology teaching to cover the current discourse and different concepts of the discipline.

Marta Botiková – Miroslav Válka

Historical Ethnology – a Heritage or a Perspective Research Direction?

Miroslav Válka

Even though we speak about Czech ethnology and its theoretical and methodological direction, we must be aware of the fact that the discourse of this scientific discipline has undergone several stages of development, which have been reflected in the discipline's official name used in the university and academic spheres, and in titles of discipline-specific journals,[1] institutions[2] and organizations.[3] On the one hand, the older names, such as *národopis* [≈ a description of the people] and *ethnography,* are often used in journalism like synonyms, on the other hand they show semantic differences in the history of the science and have their historical validity. However, we have to say that the abovementioned changes in the Czech environment reflected the Central-European development which differed from the situation especially in the Anglo-Saxon environment, where the research developed on the basis of anthropology and social sciences (Soukup 1996; 2004). The historical orientation, which defines the beginnings of the discipline, was confronted with other research concepts, and this became most evident upon social-political changes related to the critical years 1918, 1948 and 1989 in Czech history.[4] If we observe the

1 *Národopisný sborník československý* [Czechoslavic Ethnographic Review] (issued 1895–1906); *Národopisný věstník československý* [Czechoslavic Ethnographic Journal] (founded in 1906, today *Národopisný věstník* [Ethnographic Journal], a press platform of the Czech Ethnological Society); *Československá etnografie* [Czechoslovak Ethnography] (issued 1950–1962); *Národopisné aktuality* [Current Events in Ethnography] (1964–1991) and *Národopisná revue* [Journal of Ethnology] (issued since 1992) as periodicals issued by the National Institute of Folk Culture in Strážnice.

2 Seminar for Ethnography at Charles University in Prague, Departments of Ethnography and Folkloristics in Prague and Brno, Institute of Ethnography and Folkloristics of the CSAS.

3 Czechoslavic Ethnographic Society (founded in 1891), Society of Czechoslovak Ethnographers at the CSAS (established in 1956), today Czech Ethnological Society as a covering organization of Czech ethnologists from the museum, academic and university spheres

4 These data concern the formation of the Czechoslovak Republic (1918), "Victorious February" connected with Communist coup d'état (1948), and "Velvet Revolution" that terminated the era of state socialism and affiliation of Czechoslovakia to the Eastern (Soviet) political bloc (1989).

recent ethnological production, the changes in paradigm are more than obvious (Janeček 2015). Does therefore the discipline's original historical approach have a place and justification in contemporary Czech ethnology?

This question can be answered by recent publications which are outcomes from scientific projects observing Czech ethnology from the methodological and methodical points of view (Pavlásek and Nosková eds. 2013; Doušek et al. 2014; Nosková 2014), or by historiographical texts focused on the situation of the discipline in the 20th century (Kandert 2002; Jančář 2014) or only in the second half of the last century, i.e. in the period of socialism (Woitsch and Jůnová Macková et al. eds. 2016), or by those who deal with teaching the discipline at universities (Válka et al. 2016) and with the situation in academic institutions (Pospíšilová and Nosková eds. 2005; Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016). The possibilities of the historical approach to cultural phenomena in the pre-industrial village, which initiated the Czech ethnography's interest, have been brought up by two recently published publications, one of which has attempted a further synthetic view of the traditional culture of Czech ethnic group with the application of the discipline's well-proven systematics (Tyllner et al. 2014), but the other one chose a debatable approach in categories, such as autochthony, stability, innovation, differentness, and unity (Doušek and Drápala eds. 2016).

Czech ethnography and development of its discourse

It can be roughly said that the Czech term "národopis"[5] relates to the beginnings of discipline's development in the 19th century and the first half of the last century, even though the use of this term can be seen even later. Like in other Central-European countries, the term has its roots in the interest in folk literature, which was monitored from national-emancipatory, literary and scientific perspectives (Horák 1933); an important role played the oldest history called "antiques" perceived in Slavic contexts as well as cultural specifics of ethnographic groups of residents (the folk), whose regional identity was confronted with created national identity (Jeřábek 1997).

The institutionalizing of the discipline was gradual and the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Society (1891), which was to manage the discipline's research work,

5 An incorrect translation of the German word "Volkskunde". The corresponding Czech terms "lidopis", and "lidozpyt" [a description of the folk] occur in professional literature, but they have not been accepted in general.

became its platform (Smrčka 2011: 6). One of its tasks was the organization of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition in 1895;[6] the Exhibition was preceded by regional exhibitions throughout the Czech lands, which led to the development of national movement with emancipatory and ethno-identification features (Brouček 1979), but on the other hand it was marked by the idealization of folk culture and the Czech nationalism (Pargač ed. 1996). The exhibits concentrated in Prague became a basis for the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Museum, founded in 1896; the museum and a periodical issued by it became the major centre of scientific work in the discipline.[7] The profile of the research work is witnessed by *Český lid* [The Czech Folk], another central discipline-specific journal established in 1891 and edited by the cultural historian Čeněk Zíbrt and the archaeologist Lubor Niederle; the originally intended wide concept of the journal was narrowed down to ethnographic and culture-historical themes represented by Zíbrt and regional researchers (Kunz 1960). The journal focused on domestic Czech material, but it overlooked more general themes as well as theory and methodology of the discipline, for which the critics reproached it. For this reason, this sphere of Czech ethnography was addressed by the *Národopisný sborník československý* [Czechoslavic Ethnographic Review], and from 1906 the *Národopisný věstník československý* [Czechoslavic Ethnographic Journal] edited by the literary scientist and folklorist, university professor Jiří Polívka who elevated the journal to European level (Veselská 2008).

How did the theoretical-methodological basis of the new discipline develop? The widest definition of the discipline's subject-matter required "a universal, complete and scientifically deepened depiction of our nation, all its aspects, all its layers and all its life" (Kovář 1897: 2), but simultaneously it was aware of the fact that the core of the nation is formed by people, and therefore "demography is the most important part and the basis of ethnography" (Kovář 1897: 6). This concept, whose author the cultural historian Emanuel Kovář, one of the central figures of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition, was, became the basis for the first ideological suggestion of a proposed encyclopaedia (Kovář 1897). Due to its width, this concept was never implemented, and

6 The term "Czechoslavic" was an opposite of the term "Deutschböhmen", as the Germans living in the Czech lands were called; since the interwar period, the Germans have been called "Sudeten Germans". The term "Czechoslavic" is used in titles of disciplinary periodicals, an ethnographic museum and a society.

7 In 1904, the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Society merged with the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Museum, and as a consequence of this the Society of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Museum was established (Smrčka 2011: 59).

Karel Chotek's new concept already works – within the Program soupisu národopisného [Programme of Ethnographic Inventory][8] – with a narrower approach, which included the traditional culture of "folk classes", i. e. rural peasant population, in whose way of life Czech national specific features were beheld (Chotek 1914).

As resulting from essays published in journals and books, the discipline aimed at the reconstruction of extinct or disappearing traditional culture of the Czech village. Even though it proceeded from the fieldwork in the past and obtained information at among living respondents, the focus on the past led to the selection of persons among survivors, members of the oldest generations. The clearly historical aiming is obvious especially with Čeněk Zíbrt, a trained cultural historian, editor and publisher of Old-Czech relics and independent works focused on the history of traditional dress, folk costume, annual customs and dance culture (Melzer 2012). Even though the first attempted syntheses, which relate to the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition (Klusáček et al. 1897) or which concern the bounds between Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia as part of the compendium *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild* (1896, 1897),[9] feature historical orientation and try to reconstruct the traditional forms of folk culture, they only describe the latest development stage and do not take into consideration older historical forms.

Zíbrt's culture-historical direction was – together with the philological-historical approach – one of the basic directions in the ethnographic research in many European countries, and it related to researchers' university education. However, the researchers' works are marked by nationalism and ethnic theory, which linked cultural phenomena and their genesis with particular ethnic groups (Frolec 1970–1971). The ethnic theory was also reflected in the Czech environment, where it became a basis to resolve antagonistic Czech-German (German-Slavic) relations. Czech folkloristics, which was more distinctly

8 On the Programme of Ethnographic Inventory worked also Lubor Niederle. Within this Programme, the historical Czech lands (Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia) were divided into regions, where the collected ethnographic materials were to be published in the form of regional monographs and to serve for a planned encyclopaedia of the Czechoslovak people. In Bohemia, the areas were defined in geographical sense, and in Moravia, the zoning was based on existing ethnographic areas (Chotek 1914).

9 The work *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild* includes – besides natural circumstances, history, economy and stylish art – folk culture of particular lands of the monarchy, treated based on the ethnic principle. As authors in the volume Bohemia are mentioned Alois Jirásek, the ethnographer and archaeologist Lubor Niederle, the musicologist Otakar Hostinský; the ethnographer František Bartoš, the court counsellor Viktor Houdek, and the secondary-school professor Josef Klvaňa are mentioned in the volume Moravian and Silesia.

integrated in the European science, applied specific research methods through its ties to the literary science (Horák 1933).

Czechoslovak ethnography between world wars and its theoretical background

In new political and social conditions after World War I we witnessed further theoretical-methodological shift in the already constituted social discipline in the independent Czechoslovakia. After Karel Chotek had been appointed Professor of general ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava in 1920, ethnography became a university scientific discipline (Podolák 1991; Paríková ed. 2011). Chotek educated the first generation of Slovak and Moravian graduate ethnographers, and he also conducted fieldwork in Slovakia and elaborated a programme for Slovak ethnographic inventory (Chotek 1924). After he had left for Prague in 1932, he delivered lectures on the discipline at Charles University in Prague and his ethnographic seminar educated the first Czech students and moulded Prague school of ethnography (Petráňová 2016). He also gave lectures on the discipline within relative subjects (Jeřábek 1993; Pavlicová 1993).

Apart from the culture-historical approach, which was represented by Zíbrt's *Český lid* [The Czech Folk], renewed in 1924, the strict historical approach to the phenomena of folk culture, especially folk art and architecture, got to theses about a passive acceptance of higher classes' stylish culture, and to opinions underestimating the creative abilities of folk classes, which was a response to romantic ideas of the age of folk culture's phenomena from the time of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition (Mencl 1927). Some researchers, not only for the abovementioned reason, accentuated new theoretical-methodological procedures, which were offered by functional structuralism (Šourek 1942).

The effort to anchor the discipline in terms of theory and methodology is documented by words spoken by Antonín Václavík, a Chotek's student in Bratislava and one of the leading representatives of Czechoslovak ethnography between world wars. Václavík spoke out against artistic-historical methods applied to assess folk art, and against the combination of ethnography with geography; this happened at congresses of Slavic geographers and ethnographers. Václavík characterised the interwar period as a not-anchored and methodologically not clarified from the perspective of theory (Václavík 1952: 142).

Příručka lidopisného pracovníka [Handbook of an Ethnographer] (1936) by Drahomíra Stránská, private senior lecturer and a research fellow from

the Department of Ethnography at the National Museum in Prague, is one of the few works written in the interwar Czechoslovakia. Stránská understood ethnographic research and working with its results as a comprehensive matter, so historical sources were only one part in addition to fieldwork, cartographic method and functional aspect: "In addition to historical reports and typology of contemporary life, an ethnographer should take notice of other aspects. He/she should observe the life not only statically, its current situation, but dynamically, how new phenomena have developed, and he/she should pay attention to their functions, to their role in the life of the people and how the people view it" (Stránská 1936: 17). The work also includes a detailed systematics of folk culture as a basis for its treatment in a monograph, and a throughout bibliography of ethnographic literature.

The scientific rigorous accuracy of interwar ethnography is demonstrated by synthetic works published within the *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], which was to represent the science of new democratic state. In the volume *Člověk* [The Human Being] (1933) Jiří Horák brought up the historical development of ethnographic research with focus on folk culture of Czechs and Slovaks, but too much factography caused that assessing judgements and general development trends were suppressed. The volume *Národopis* [Ethnography] (1936) written by Karel Chotek and Drahomíra Stránská dealt with realia of tangible and social culture. It proceeds from the discipline's traditional systematics, focusing on the traditional phenomena of tangible and social culture in the historical Czech lands, Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia, supplemented with demographic data in the introduction. Because Czechoslovak ethnography adhered to the abovementioned programme's focus on folk culture of the national community, the concept of European ethnology developed by the Swedish scientist Sigurd Erixon could not find a place here. The concept promoted general comparatistic research into the culture of European continent as a parallel to the research into other continents (Jeřábek 2013: 61).[10]

At the end of World War II, the Slovak folklorist Andrej Melicherčík wrote the *Teória národopisu* [The Theory of Ethnography] (1945), which submits well-

10 In the Czech and Central-European environments, this term and interpretation were accepted only in the 1990s, after political changes related to the fall of the Iron Curtain. Even though the term "ethnology" was not unknown in domestic science, it was not accepted on a wider bases, in contrast to e.g. Slovenia, where the central disciplinary journal's title was *Ethnolog* [The Ethnologist] from 1926. See Slavec Gradišnik, Ingrid. 2000. *Etnologija na Slovenskem. Med čermi narodopisja in antropologije.* Ljubljana: Založba ZRC SAZU.

founded information about intellectual development of the discipline, and transformations in its theoretical-methodological basis, in which the author used the knowledge he gained during his study stay in Leipzig. He remarks to the discipline's theory that "ethnography with its general focus resulting from the nature of material, is not a science of the past, but exclusively a science of living materials of current days" (Melicherčík 1945: 131). For this reason, the ethnographic research addresses the contemporaneity ("synchronous ethnography") and the rural environment is not a sole bearer of ethnographic phenomena, as he says. However, among methods used in ethnography he mentions the historical method, which tries to resolve the theme of age and origin of folk culture's phenomena (Melicherčík 1945: 82). In the work, he also deals with the relation between ethnography and sociology, and ethnography and ethnology, but he does not take into consideration the project of European ethnology.[11]

Concept of socialistic ethnography as a historical science

A crucial change in the development of Czechoslovak society and discipline, which can be described as discontinuous, happened in connection with the political development in Europe after World War II. The new political-social situation in Czechoslovakia and the affiliation to the Soviet (Eastern) bloc introduced historical-materialist Marxist philosophy as a binding platform into the theory of social sciences. This was accompanied by class-based approach to social issues, and sharp criticism of "bourgeois science". New ideological direction of the discipline was outlined at the 1st and 2nd national conferences of Czechoslovak ethnographers, held in Prague in 1951 and 1952. Otakar Nahodil became the leading figure of Marxist ethnography in Czechoslovakia (Petráňová 2017). The principles of the new ethnographic science, built up on the foundations of historical materialism, were formulated, and the interwar "bourgeois" ethnography was criticized with the focus on Antonín Václavík's and Karel Chotek's outputs (Nahodil 1951: 52).

The terms "ethnography" and "folkloristics" became official names of the discipline for the second half of the last century, which was supposed to develop

11 During the World War II and the existence of the independent Slovak state, volumes devoted to folk culture were published within the work *Slovenská vlastiveda* [Slovakia in All Its Aspects]. The conception of these volumes reflects the period role of the folk and its culture in society. They were written by the ethnographer Rudolf Bednárik (1943) and the folklorist Andrej Melicherčík (1943).

in accordance with the Marxist concept of Soviet science: "The contemporary forward-looking ethnographic science, represented mainly by Soviet ethnographic school, is nothing but part of Marxist-Leninist historical science" (Nahodil 1951: 54). Its methodological principles were explained in works written by the then leading ideologist Otakar Nahodil (1950), or in cooperation with Jaroslav Kramařík (1952). This "looking-forward" programme should be implemented by the *Československá etnografie* [Czechoslovak Ethnography] journal, led by Otakar Nahodil as an editor-in-chief: "For this reasons, one of the principal tasks of the journal will be to equip our workers in the field of ethnography and folkloristics with the most important theoretical knowledge. And this development of work in the realm of theoretical research will undoubtedly be 'the major force to remove detrimental hangovers from the bourgeois idealistic science, especially the ahistorical trends as well as the influence of cosmopolite, nationalistic and otherwise pernicious ideas', as mentioned in the Resolution of the 2nd nation-wide ethnographic conference" (Nahodil 1953: 1).[12]

The socialist ethnography's research range was extended by the culture of working classes[13] and the contemporary (cooperative) village, as this focus met the criterion "of a real science that resolves important and ongoing issues and that is based on the Marxist-Leninist world view" (Nahodil 1953: 1). Although the observation of traditional folk culture's phenomena continued, its mission was re-defined with the emphasis on looking-forward phenomena (Fojtík 1952). The works published were adapted to the new doctrine (Václavík 1959). The research into phenomena of spiritual culture, i.e. issues of religiosity and belief, underwent a specific development. Due to promoted atheism, the relevant works feature an antireligious character and fought against superstitions and obscurantism (Nahodil and Robek 1959). Despite the mentioned ideological pressure, Antonín Václavík and his students tried to continue the research into traditional folk culture, applying fieldwork methods (Václavík 1959), and this direction, interrelated with historical sources, appeared stimulating (Válka 2010).

Socialist ethnography in Czechoslovakia included a complex historical-comparative discipline, even though in Western Europe, where social and

12 Researchers' greatest attention should be paid to the study of the contemporary way of life and culture of the Czech and Slovak folks, to Slavic and foreign ethnography, to issues of the history of ethnography and folkloristics, to discussions of methodological nature on serious and questionable issues of everyday scientist work, and to the contemporary methodology of research work (Nahodil 1953).

13 In the beginning he focused on miners, as miners – from the perspective of class-based perception of society – were understood as a vanguard of the working class due to their political awareness.

cultural anthropology developed, ethnography was only a fieldwork method, and collection and systemization of materials. Because the term "ethnology" did not correspond to the ideology, it was replaced by the term "foreign (non-European) ethnography". The new conception of Czechoslovak ethnography and folkloristics, adapted to Soviet science as to its model, emphasized the research into tangible culture, which was supported both by ideological premises based on the theory of the "base and superstructure", and by pragmatic reasons resulting from the extinction of the phenomena of traditional culture upon the nationalisation of land.[14] Besides agrarian issues focused on the typology of ploughing tools, yoking the cattle, forms of grain harvest, and viticulture, it was the research into vernacular architecture and folk dress, crowned with syntheses and regional monographs that reached its peak at that time. Karel Chotek tried to justify theoretically the historically-oriented ethnography. He describes the main features of folk culture, and uses particular examples from traditional farming to prove the validity of ethnographic material as a historical source (Chotek 1966).[15] Similarly, Dušan Holý and Václav Frolec, Václavík's students at the university in Brno, declare ethnography as a science which endeavours to reconstruct the development of culture: "The particularity of ethnography as a science studying folk culture in its historical development consists in the endeavours to discover general trends in the development of individual cultural expressions, and especially in the disclosure of peculiarities – whether of ethnic and regional character – in which folk culture of particular regions or ethnic units differ in many ways" (Frolec and Holý 1964: 2–3). However, they are aware of the fact that "the ethnographic disciplines as historical disciplines will not be history in the common sense of the word" (ibid: 6).

The research into contemporary rural and urban environments led to the discussion about the relationship between ethnography and sociology, which found a polemic platform on the pages of the *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] journal (Holý and Stuchlík 1964). The work *K teorii etnografie současnosti* [Towards a Theory of the Ethnography of the Present] (1971) by Olga Skalníková and Karel

14 The nationalization (collectivization) of the countryside, thoroughly aligned with Soviet model in Czechoslovakia in the 1950s, was a necessary pre-condition for the construction of the Socialist society. This was accompanied by repressions against "kulaks" – prosperous farmers, who refused to enter agricultural cooperatives, and hitherto village elites (Válka 2011: 102–104).

15 In the book, Karel Chotek mentions one of the definitions of the discipline: "According to an older brief definition of the discipline, ethnography is a science which describes and explains the life and work of rural people in all aspects of tangible and spiritual culture alongside societal relations, both in their space spreading, and time layering." (Chotek 1966: 271).

Fojtík, two academics from the Institute of Ethnography and Folkloristics of the CSAS, attempted to reply to theoretical-methodological problems of socialist ethnography in this realm. The authors tried to interconnect the ideologically declared historical orientation of the discipline with the research into the present which was more and more frequent in Czech and Slovak ethnography. Because – according to their commentary – "modern ethnography studies folk culture as a process, even ethnography of the present features a basic inevitable need to study its older stages retrospectively, if these are capturable from the reports of informants-eyewitnesses or other reliable sources in the needful accuracy and completeness: through this extension of ethnographic research to a longer period of time, or to the entire stage of the development in changed external and internal conditions of life, ethnography of the present creates a precondition for generalizing conclusions" (Skalníková and Fojtík 1971: 7).

The synthesis *Lidová kultura* [Folk Culture] (1968) about traditional culture of the Czech and Slovak folks, published within the new book Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects, reflects theoretical-methodological procedures of socialist ethnography and folkloristics. This work written by Czech and Slovak academics has a historical dimension and focuses on rural phenomena as well as those from the culture of working classes; it contains the characteristics of the discipline as a social science "which deals with the research into collectively created and passed-on phenomena of life and culture in traditional groups (communities) and in local groups, which are an analogy of traditional groups in industrial civilization" (Lidová kultura 1968: 20). The authors consider direct observation, i.e. a direct contact between the researcher and the researched subject, to be the traditional and basic method of ethnographic research, but they also know the category of historical ethnography, where products of people's activity are the source of knowledge.

The period of tough Stalinism and subsequent political liberalization, the 1950s and 1960s, was stopped by the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968 – another crucial milestone in the development of society and discipline. The follow-up normalization and "real socialism", i.e. the 1970s and 1980s, was – at their beginning – associated with personal changes in the leadership of discipline's workplaces, editorial boards of journals, and in research groups.[16] Antonín Robek, a quite controversial figure of Czechoslovak

16 At the Faculty of Arts of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Brno, the independent Department of Ethnography and Folkloristics was integrated into the Department of History and Ethnography

ethnography (Hlaváček 2017), took up offices as Head of the Prague Department of Ethnography and Folkloristics, Director of the Institute of Ethnography and Folkloristics, and editor-in-chief of the *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] journal which was the central periodical of the discipline. He enforced significant ideologization of the discipline, as resulting from his engaged organizational and publication activities, from his political editorials in *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] and from the history of Czech and Slovak ethnography, where the particular development stages are defined in accordance with Marxist social relations of production, and their progresiveness assessed through class criteria was the principal standard to evaluate eminent persons (Robek 1979). Mirjam Moravcová assessed Robek's understanding of the discipline with the following words: "He preferred the study of social sciences and he refused the primary orientation at cultural-ethnographic analyses of the phenomena of traditional tangible folk culture and folk art – whether these were interpreted as cultural heritage, a hangover from the past or viable expressions of modern-day culture" (Moravcová 2003: 147).

The discipline's research was subordinated to the centrally controlled Basic Research State Plan, which for ethnography defined the main task VIII-3-9 "Development of Folk Culture in the Czech Lands and Slovakia" in 1971. The following partial tasks were part of the Plan: 1) The Folk and Folk Culture in the Period of National Revival; 2) Culture and Style in the Socialist Village; and 3) Culture and Way of Life of Czechoslovak Working Classes (Olšáková 2016: 136). The tasks corresponded to the new organizational chart of the Prague Institute of Ethnography and Folkloristics of the CSAS, which was supposed to avoid the dissolution of the Institute, or the transfer of ethnographic research to Brno, as contemplated (Hlaváček 2017: 33). It is obvious that the historical orientation remained dominating with the solution of the first partial task,[17] as well as with the research into the culture of working classes, as documented by the monograph *Stará dělnická Praha* [Old Prague of Working Classes] (Robek ed. 1981).

---

of Central, South-Eastern and Eastern Europe, as its section (Válka et al. 2016: 41). At Comenius University in Bratislava, Ján Podolák succeeded in 1968 in establishing the Division of Ethnology, a research-scientific workplace focused on learning about folk culture of the South-Eastern-European countries and especially Slavic nations. However, staff changes also took place at the disciplinary workplace in Bratislava (Paríková, ed. 2011), like they did in Prague (Hlaváček 2017).

17 "Maketa", a series of voluminous studies, which dealt with particular components of traditional folk culture, was a press outcome at the Institute of Ethnography and Folkloristics of the CSAS in Prague. In 1978, the first volume of the Ethnographic Atlas was published, but this was the last work in the field of ethno-cartographic works, in contrast to Slovakia.

Even though Prague academic workplaces carried out research into the (socialist) village with cooperative agriculture, the best results were reached by interdisciplinary comprehended projects of Brno ethnographers aimed at one location (Jeřábek at al. 1981),[18] and the broad research into the "Revolutionary Transformations in South-Moravian Countryside (and Rural Landscape)" organized by Václav Frolec (1979). The results were published in the series *Lidová kultura a dnešek* (Folk Culture and the Present), particular volumes of which were devoted to different fields of life and culture in the contemporary village. Frolec's work *Jihomoravská družstevní vesnice* [South-Moravian Village with Cooperative Agriculture] (1989) is an attempted synthetic treatment of the theme. Assesing the abovementioned research, one must deal with validity of outcomes and access to negative phenomena which accompanied the forced collectivization, and possible ideological indoctrination by the period political system. It is possible to polemicize with Věra Frolcová's opinion, according to which: "The Brno legacy of ethnography to the present days includes methodological inspirations for a concept of historical ethnology, which takes into account the contemporary field document as a segment in the historical development" (Frolcová 2016: 171). The category of historical ethnography may rather include research activities within the International Commission of the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathians and Balkans[19] in the section of highwaymen's folklore, Carpathian pastoral farming and log-structure architecture (Frolec 1985).

It remains a question whether Czech ethnography could go along other paths in the period of real socialism? The historian Jiří Hlaváček thinks that Antonín Robek with his strategy rescued the Prague Institute from being dissolved, and he returned the lost prestige to it through the research into ethnic processes in the 1980s (Hlaváček 2017: 42). The Prague academic institute also gained international renown in the field of research into the culture of working classes (Woitsch 2012), while the Brno university workplace became internationally renowned for its research into the contemporary village, and the continuing historically-oriented research into traditional folk culture (Válka 2002; Altman 2016a). Folkloristics, which developed mainly in Slovak and Moravian academic workplaces, kept its specific position (Leščák and Sirovátka 1982).

---

18 The research team, which studied the village of Brumovice (District of Břeclav), included ethnographers, a historian and a sociologist (Jeřábek et al. 1981).

19 The foundation of the International Commission of the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathians and Balkans was initiated by Polish and Slovak ethnographers in 1959 (Frolec 1985). Its activity ceased after the disintegration of the Soviet political bloc (Podoba 2006).

Ethnology, historical anthropology, intangible cultural heritage

The fall of state socialism and the political development after November 1989 brought a new societal situation to Czechoslovakia. The unifying Europe created conditions for the cooperation among researchers despite political doctrines. Several works which coped, more or less vigorously, with the "communist" past and which were initiated by domestic science, were written (Jiřikovská and Mišurec et al. 1991); works by foreign researchers were more criticizing (Kandert and Scheffel 2002). In the Czech Republic, like in other Central-European countries, a new concept of (European) ethnology was adopted, which shifted the discourse towards the comparative social science and which was influenced by well-established anthropology. The discussion between both disciplines ran on the pages of the *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] journal, where (socialist) ethnography was reproached for its descriptive nature and ideological indoctrination (Nešpor and Jakoubek 2006). The situation from the perspective of ethnography was clarified by Josef Vařeka (2005). Similarly, Josef Kandert recapitulated the research techniques used by the discipline, the result of which is a large quantity of data about cultural and social system of Czech ethnic group, a considerable part of which, however, has a low informative value, "when we would like to deal with qualitative analysis and interpretations of human behaviour" (Kandert 2005: 49). The method of ethnological qualitative fieldwork began to be successfully used also by oral history (Nosková 2014).

The ethnological methodology was the basis for historical anthropology, which, as an independent discipline, was also proceeded from social history, micro-history, and history of mentalities and everyday life. The development of historical anthropology in Czech Republic after 1989 was encouraged by translations of foreign works, e.g. by Italian Carlo Ginzburg, or a book about methodology by Richard Dülmen (2002). Due to accessible sources, historical anthropology focused mainly on the early modern times. Lydie Petráňová drew Czech ethnology's attention to this research direction (1991); a periodical for the history of culture published a methodologically comprehended treatise (Nešpor and Horský 2004). However, historical anthropology remained a domain of historians in the Czech Republic, although ethnologists published several works which we could involve in this category (Doušek 2009).

If we observe the journal and book production in the Czech Republic in recent years, the research basis for the historically-oriented research into

traditional cultural phenomena narrowed, and especially in the realm of tangible culture, the initiative was taken-over by museum institutions and other disciplines. Agrarian theme was treated in collected works, but only aimed at general development trends and without a wider interest in folk agronomy (Beranová and Kubačák 2010). The period of the second half of the last century was observed as well, including its discontinuous expressions brought about by the collectivization of agriculture (Válka 2011). The theme of the rural house was resolved by architects[20] based on constructional-historical research into late-medieval and early-modern houses, building structures and period legislation, which made further syntheses possible (Škabrada 1999). Jan Pešta assessed the architectural and urbanistic fund of the Czech village (2004–2011). Jiří Langer built up his work about log-structure architecture in the north-western Carpathians on historical sources and fieldwork (1997).[21] The synthesis dealing with Carpathian and Balkan houses and indicating innovative paths and streams shows a wider territorial dimension (Langer and Bočková 2010). A methodological handbook for students with an instruction of how to research into the village house was written (Doušek 2013). Folk dress became a theme of the comprehensively treated iconographic sources until the mid-19th century (Křížová and Šimša 2012), and of a work explaining the research theory and methodological procedures with the use of historical sources (Jeřábková 2014). The work by Richard Jeřábek brought an overview about the theory of folk and popularized art and its methodological issues (2011). Historical approach can be found also in the works devoted to folk traditions and their exploitation by different social systems (Křížová, Pavlicová and Válka 2015).

Although Czech ethnology returned to the idea of an ethnographic atlas after 1989 and the Institute of Ethnology of the CAS in Prague published several new volumes of the *Etnografický atlas Čech, Moravy a Slezska* [Ethnographic Atlas of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia], these are not compatible and systematic due to the chosen conception. They lack the access to selected cultural phenomena within one time-level and the observation of these phenomena in a regular network of localities, which is the basic idea of an ethnographic atlas. As to

20 From 2000, interdisciplinary conferences "A History of Buildings" took place in Nečtiny (District of Pilsen-North); the conferences included also the Vernacular Architecture Section. The papers were published in the form of anthologies with the same title.

21 *Zpravodaj Komise pro lidové stavitelství, sídla a bydlení České národopisné společnosti* [Bulletin of the Commission for Folk Architecture, Settlements and Housing by the Czech Ethnological Society] has published the bibliographic inventory of professional literature since 2004.

Jiří Woitsch, "its realization is an anachronism today, which offers a space for noteworthy projects of another type to develop" (Woitsch 2016: 225) on the basis of geographical information systems. Yet is the Ethnographic Atlas one of the basic works of national ethnologies.

The globalization processes worldwide and the specific forms of national and local cultures in danger of extinction were the reason why UNESCO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, developed activities to support and safeguard them. Particular states complied with the appeals through their own programmes. In the Czech Republic, the documentation of traditional handicrafts and home production, implemented by the Institute of Folk Culture in Strážnice, was the first step (Jančář 2004). The project of intangible cultural heritage has become a new platform, which does not relate to the artefacts of tangible nature, but to the knowledge of hand craft techniques and phenomena of social culture and folklore. Due to its international effect, the project has become a prestigious matter for particular states, and for this reason and in terms of ethnology, intangible cultural heritage is a new research platform and a basis for social participation, which it should use indisputably (Janeček 2015).

Conclusion

The described and more than one-hundred-year long development of the discipline "národopis / ethnography / ethnology" shows the encounter of different conceptions and methodological procedures, accompanied by the transformation in discipline's discourse. Even though ethnographic research approached the reconstruction of traditional folk culture, and the historical orientation was one of the basic methodological attitudes, the term "historical ethnography (ethnology)" occurred only in relation to the extinction of traditional cultural phenomena, which was caused by rural collectivization and changes that it brought about. The socialist village (with cooperative agriculture) differed from the pre-industrial village, where small-scale farming was the basic resource of livelihood for independent peasants, who cultivated the land inherited after their ancestors, with which specific life and cultural forms were associated. If the discipline wanted to continue its research into traditional cultural phenomena, it had to address other sources of knowledge than the empiric qualitative fieldwork. The importance of different sorts of archival material and that of museum ethnographic collections increased, so