

**Miroslav Válka**

Department of European Ethnology, Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University, Brno  
valka@phil.muni.cz

## **Czechoslovak Republic and the Formation of Ethnographic Science during the “First Republic” (1918–1938) – Part II\***

Our target is to assess how the Czech and the Slovak ethnography developed in the period of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1918–1938), whether it displayed international connotations, and to what extent it responded to the common European development of this discipline. Research contacts between Slavic ethnographers and geographers influenced one of the ethnographic research lines in Czechoslovakia, and the evidence for this are the application of Jovan Cvijić's Anthropogeographic School and the application of cultural and geographical research line in interwar Czechoslovakia's science. Between the world wars, Czechoslovak ethnographers paid attention to Slovakia and to Carpathian Ruthenia, where forms of traditional folk culture still actively lived on. Ethnography in the interwar Czechoslovakia can be considered to be an important part of evolving European ethnology. Unfortunately, this advancement was interrupted by political development after World War II.

*Key words:* Czechoslovakia (1918–1938), ethnography, anthropogeography, Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia, history of science

### **Чехословачка република и формирање етнографске науке у време „прве републике“ (1918–1938) – други део**

Наш циљ је оцена развоја чешке и словачке етнографије у периоду прве Чехословачке републике (1918–1938) – да ли је испољавала интернационалне тенденције и у којој је мери била усклађена са општим европским развојем дисциплине. Истраживачки контакти међу словенским етнографима и географима утицали су на једну од етнографских истраживачких линија у Чехословачкој, што доказује примена приступа антропогеографске школе Јована Цвијића, те примена културне и географске истраживачке линије у међуратној чехословачкој науци. У периоду између два светска рата чехословачки етнографи су усмеравали пажњу на Словачку и Карпатску Рутенију, где су форме традиционалне народне културе још увек активно живеле. Етнографија у међуратној Чехословачкој може се сматрати важним делом европске етнологије у развоју. Нажалост, овај напредак прекинула су политичка кретања после Другог светског рата.

---

\* The article was prepared with the support of the Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University, Brno.

*Кључне речи:* Чехословачка (1918–1938), етнографија, антропогеографија, Словачка и Карпатска Рутенија, историја науке

## Theory and Methodology of Czechoslovak Interwar Ethnography

In new political and social conditions after World War I we witnessed further development of ethnography as a constituted social discipline in the independent Czechoslovakia. Its societal reputation was affirmed by the participation of the ethnographers Lubor Niederle and Karel Chotek as experts in peace negotiations in Paris, which after World War I defined the borders of successor states to the dissolved Austro-Hungary. Chotek worked as an expert for Slovakia there.<sup>1</sup> He maintained contacts with Slovak nationalists and for this reason he was present at debates about the wording of the declaration through which the Slovak political representation proclaimed its allegiance to the idea of a common states with Czechs on October, 30 1918 (Ducháček 2016, 29). During Paris negotiations, he worked with Niederle on the delimitation of Slovak boundaries, and together with Czech geographers, he took part in an expedition that demarcated the boundary between eastern Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia based on natural conditions and complicated ethnic situation, which was caused by the consciousness of local inhabitants.

In 1921, ethnography in Czechoslovakia became a university scientific discipline, after Karel Chotek had been appointed the first professor of general ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava (Podolák 1991, 222). Chotek educated the oldest generation of Slovak<sup>2</sup> and Czech<sup>3</sup> graduate ethnographers, and he also conducted fieldwork in Slovakia and elaborated a concept for the Slovak ethnographic research (Chotek 1924). After he had left for Prague<sup>4</sup>, he started delivering lectures on the discipline at Charles University in Prague in 1932, and his Seminar

---

<sup>1</sup> He reached the mentioned reputation as an expert by his ethnographic research. By authority of Lubor Niederle, he monitored the ethnic Slovak-Hungarian boundary before World War I. He made good use of his knowledge gained in the research in the local monograph on the village of Cerovo, which was published in *Národopisný věstník československý* [Czechoslovak Ethnographic Journal] 1906.

<sup>2</sup> Ján Mjartan (1902–1996), a secondary school teacher, was the head of the Institute of Ethnography of the Slovak Academy of Sciences in Bratislava after World War II; Rudolf Bednárik (1903–1975), a secondary school teacher; after World War II he became a professor of ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava (Jeřábek 2013, 28).

<sup>3</sup> Antonín Václavík (1892–1959), later a professor of ethnography at Masaryk University in Brno; Jan Húsek (1884–1973), a secondary school teacher. He was awarded the first doctoral degree in ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava. Author of works on cultural situation in Slovak-Ruthenian and Moravian-Slovak borderlands (Jeřábek 2007, 87); Vilém Pražák (1889–1976), senior lecturer in ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava and at Charles University in Prague. Author of works related to traditional material culture and Czech-German relationship (Jeřábek 2013, 154–155).

<sup>4</sup> After Karel Chotek left for Prague, the discipline's teaching was interrupted at Comenius University in Bratislava, and then ensured by the Russian folklorists Piotr G. Bogatyriov (1893–1971). During World War II, the lectures in the discipline were delivered by the German ethnographer Bruno Schier (Paříková 2011, 111).

for general ethnography educated the first students; according to several authors, he moulded his Prague school of ethnography (Petráňová 2016). Before Chotek's arrival, ethnographic themes were studied in Prague as part of relative disciplines, e.g. history of culture, literary science, musicology, and Slavic studies. In was possible to study ethnography (Deutsche: *Volkskunde*) as an independent discipline at the German section of Charles University from 1919, the discipline's guarantors were professors Adolf Haufen<sup>5</sup> and after him Gustav Jungbauer<sup>6</sup> (Lozoviuk 2006, 31–36).

Chotek's disciplinary discourse can be described as being tripartite: 1) political ethnography; 2) general ethnography; 3) special ethnography. In his theories, he grounded on works on evolution by Edward Burnett Tylor,<sup>7</sup> and he saw the mission of the discipline in the research into material culture and in the search for survivals that he could find in "retreat" areas, where cultural phenomena were preserved for economic and natural reasons. Under the term "political ethnography" Chotek understood committed participation of ethnographers in the solution of ongoing ethnic problems.<sup>8</sup> As a private senior lecturer, he delivered the lecture *Principal Issues of Political Ethnography in the Balkans* at the Faculty of Arts of Comenius University in winter semester 1921/1922 (Moravcová 2006, 101), but already in the 1930s he stopped being correct, as resulting from the approved concept of Chotek's course of ethnography at Charles University.<sup>9</sup> This term "political ethnography" did not appear even later, although Chotek continued delivering lectures focussed on the Balkans.<sup>10</sup>

The situation at Masaryk University in Brno, the capitol of Moravia and the second-largest city in Czechoslovakia, developed differently. The efforts to found

---

<sup>5</sup> Adolf Haufen (1863–1930), a German ethnographer, philologist, and literary scientist. He worked at German Charles University in Prague from 1898. He dealt with the research into German language island Kočevje (Gottschee) in present-day Slovenia, he wrote about the German folk song in Bohemia, he worked-out the introduction to German-Czech ethnography, and he published a bibliography of German ethnography in Bohemia (1931). He was managing the edition *Beiträge zur Deutschböhmisches / Sudetendeutsche Volkskunde* (Jeřábek 2013, 86).

<sup>6</sup> Gustav Jungbauer (1886–1942), a German ethnographer, professor at the German section of Charles University from 1933. He dealt with the research into the folk song and literature in the Bohemian Forest (Böhmerwald), he treated the history of German ethnography in general (1931) and with focus on the Czech lands (*Československá vlastivěda, Národopis* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects, Ethnography] 1936) (Jeřábek 2013, 104–105).

<sup>7</sup> Edward Burnett Tylor (1832–1917), an English anthropologist, a leading person in cultural evolutionism.

<sup>8</sup> He took over the mentioned concept from his teacher Lubor Niederle, who applied it e.g. in his work *Slovanský svět* [The Slavic World] (1909).

<sup>9</sup> Lectures in the branch of general ethnography and Slavic ethnography, the latter one defined as cultural and political ethnography, were expected to be given at the new department of ethnography. But the latter specialization was deleted by the establishing commission. The term was not accepted even after the year 1945 (Moravcová 2006, 109).

<sup>10</sup> In academic years 1932/1933 and 1935/1936, he delivered lectures on *Ethnography of the Balkans with Focus on Slavic Lands* in Prague (Ducháček 2014, 195).

the second Czech university in Brno appeared already before World War I, but these encountered resistance from the local Germans. Even though a university, named Masaryk University after the founder of the new state, was founded in Brno in the same year as the university in Bratislava (1919), the Faculty of Arts was established for financial reasons as the last faculty in the year 1921 (Fasora & Hanuš 2010, 13).

In Brno, ethnographic themes were taught only within historical geography,<sup>11</sup> and lectures on folkloristics were given within literary science<sup>12</sup> and Slavic studies;<sup>13</sup> lectures on ethnology were delivered at the Faculty of Natural Science within physical anthropology.<sup>14</sup>

When Antonín Václavík was awarded the senior lecturer degree at Masaryk University in 1933,<sup>15</sup> as a private senior lecturer he gave selective lectures, the first of which was focussed on the methods of ethnographic research. This theme was interesting for Václavík and he considered it to be problematic, when he studied under Karel Chotek's leadership in Bratislava.<sup>16</sup> From the theoretical and methodological point of view, Václavík was influenced mainly by Polish ethnography,<sup>17</sup> even though he also left for a study trip to Germany and he listened to the lectures given

---

<sup>11</sup> The lectures were given by Bohuslav Horák (1881–1960), professor of historic geography, history of geography, and historic ethnography (Válka 2016, 18).

<sup>12</sup> Stanislav Souček (1870–1935), professor, a literary historian, and chairman of the Moravian-Silesian Committee at the State Institute for Folk Song. He dealt with the study of folklore genres (folk song, fairy-tale) and the history of collecting (Pavlicová 1993).

<sup>13</sup> Frank Wollman (1888–1968) and Roman O. Jakobson (1896–1982), one of the fathers of the structural-functions methods, were among important Slavists, who worked at Masaryk University and dealt with folklore (Jeřábek 2013, 98).

<sup>14</sup> The lectures in non-European ethnology were given by Professor Vojtěch Suk (1879–1979), author of the handbook *Antropologie a národopis* [Anthropology and Ethnography] (1929). Besides the non-European countries, he also conducted research in Carpathian Ruthenia (Jeřábek 2007, 211–212).

<sup>15</sup> Antonín Václavík (1892–1959) studied ethnography and history of art at Professor Karel Chotek's department in Bratislava. Between the world wars, he worked as a government official in Bratislava, he cooperated with Slovak museums, and he conducted field research into folk culture, which resulted in monographs and works devoted to folk art (Jeřábek 2013, 181–183). He is often associated with the Moravian school of ethnography (Válka 2010; Altman 2016).

<sup>16</sup> “Students of our generation could hardly wait for a course at which ethnographic [the term “národopis” is mentioned in the original] methods and theories or certain phenomena, such as particular customs, artistic expressions, shepherd culture, etc., in a systematic strictly historical overview would have been taught. The lectures, which in fact were more geographic than ethnographic, did not explain to them what belongs to folk phenomena and what not, and why; this education left the Bratislava students completely forlorn in terms of theory, and was the reason for which some of them (and these were very promising students) changed to other disciplines, where the methodological bases were clear. No wonder that many of them relied on the history of arts and functional structuralism” (Václavík 1952, 141).

<sup>17</sup> During his study trip to Poland, he got to know the work by leading Polish ethnographers, university professors Stanisław Poniatowski (1884–1945), Jan St. Bystron (1892–1964), and Kazimierz Moszyński (1887–1959) (Válka 2016, 21).

by the ethnographers Richard Beitel<sup>18</sup> and Arthur Byhan<sup>19</sup> in the branch of non-European ethnology. His study trips were also heading to the Balkans (Válka 2016, 21).

It was the Czechoslavic Ethnographical Society,<sup>20</sup> which published the journal *Národopisný věstník českoslovanský* [Czechoslavic Ethnographic Journal] edited by the folklorist Jiří Polívka<sup>21</sup> together with Karel Chotek and Jiří Horák, that became a research and organizational platform for the interwar ethnography. The journal represented Czechoslovak science abroad and it followed European research trends, because it also dealt with theoretical and methodological issues, in contrast to the renewed journal *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] edited by Čeněk Zíbrt. After the Ethnographical Society handed over its ethnographic collections to the National Museum in Prague in 1922, i.e. to the state administration, it could fully focus on its research and publication activities (Smrčka 2011, 111). In Slovakia, the “Matica Slovenská”, a national cultural organization, included an ethnographic department that published the discipline’s periodical *Národopisný sborník Matice slovenskej* [Matica Slovenská Ethnographic Review], which focussed on the treatment of Slovak traditional culture (Slavkovský 2013, 44). The “Muzeálna slovenská spoločnosť” [Slovak Museum Society] from Martin was another one of nation-wide institutions. In 1926, its status changed to the Slovak National Museum, and the foundation stone for its new representative building was laid at the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Czechoslovakia. In Bratislava, the Slovak Regional Museum with the nation-wide focus was active from 1924; ethnography was one of its disciplines.<sup>22</sup>

The scientific meticulousness of Czechoslovak interwar ethnography is demonstrated by synthetic works published in *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], which was to represent the free science of the new

---

<sup>18</sup> Richard Beitel (1900–1982), a Germany ethnographer, and senior lecture at the university in Berlin; he cooperated on the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde*, he is co-author of the *Wörterbuch der deutschen Volkskunde* (1936).

<sup>19</sup> Byhan, Arthur (1872–1942), professor of ethnology, and the head at the Museum für Völkerkunde in Hamburg.

<sup>20</sup> The Czechoslavic Ethnographical Society was founded in 1891. It supported the organization of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition 1895, and after the Exhibition it established and operated the independent Czechoslavic Ethnographic Museum until the early 1920s (Smrčka 2011).

<sup>21</sup> Jiří Polívka (1858–1933), a literary scientist and folklorist, professor at Charles University, an editor of the journal *Národopisný věstník českoslovanský* [Czechoslavic Ethnographic Journal]. In his research work, he focussed on Slovak tradition, especially fairy-tales. He cooperated with J. Bolt on the comments on the fairy-tales by the Grimm brothers. He is author of the summarizing work *Súpis slovenských rozprávok I–V* [Inventory of Slovak Fairy-Tales I–V] (Jeřábek 2013, 151–153).

<sup>22</sup> The museum was established thanks to the architects D. Jurkovi and J. Hofman, and the historian V. Chaloupecký. The department of ethnography consisted of Czech experts, such as A. Václavík (custodian), V. Pražák, J. Vydra, and J. Húsek, and Slovaks experts P. Blaho and P. Socháň. The department’s work resulted in a project of complex ethnographic research into Slovakia with scientific assessment of the collections (Slavkovský 2013, 42).

democratic state. In the volume *Člověk* [The Human Being] (1933) Jiří Horák<sup>23</sup> brought up the historical development of ethnographic and folkloristic research with focus on folk culture and folk traditions of Czechs and Slovaks, but too many facts caused that assessing judgements and general development trends were suppressed. The volume *Národopis* [Ethnography] (1936) written by Karel Chotek and Drahomíra Stránská<sup>24</sup> dealt with cultural background in tangible and social culture. It proceeds from the discipline's traditional systematics and focussed on traditional cultural phenomena in the historical Czech lands, Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia, supplemented with demographic data in the introduction.

*Program soupisu národopisného* [Programme of Ethnographic Inventory], which Karel Chotek published before World War I, was supposed to become a major concept for the ethnographic research into the western parts of the new state, i.e. for Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia (Chotek 1914). The source materials for an encyclopaedia about traditional culture of the Czech ethnic group was gathered using the method of regional monographs,<sup>25</sup> but the criteria of the project were met only in the first volume, a joint publication on Moravian Slovakia,<sup>26</sup> an ethnographic area in the South-East of Moravia with hitherto living forms of traditional rural culture (Niederle 1918, 1922).<sup>27</sup> Out of Chotek's programme, the regional monograph on the ethnographic area of Luhačovické Zálesí in eastern Moravia (Václavík 1930) with its exhaustive content and quality of pictures in the appendix ranked among the representative works of Czechoslovak interwar ethnography.<sup>28</sup> It documents author's focus on traditional culture in the pre-industrial village but it does not reflect modernization processes, so it creates quite an anachronous picture of folk life in the researched region.

*Průručka lidopisného pracovníka* [Handbook of an Ethnographer] (1936) by Drahomíra Stránská is one of the few ethnographic methodological works writ-

---

<sup>23</sup> Jiří Horák (1884–1975), a literary scientist, Slavist, folklorist, diplomat, university professor in Brno and Prague; after World War II he worked as the director at the Institute for Ethnography of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences; author of the history of Czech and Slovak ethnography and folkloristics (*Československá vlastivěda, Člověk* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects, The Human Being] 1933) and books on folk literature and song (Jeřábek 2013, 90–91).

<sup>24</sup> Drahomíra Stránská (1899–1964), an ethnographer at the National Museum in Prague, senior lecturer at Charles University. She dealt with the research into material culture of the Czech and the Slovak ethnic group (folk house, clothing). She promoted the idea of an ethnographic atlas and open-air museums (Válka 1999).

<sup>25</sup> The idea of an encyclopaedia of the Czechoslovak people emerged already at the time of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in 1895. The first concept was elaborated by the cultural historian Emanuel Kovář, but this was not implemented (Smrčka 2011, 116).

<sup>26</sup> Even in the interwar period, the term Moravian Slovakia was replaced by the correct term, not only in professional press, but also in journalism.

<sup>27</sup> The follow-up three volumes published by the Ethnographical Society lacked the complexity, and they focussed only on regional traditions (the region of Czech Kladsko), folk visual art (western Moravia), and agriculture and house (the Pilsen area).

<sup>28</sup> The work was a basis for Václavík's dissertation at Masaryk University in Brno; he was awarded the senior lecturer degree in 1933 (Válka 2016, 20).

ten in the interwar Czechoslovakia. Stránská understood ethnographic research as a comprehensive matter, so in addition to fieldwork and exploration of historical sources she also recommended using the cartographic method and functional approach.<sup>29</sup> The work also includes a detailed systematics of folk culture and a throughout bibliography of ethnographic literature published from the time of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition (1895). Because Czechoslovak ethnography adhered to programmatic focus on traditional folk culture, meaning rural culture of the national community, the concept of European ethnology could not find a place here. Already at that time, the concept promoted comparative research into national cultures of European continent as a parallel to the research into other continents.

## International Cooperation between Slavic Ethnographers and Geographers

Ethnography in the interwar Czechoslovakia was not closed within the borders of its own country, but it featured an international dimension and it developed inter-disciplinary cooperation. The above tendencies can be exemplified already before World War I. During his journey around the Balkans in 1910, Karel Chotek could visit South-Slavic museums, and he also met Jovan Cvijić and other leading Balkan Slavists and ethnographers (Ducháček 2014, 192). Jovan Cvijić maintained contacts with Czech geographers (Martínek 2017). Lubor Niederle applied anthropogeographic research methods; knowledge gained in the fieldwork was exploited in peace negotiations in Paris, where Karel Chotek was one of those who co-formulated a memorandum speaking about the oppression of Slovaks by Hungarians and about the situation of Serbians in southern Hungary. Karel Chotek's research contacts with South-Slavic geographers were strengthened by electing him a corresponding member of the Geographic Society in Belgrade (1932) and by his hitherto not very clarified study trip around Yugoslavia in the early 1930s, which was linked to awarding him the Saint Sava Order (Ducháček 2014, 196).

The geopolitical situation after World War I and the formation of Little Entente<sup>30</sup> were mirrored in the cooperation between scholars from Slavic countries. The stipulating cooperation of Slavic ethnographers and geographers resulted in common congresses, the first of which took place in Prague in 1924 (Šalamon & Švambera 1926). It was Jovan Cvijić who proposed Prague to be the first congress venue; among its participants we can find leading researchers who investigated the ties between natural environment and traditional culture in particular Slavic countries, as well the inter-ethnic topics. Besides Jovan Cvijić, the South-Slavic area was

---

<sup>29</sup> "In addition to historical reports and besides the typology of the contemporary life, an ethnographer shall notice even other aspects. He shall observe the life not only from the static perspective, meaning its present status, but from the dynamical perspective, as the particular phenomena evolved; he also shall pay attention to their function, to their tasks in the life of the folk, and to how the folk itself can see them" (Stránská 1936, 17).

<sup>30</sup> Little Entente (1921–1939), a political bloc comprised of Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Yugoslavia; it was directed against Hungarian irredentist struggles to revise the results of World War I.

represented by Borivoj Ž. Milojević, Matija Murko, Artur and Milovan Gavazzi, and others (Pospíšilová & Válka 2016, 726). Czechoslovak science was represented by the ethnographer Karel Chotek, and the literary scientists Jiří Polívka and Jan Jakubec; cultural geographers were represented by Jiří V. Daneš,<sup>31</sup> Viktor Dvorský<sup>32</sup> and Jiří Král,<sup>33</sup> and the demographer and statistician Antonín Boháč.<sup>34</sup>

The Prague congress of Slavic geographers and ethnographers is associated with another initiative. The Bulgarian ethnographer Ivan Šišmanov came up with an idea of founding a Pan-Slavic Museum named after Pavel Josef Šafařík. After a certain delay, this idea was taken up by Karel Chotek, who became involved in Niederle's plan of Slavic Ethnographic Exhibition even before World War I. Chotek published a decentralized concept of the Pan-Slavic Museum, which was supposed to be discussed at the second congress of Slavic geographers and ethnographers in Kraków, but in the end the idea was not implemented for political and economic reasons (Horák 1933, 448).

The Prague congress of Slavic geographers and ethnographers also established the *Slavic Commission for the Research into Shepherd Culture and Pastoral Farming in the Carpathians and Balkans*, which consisted of Czechoslovak, Polish, and South-Slavic researchers. Volodymyr Kubyovych<sup>35</sup> from Ukraine was elected its chairman, and Jiří Král became the representative of Czechoslovakia. The research into Carpathian Ruthenia focussed on monitoring of the ties between Carpathian mountainous settlements and their economic background – montane pastures (Polonynas) used in sheep husbandry. The research results were published in a monographic form; the work about the village of Boržava (Král 1932–1936) can be mentioned as the principal work. Other works dealt with the shepherd culture of Hutsuls, and a bibliographic inventory of anthropogeographic works was published (Král 1935).

---

<sup>31</sup> Jiří Viktor Daneš (1880–1928), professor of geography at Charles University in Prague; a traveller and diplomat; author of the book *Jovan Cvijić. K jeho šedesátým narozeninám* [Jovan Cvijić. On the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday] (1925) (Jeřábek 2007, 41–42).

<sup>32</sup> Viktor Dvorský (1882–1960), professor of geography at Charles University in Prague; author of publications focused on the South-Slavic environment (Slovenia, Monte Negro); founder of Czech anthropogeography (Jeřábek 2007, 47).

<sup>33</sup> Jiří Král (1893–1975), university professor at Charles University and Comenius University in Bratislava; an anthropogeographer; in addition to geography he dealt with the research into Carpathian pastoral farming. Based on his field research in Carpathian Ruthenia he published several monographs on Ruthenian villages.

<sup>34</sup> Antonín Boháč (1882–1950), a demographer; senior lecturer at Charles University in Prague; a government official; he monitored ethnic and population situation in Czechoslovakia; he studied ethnic minorities (Jeřábek 2007, 30).

<sup>35</sup> Volodymyr Kubyovych (Włodzimierz Kubijowicz, 1900–1985), a Ukrainian anthropogeographer; senior lecturer at the university in Kraków, who participated in the research into Carpathian shepherd culture. Author of the work *Pastýřský život v Podkarpatské Rusi I* [Shepherd Life in Carpathian Ruthenia] (1935).



Research contacts between Slavic ethnographers and geographers influenced one of the ethnographic research lines in Czechoslovakia, and the evidence for this are the application of Jovan Cvijić's Anthropogeographic School and the application of cultural and geographical research line in interwar Czechoslovakia's science. Besides Karel Chotek, it is necessary to mention the work by Drahomíra Stránská who left for a study stay at University of Belgrade in 1925, where she could acquaint herself with South-Slavic museum collections and she made several field journeys.<sup>36</sup> Stránská got to know Jovan Cvijić's work only through his students<sup>37</sup>, and she tried to apply the principles of the cultural and geographic line in her own scientific work. She was one of the main promoters of the idea of an ethnographic atlas in Czechoslovakia, and she took many particular actions with the goal to implement it. She saw the basic benefit of the ethno-cartographic method in discovering cultural streams that formed Czech and Slovak folk culture situated at the crossings of eastern and western influences (Stránská 1934–1935). She is author of the project of a Czechoslovak open-air museum, which was to be established in Prague, but her departure from the National Museum, and World War II did not allow her to implement the idea. Based on her knowledge acquired in the Balkans, Stránská installed in Prague two big exhibitions on pastoral farming in the Durmitor Mountains in Monte Negro, and on folk culture of Bulgarians.<sup>38</sup>

The cooperation with geographers was not accepted in general in interwar Czechoslovakia's ethnography. Antonín Václavík raised reservations about connection of ethnography with other disciplines. As obvious, Václavík defended the sovereignty of ethnography and its specific methodological procedures based on the field research and interpretation of ethnographic material.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Her field journeys led to Šumadija, Banat, Skopje, and Dubrovnik (Mevaldová & Tauberová 2011, 10).

<sup>37</sup> Even though specialized literature published an information that D. Stránská studied at Professor J. Cvijić's department (Johnová 1965, 55), the source material from her estate does not confirm this. She maintained correspondence with J. Erdeljanović and B. Ž. Milojević (Štěpánová 1999, 8).

<sup>38</sup> Using the domestic materials, she organized a large exhibition *Slovenské Tatry – kraj i lid* [Tatra Mountains – the Region and the People] (1933), where she made good use of her research in Slovakia (Mevaldová & Tauberová 2011, 22).

<sup>39</sup> "Chaotic ideas about the subject-matter and goals of ethnography led to the fact that ethnography was affiliated as a pendant to different sciences based on the subjective meaning of particular people – sometimes even dilettantes in the branch. So we could see ethnography alongside geography, fully in concurrence with the organization of "geographic-ethnographic" congresses, and using geographic methods which purely describe and do not explain. The additional knowledge about ethnography was seen in a detailed description of facts" (Václavík 1952, 142).

## Ethnographic Research in Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia

Between the world wars, Czechoslovak ethnographers paid attention to Slovakia<sup>40</sup> and to Carpathian Ruthenia, where forms of traditional folk culture still actively lived on, showing ties to wider cultural areas – the Carpathian and the Pannonian ones. It was possible to study the genesis of tangible and spiritual cultural phenomena; moreover, the ethnic composition of both countries created a platform to observe cultural exchanges and inter-ethnic influences. The hinterland for the interdisciplinary field research was provided by the above-mentioned *Commission for the Research into Shepherd Culture and Pastoral Farming* and by the *Committee for the Research into Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia*; the latter was established at the Slavic Institute in Prague in 1929. The ethnographer Karel Chotek was charged with acting as Secretary of the Committee (Horák 1933, 449).

The results of ethnographic research into traditional rural culture in both countries appeared in the above-mentioned synthetic works in *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects] (1933, 1936), and in illustrated summarizing monographs by Bohumil Vavroušek (1925; 1929a, 1929b), which dealt with vernacular architecture and sacral monuments of folk origin. Living forms of Slovak folk culture became a subject-matter of ethnographic and folkloristic investigation and discussions about their safeguarding and protection from decline as a consequence of continuing modernization of rural life.

The rural house in Slovakia featured distinctive forms that became a basis for many regional types. These were moulded by diverse natural environment, cultural influences, economic and social factors, and ethnic composition of the inhabitants. The first monograph on vernacular architecture in Slovakia (1925) was published by Josef Vydra.<sup>41</sup> In this monograph, Vydra entered into a debate with art historians over the dependence of the rural house on stylized architecture.<sup>42</sup> Antonín Václavík in his works focussing on different forms of Slovak visual arts also defended the above assertions about the autochthonousness of folk culture's phenomena (Václavík 1936; 1937). As an advocate of production movement, he emphasized ties to economic prosperity, whereby these ties were, in folk life, fulfilled by visual artefacts (Václavík 1936). Another Václavík's work written in Slovakia touched ethnic issues and cultural exchange. His monograph on Croatian Grob, a

---

<sup>40</sup> K. Chotek brought up the concept of ethnographic research in the *Program slovenského národopisného súpisu* [Programme of Slovak Ethnographic Inventory] (1924).

<sup>41</sup> Josef Vydra (1884–1959), a fine artists, ethnographer, and art historian. Between the world wars, he worked in Slovakia. Author of monographs on vernacular architecture, ceramics, blue print, reverse glass paintings, and clothing. He also dealt with folk production and its protection against extinction (Jeřábek 2007, 254–255).

<sup>42</sup> “Folk art is not a garbage from higher artistic cultures, but a basis and forerunner from which those higher cultures evolved. We can admit a kind of reversal conversion of higher culture to the lower ones, an influence of high art on folk creation, whereas such influence is only a fragment of all other influences” (Vydra 1925, 22).

village in south-western Slovakia, where a Croatian minority lived<sup>43</sup>, dealt with the question to what extent the Croats influence the culture of majority Slovaks (Václavík 1925).

The interwar period in Slovakia saw intensive folkloristic research initiated by Frank Wollmann, professor at Comenius University in Bratislava.<sup>44</sup> The Russian Slavist Piotr Grigorievich Bogatyriov delivered lectures in Slavic ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava at the time of his activity in Czechoslovakia in the second half of the 1930s.<sup>45</sup> Bogatyriov applied the method of structural linguistics on ethnographic material, in particular on folk theatre and staged expressions in folk customs. He published some of his works that concerned this theme in Carpathian Ruthenia, such as family cycle of ceremonies and church feasts and festival, in the journals *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] and *Národopisný věstník československý* [Czechoslovak Ethnographic Journal].

Many Czech literary works<sup>46</sup> as well as anthropogeographers' research, which we mentioned in the previous chapter, aimed at the recognition of life and traditional culture in Carpathian Ruthenia. Amalie Kožmínová<sup>47</sup> became an enthusiastic exponent of Ruthenian culture. When she published her monograph on Carpathian Ruthenia soon after World War I, she tried to inform the Czech public about that "unknown" country based on her own field research and in a comprehensive way (Kožmínová 1922). Even though the period criticism reproached her for the non-systematic and non-critical nature of her assertions, and sometimes even unprofessionalism, the author brought a lot of authentic information about Ruthenian reality immediately after World War I, and the publication became one of the basic sources to know Carpathian Ruthenia and its folk culture. The work radiates

---

<sup>43</sup> Croats got to south-western Slovakia and South Moravia in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, as a consequence of Turkish invasions in the Balkans (Botík 2001).

<sup>44</sup> Frank Wollman (1888–1969), a literary scientist, Slavist, and folklorist; university professor at universities in Bratislava and Brno. Author of the work *Slovesnost Slovanů* [Folk Literature of Slavs] (1928) and other comparative works dealing with Slavic literatures. Results of a collecting action in Slovakia, which he managed, were published as *Slovenské ľudové rozprávky. Výber zo zapisov z rokov 1928–1947 I–III* [Slovak Folk Fairy-Tales. An anthology of records from 1928–1947 I–III] (1993–2004) (Jeřábek 2007, 259–260).

<sup>45</sup> Piotr Grigorievich Bogatyriov (1893–1971), a Russian Slavist, folklorist, and linguist; senior lecturer at Comenius University in Bratislava between 1936 and 1939. In Czechoslovakia, he applied his functional-structural methods in the works *Funkcia kroja na Moravskom Slovensku* [The Function of Folk Costumes in Moravian Slovakia] (1937) and *Lidové divadlo české a slovenské* [Czech and Slovak Folk Theatre] (1940). See Jeřábek 2013, 33–35.

<sup>46</sup> The then reality of life in Carpathian Ruthenia was exemplified by the Czech writer Ivan Olbracht (1882–1952). His *Nikola Šuhaj loupežník* [Nikola Šuhaj the Robber] (1933) is the most famous one among his stories and novels aimed at social problems.

<sup>47</sup> Amalie Kožmínová (1876–1951), a teacher and enthusiastic promoter of folk art, as resulting from her journal articles and the book *Svéráz v zemích československých* [Svéráz /Peculiarity/ in the Czechoslovak Lands] (1921), which she published together with Renata Tyršová (Jeřábek 2007, 119).

Kožmínová's social awareness and her struggle to improve the living standard of Ruthenian women through the promotion of their hand-made artistic products.

In contrast to Kožmínová, Sergei Konstantinovich Makovsky<sup>48</sup> was sceptical about further existence of the traditional forms of Ruthenian folk art. His monograph *Lidové umění Podkarpatské Rusi* [The Folk Art in Carpathian Ruthenia], which observes the aesthetical value of Ruthenian wood-carving, ceramics, clothing, embellishments, embroideries and fabrics, focused on distinctive expressions of those traditional forms (Makovsky 1925). The author presented the above artefacts at Prague exhibition *Art and Life in Carpathian Ruthenia* (1924).

Traditional culture of Carpathian Ruthenia was most distinctively substantiated by log churches (*cerkve*), and many art historians, architects and ethnographers dealt with the research into them. Valuable documents on Ruthenian sacral architecture were acquired by Florian Zapletal,<sup>49</sup> but he did not succeed in publishing them in a summary, as Bohumil Vavroušek in his *Církevní památky na Podkarpatské Rusi* [Church Monuments in Carpathian Ruthenia] (Vavroušek 1929b) did. The interwar research into vernacular architecture in Carpathian Ruthenia was terminated by the monograph *Dřevěné stavby v karpatské oblasti* [Timber Buildings in the Carpathian Region] (1940), which was published by the Slavic Institute in Prague with the foreword written by Karel Chotek. Its author Volodymyr Sichynskyi<sup>50</sup> set Ruthenians' building tradition into a wider Carpathian and European historical and geographical context. He devoted one chapter to the house in rural environment and in the small town; he also explained the genesis of sacral constructions and he elaborated their typology. He also reflected on the "joint" creativity and that of particular master carpenters. The voluminous list of literature refers to international interest in log constructions in Carpathian Ruthenia and their importance for European culture.

Other components of traditional culture in Carpathian Ruthenia are defined, even though only briefly, by Karel Chotek and Drahomíra Stránská in *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], in the volume *Národopis* [Ethnography] (1936). Through this, Ruthenian ethnographic material was integrated into wider genetic-typological connections, and while evaluating it, Karel Chotek stated: "*I do not hesitate to declare that in Slovakia and especially in Carpathian Ruthenia, survivals and residues from the oldest periods has been preserved in particular components of material and spiritual culture, and in social forms. However, later periods left their mark there.*" (Chotek 1936, 146).

---

<sup>48</sup> Sergey Konstantinovich Makovsky (1877–1962), a Russian art historian, poet, and author of exhibitions of art. After the Bolshevik seizure of power he lived in exile.

<sup>49</sup> Florian Zapletal (1884–1969), a journalist and historian of culture. He came to Carpathian Ruthenia as an officer with the Austro-Hungarian Armed Forces during World War I; after the war he worked there shortly as a Czechoslovak government official. He collected a large set of photos and drawings of Ruthenia's log architecture; the set is part of several museum collections now. The photos taken by Zapletal were published only after his death in the book *Holzkirchen in den Karpaten / Wooden churches in the Carpatians* (1982) by P. R. Magocsi.

<sup>50</sup> Volodymyr Sichynskyi (1894–1962), a Ukrainian architect.

With the disintegration of Czechoslovak Republic, the ties to Carpathian Ruthenia were interrupted; after World War II, Carpathian Ruthenia was unified with Soviet Ukraine. The research on Ukrainians – Ruthenians continued only in eastern Slovakia, where the museum in Svidník became its centre.

## Conclusion

The First Czechoslovak Republic is an important stage of development in the history of Czech and Slovak ethnologies. The search for new state's identity was mirrored in the interest in folk culture, even though the authors defined and assessed it in a different way. Left-wing intellectuals advanced, besides rural culture, also omitted expressions of urban and labourers' culture, which related to the re-definition of the word "folk". Ethnographic material helped seek for arguments in favour of the idea of Czechoslovakism; this idea was based on the political doctrine of one nation with two branches. The "Czechoslovak nation" created the needful majority in the new state due to large minorities of Sudetenland and Carpathian Germans, Hungarians, Ruthenians, and Poles. The interwar Czechoslovakia was a unitary multi-ethnic state, and even though it adhered to democratic principles, this did not avert its dissolution as a consequence of international and domestic situation in 1939.

After World War II we witnessed strong criticism of Czechoslovak interwar ethnography. According to the Soviet model, it was, as a "bourgeois science", accused of positivism and absence of theoretical thinking (Nahodil & Kramářik 1952). These opinions appeared again after 1989, when the society coped with the past, in defending the young "Communist-oriented" generation of students of ethnography at Charles University in Prague, who were members of the "Marxist circle" after World War II (Skalník 2002). It remains a question to what extent the above-mentioned criticism of Czechoslovak interwar ethnography was objective.

Opposite assessing attitudes tried to prove that interwar Czechoslovakia's leading ethnographers were well versed in discipline's European discourse of the time, and that they played a positive role in the formation of ethnographic science (Ducháček 2016). Besides Professor Karel Chotek and his students, it was also Drahomíra Stránská who – due to her scientific studies and activities as an organizer – took an important part in the formation of ethnography in the period of the First Czechoslovak Republic. The words of Antonín Václavík, another one of discipline's representatives in the interwar period, document the efforts to anchor Czechoslovak ethnography in terms of theory and methodology. Václavík opposed both the art-historian methods used in the assessment of folk art, and the association of ethnography with geography. Czechoslovak folkloristics with its inventories, the application of new methods, and the interpretation of materials using the functional-structural analysis was at European level. Czechoslovak ethnographers maintained international research contacts not only within the Slavic world.

As resulting from what has been mentioned above, Czechoslovak interwar ethnography responded to the development in the discipline, and it featured diverse

research methods as well as interpretations of ethnographic materials acquired in field research or through the study of sources. Dominating is the research into traditional rural culture that, as a consequence of the lifestyle modernization, was subject to extinction, or it was transformed and it received new functions, even though the Czechoslovak avant-garde pointed out the research on working classed and urban culture. Research was conducted in all historical lands that constituted the First Czechoslovak Republic. It gave rise to synthetic works within the *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], as well as to monographs dealing with particular forms of culture, such rural house, folk dress, visual art, phenomena of social culture, and folklore expressions. In parallel, the ethnographic research on the Sudetenland and Carpathian Germans developed, with the German section of Charles University in Prague as well as other regional and local museums and societal organizations being its centre.

## References

- Altman, Karel. 2016. “Antonín Václavík a jeho škola” [Antonín Václavík and His School]. In *Etnologie v zúženém prostoru*, eds. Jiří Woitsch & Adéla Jůnová Macková, 93–105. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.
- Botík, Ján, 2001. *Slovenskí Chorváti. Etnokultúrny vývin z pohľadu spoločenskovedných poznatkov* [Slovak Croatians. The Ethno-Cultural Development from the Perspective of Social-Science Knowledge]. Bratislava: Lúč.
- Ducháček, Milan. 2014. “Československý národ jako ideál a jako touha” [The Czechoslovak Nation as an Ideal and as a Desire]. In *Historické fikce a mystifikace v české kultuře 19. století*, eds. Martin Hrdina & Kateřina Piorecká, 185–197. Praha: Academia.
- Ducháček, Milan. 2016. “Deset tezí k (dis)kontinuitě československé etnografie před rokem 1945” [Ten Assertions on the (Dis)Continuity of Czechoslovak Ethnography before 1945]. In *Etnologie v zúženém prostoru*, eds. Jiří Woitsch & Adéla Jůnová Macková, 37–67. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.
- Fasora, Lukáš & Jiří Hanuš. 2010. *Filozofická fakulta Masarykovy univerzity. Pohled na dějiny a současnost* [The Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University. A View of the History and the Present]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Horák, Jiří. 1933. “Národopis československý. Přehledný nástin” [Czechoslovak Ethnography. A Synoptic Indication]. In *Československá vlastivěda II. Člověk*, 305–472. Praha: Sfinx Bohumil Janda.
- Chotek, Karel. 1914. *Program soupisu národopisného* [The Programme of Ethnographic Inventory]. Praha: Nákladem vlastním.

- Chotek, Karel. 1924. *Program slovenského národopisného súpisu* [The Programme of Slovak Ethnographic Inventory]. Turčianský Sv. Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Chotek, Karel & Drahomíra Stránská. 1936. *Československá vlastivěda. Řada II. Národopis* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects. Series II. Ethnography]. Praha: Sfinx.
- Jeřábek, Richard, ed. 2007. *Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska 1. Biografická část* [Folk Culture. Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia. Vol. I. Biographic Section]. Praha: Mladá fronta.
- Jeřábek, Richard. 2013. *Biografický slovník evropské etnologie* [Biographic Dictionary of European Ethnology]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Kožmínová, Amalie. 1922. *Podkarpatská Rus. Práce a život lidu po stránce kulturní, hospodářské a národopisné* [Carpathian Ruthenia. The Work and Life of the People in Terms of Culture, Economy, and Ethnography]. Praha: vlastním nákladem.
- Král, Jiří, Volodymyr Kubijovyč & Miloslav Maloch. 1932–1936. *Boržava v Podkarpatské Rusi / La région de la Boržava en Russie Subcarpathique I–III*. Bratislava: nákladem vlastním.
- Král, Jiří. 1935. *Die anthropologische Durchforschung der Slowakei und Karpathosrussland in den Jahren 1919–1934*. Bratislava: vlastním nákladem.
- Lozoviuk, Petr. 2006. “Dějiny německy psaného národopisu v Čechách” [The History of the German-Written Ethnography in Bohemia]. In *Kultura – společnost – tradice II*, ed. Zdeněk Uherek, 13–52. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert, ed. 1982. *Holzkirchen in den Karpaten / Wooden churches in the Carpatians*. Wien: W. Braumüller.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. 2014. *Národ odnikud. Ilustrované dějiny karpatských Rusínů* [A Folk from Nowhere. The Illustrated History of Carpathian Ruthenians]. Užhorod: Vydavateľství V. Paďaka.
- Makovský, Sergej Konstantinovič. 1925. *Lidové umění Podkarpatské Rusi* [Folk Art in Carpathian Ruthenia]. Praha: Plamja.
- Martínek, Jiří. 2017. *Geograf a cestovatel Jiří Daneš* [Jiří Daneš, a Geographer and Traveller]. Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR.
- Mevaldová, Helena & Monika Tauberová. 2011. *Drahomíra Stránská. Osobnost evropské etnologie* [Drahomíra Stránská. A Significant Person of European Ethnology]. Praha: Národní muzeum.

- Moravcová, Miriam. 2006. “Politický národopis v pojetí Lubora Niederla a Karla Chotka” [Political Ethnography as Interpreted by Lubor Niederle and Karel Chotek]. In *Od lidové písně k evropské etnologii. 100 let Etnologického ústavu Akademie věd České republiky*, eds. Jana Pospíšilová & Jana Nosková, 101–112. Brno: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.
- Nahodil, Otakar & Jaroslav Kramář. 1952. “J. V. Stalin a národopisná věda. Příspěvky k diskusi o díle ‘Marxismus a otázky jazykovědy’” [J. V. Stalin and the Ethnographic Science. Contributions to the Discussion about the Work “Marxism and Issues of Linguistics”]. Praha: Nakladatelství Československo-sovětského Institutu.
- Niederle, Lubor, ed. 1918, 1922. *Moravské Slovensko I, II* [Moravian Slovakia I, II] Praha: Národopisná společnost československá.
- Paríková, Magdaléna, ed. 2011. “Katedra etnologie a kultúrnej antropológie. Dejiny oboru a katedry” [The Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology. The History of the Discipline and Department]. *Ethnologia slovacica et slavica* 34.
- Pavlicová, Martina. 1993. “Slovesná folkloristika na Masarykově univerzitě v letech 1919–1939” [Literary Folkloristics at Masaryk University in 1919–1939]. *Národopisná revue* 3: 81–84.
- Petráňová, Lydia. 2016. “Karel Chotek a jeho škola” [Karel Chotek and His School]. In *Etnologie v zúženém prostoru*, eds. Jiří Woitsch & Adéla Júnová Macková, 71–92. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.
- Podolák, Ján. 1991. “Jubileum národopisu na Univerzite Komenského v Bratislave” [The Jubilee of Ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava]. *Český lid* 78 (3) 222–226.
- Pospíšilová, Jana & Miroslav Válka. 2016. “Reflection of Jovan Cvijić’s Anthropogeographic Work in the Czech Interwar Ethnology”. In *150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Jovan Cvijić’s birth*, eds. Vidojko Jović & Ana M. Petrović, 723–735. Belgrade: Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Sičynskýj, Vladimír. 1940. *Dřevěné stavby v Karpatské oblasti* [Timber Constructions in the Carpathian Region]. Praha: Slovanský ústav.
- Skalník, Petr. 2002. “Komentář k článku Davida Scheffela a Josefa Kanderta ‘Politika a kultura v české etnologii’” [Comments on the Article by David Scheffel and Josef Kandert “Politics and Culture in Czech Ethnology”]. In *Česká etnologie 2000*, eds. Markéta Holubová, Lydia Petráňová & Jiří Woitsch, 231–234. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.
- Slavkovský, Peter. 2013. *Slovenská etnografia. Kompendium dejín vedného odboru* [Slovak Ethnography. Compendium of the Discipline’s History]. Bratislava: Veda.



- Smrčka, Vít. 2011. *Dějiny psané národopisem* [The History Written by Ethnography]. Praha: Česká národopisná společnost.
- Stránská, Drahomíra. 1934–1935. “O soupis a atlas lidových staveb v Československu” [For the Inventory and Atlas of Vernacular Buildings in Czechoslovakia]. *Národopisný věstník československý* 27–28: 85–98.
- Stránská, Drahomíra. 1936. *Příručka lidopisného pracovníka* [Handbook of an Ethnographer]. Praha: Národopisná společnost československá.
- Šalamon, Bedřich & Václav Švampera, eds. 1926. *Sborník I. sjezdu slovanských geografů a ethnografů v Praze 1924* [A Proceedings from the 1<sup>st</sup> Congress of Slavic Geographers and Ethnographers in Prague 1924]. Praha: Geografický ústav Karlovy university.
- Štěpánová, Irena. 1999. “Život a dílo Drahomíry Stránské” [The Life and Work of Drahomíra Stránská]. *Národopisný věstník* 15–16: 7–17.
- Václavík, Antonín. 1925. *Podunajská dedina v Československu*. [The Danubian Village in Czechoslovakia]. Bratislava: Vydavateľské Družstvo.
- Václavík, Antonín. 1930. *Luhačovské Zálesí. Příspěvky k národopisné hranici Valašska, Slovenska a Hané* [The Ethnographic Area of Luhačovské Zálesí. Contributions to Ethnographic Boundary between Wallachia, Slovakia, and Haná]. Luhačovice: Musejní spolek.
- Václavík, Antonín. 1936. *Tradicie ľudovej drevorezby* [Traditions of Folk Wood-Carving]. Bratislava: Rolnícká osveta.
- Václavík, Antonín. 1937. *Slovenské palice* [Slovak Sticks]. T. Sv. Martin: Nákladem vlastním.
- Václavík, Antonín. 1952. “Příspěvek k diskusi o některých otázkách naší ethnografie” [A Contribution to the Discussion about Several Questions on Our Ethnography]. *Český lid* 39 (5–6): 137–143.
- Válka, Miroslav. 1999. “Přínos Drahomíry Stránské k výzkumu lidové architektury” [Drahomíra Stránská’s Contribution to the Research into Vernacular Architecture]. *Národopisný věstník* 15 (57)–16 (58): 62–68.
- Válka, Miroslav. 2010. “Moravská národopisná škola. Realita či fikce?” [Moravian Ethnographic School. A Fiction or a Reality?]. In *Antonín Václavík (1891–1959) a evropská etnologie*. ed. Daniel Drápala, 125–133. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Válka, Miroslav, Martina Pavlicová, Alena Křížová, Roman Doušek & Daniel Drápala. 2016. *Od národopisu k evropské etnologii. 70 let Ústavu evropské etnologie Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity* [From Ethnography to European Ethnology. 70 Years of the Institute of European Ethnology at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

- Vavroušek, Bohumil. 1925. *Dědina. 516 fotografií lidových staveb v Republice Československé* [The Village. 516 Photographs of Vernacular Buildings in the Czechoslovak Republic]. Praha: Vesmír.
- Vavroušek, Bohumil. 1929a. *Kostel na dědině a v městečku. 615 fotografií církevních lidových staveb v Republice Československé* [The Church in the Village and Small Town. 615 Photographs of Sacral Vernacular Buildings in the Czechoslovak Republic]. Praha: Kvasnička a Hampl.
- Vavroušek, Bohumil. 1929b. *Církevní památky na Podkarpatské Rusi* [Church Monuments in Carpathian Ruthenia]. Praha: Kvasnička a Hampl.
- Vydra, Josef. 1925. *Lidové stavitelství na Slovensku* [Vernacular Architecture in Slovakia]. Praha: Jan Štenc.

Примљено / Received: 25. 02. 2020.

Прихваћено / Accepted: 04. 09. 2020.