

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 I *

The 100th anniversary of the formation of Czechoslovakia (1918) made it possible to assess, with the benefit of hindsight, the historical role of this state, whose basic ideas included the renewal of Czech statehood, the liberation from the “old Austria”, and the formation of modern civil society based on democratic principles. One can also bear in mind the creation of the new state’s identity, which our discipline, meaning ethnology, can express its pertinent opinion on. For this reason, we repeat ethnic relations in the interwar Czechoslovakia in this text, because they significantly influenced the future existence of the Czechoslovak Republic; we explain the idea of “Czechoslovakism”, a central political doctrine of the new state, and we observe the role of folk culture with its ethnic-identification functions.

Key words: Czechoslovakia (1918–1938), population, idea of Czechoslovakism, folk culture, history of science

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

Стогодишњица формирања Чехословачке (1918) омогућава процену – уз предности које пружа поглед уназад – историјске улоге ове државе чија је основна идеја била обнова чешке државности, ослобођење од „старе Аустрије“ и формирање модерног грађанског друштва заснованог на демократским принципима. Потребно је такође имати у виду креирање новог идентитета државе, о чему наша дисциплина – етнологија, може да да релевантно мишљење. Из тог разлога, у овом тексту разматрамо етничке односе у међуратној Чехословачкој, с обзиром на то да су они значајно утицали на будућу егзистенцију Чехословачке Републике; објашњавамо идеју чехословакизма, централну политичку доктрину нове државе, и посматрамо улогу народне културе и њених етно-идентификацијских функција.

Кључне речи: Чехословачка (1918–1938), становништво, идеја чехословакизма, народна култура, историја науке

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

The 100th anniversary of the creation of Czechoslovakia offered an opportunity to explain the historic circumstances of its formation, and to assess the development of the new state in the first twenty years of its existence. Czech history speaks about this period as about the “First Czechoslovak Republic” (ČSR) which is defined by 28 October 1918, a day on which the independence was declared, and 30 September 1938, a day on which the border regions inhabited by German residents (the Sudeten German territory, or Sudetenland) were ceded based on the Munich Agreement. The anniversary of the establishment of Czechoslovakia became an occasion for official state celebrations,¹ cultural events, diverse exhibitions,² as well as for publishing activities that resulted in a lot of works aimed not only at history and political science.³

The published books analysed activities of Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937), Czechoslovakia’s first president, with the aim to clarify the role of resistance abroad and that of Czech domestic politics, which led to the disintegration of Austro-Hungary and the formation of successor states (Zidek 2018). Besides the period enthusiasm about the national freedom and own country, several authors assessed, objectively and without emotions, the life of Czechs in the former Habsburg Monarchy, and they associated the formation of Czechoslovakia with its future fate, fatally affected first by the Munich Agreement⁴ and then by the dissolution of the “Second Republic”, which was caused by the occupation by Hitler’s Germany and the establishment of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia on 16 March 1939 (Uhlíř 2017). In connection with the breakage of Czechoslovakia, the new independent Slovak State, reduced by southern territories inhabited by Hungarians, developed. The easternmost part of Czechoslovakia, Carpathian Ruthenia, was occupied by Hungarians as well.

The constituting of new states after World War I did not run without problems and conflicts. Peace negotiations, which began in Versailles near Paris and continued in Saint-Germain or Trianon, were concluded with treaties and definitions

¹ The commemorative ceremonies culminated in Prague on 28 October 2018. Miloš Zeman, President of the Czech Republic, and Andrej Kiska, President of the Slovak Republic, took part in a ceremony at the National Memorial on Vítkov hill; a military parade took place on Evropská Avenue; the National Museum in the Wenceslas Square was opened to the public after a demanding general reconstruction; the celebrations included a firework below Letná, and the ceremonies to remember the Independent Czechoslovak State Day culminated in the Vladislav Hall at Prague Castle where state prizes were awarded.

² The representative common *Czech-Slovak / Slovak-Czech Exhibition* was opened in Bratislava, the capitol of Slovakia, between 27 April and 9 September 2018 first, and then at the National Museum in Prague between 28 October 2018 and 30 June 2019. In Brno, the exhibition *Traditional Folk Culture – a show case of the state – a rewarding symbol of the nation* in Moravian Museum lasted from 19 October 2018 until 30 June 2019.

³ Rychlík 2018; Zidek et al. 2018; Hvižd’ala & Přibáň 2018; Hájková & Horák 2018; Hájková et al. 2018; Dejmek 2018.

⁴ Based on the Munich an agreement signed by France, Great Britain, Italy, and Nazi German on 30 September 1939, Czechoslovakia had to cede border regions, meaning the Sudetenland with German-speaking inhabitants, to the German Reich (Rychlík 2012, 154).

of binding borders of successor states in 1919 and 1920 (Dejmek 2011). It also was Lubor Niederle⁵ and Karel Chotek⁶ who took part in the above negotiations as representatives of Czechoslovakia and experts in the theme of ethnicity; they essentially engaged in the formation of the interwar Czechoslovak ethnography.⁷

Ethnic Composition of the First Czechoslovak Republic and the Idea of Czechoslovakism

When looking at the map of the First Czechoslovak Republic with indicated ethnic composition of the population, we can see that the new state had a multi-ethnic structure, which reminded of the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in many ways, and which featured the same problems in relations between the majority, constituted by the state-forming “Czechoslovak nation”,⁸ and numerous ethnic minorities, especially Sudeten and Carpathian Germans, southern-Slovak Hungarians and Carpathian Ruthenians, and smaller ethnic groups of Poles in the Cieszyn area, Croatians in South Moravia and western Slovakia, Rumanians in Carpathian Ruthenia, and Jews and Gypsies-Romani people living in a diaspora (Boháč 1926). As a consequence of the historical development, it was mainly Czechs who identified themselves with the new state, even though the Constitutional Charter from the year 1920 begins: “*We, the Czechoslovak nation...*”

The relations between Czechs and (Upper-Hungarian) Slovaks, close nations in terms of language and culture, were created on the principles of Czech-

⁵ Lubor Niederle (1865–1944), an archaeologist, ethnographer, anthropologist, Slavist, and author of synthetic works on the history and culture of Slavic nations (*Slovanské starožitnosti* [Slavic Antiques], *Život starých Slovanů* [The Life of Old Slavs]) monitored the contemporary circumstances and the political situation in Slavic nations (*Slovanský svět* [The Slavic World], 1909), he became involved in the preparation of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition 1895, he was among founders of the central discipline’s journal *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] (1891, together with Čeněk Zíbrt), and he was one of the authors and the editor of the monograph *Moravské Slovensko* [Moravian Slovakia] (1918; 1922) (Jeřábek 2013, 145–147).

⁶ Karel Chotek (1881–1967), an ethnographer, physical anthropologist, Lubor Niederle’s student, professor of general ethnography at Comenius University in Bratislava and at Charles University in Prague, author of the project of ethnographic research in the Czech lands (1914) and in Slovakia (1924), co-author of a synthesis in *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], volume *Národopis* [Ethnography] (1936). He conducted ethnographic research in Caucasus, the Balkans, and in Slovakia (Jeřábek 2013, 96–98).

⁷ The term “ethnography” defined the complex scientific discipline and not only a method of collecting materials using field research, as this is understood by present-day ethnology, in the period of the First Czechoslovak Republic and throughout the second half of the 20th century. The Czech synonym for “ethnography” was “národopis”, which corresponded to the German term “Volkskunde” (Doušek 2014).

⁸ The Czechoslovak nation constituted a majority based on the Constitutional Charter of the Czechoslovak Republic from 1920 and the official political doctrine. For this reason, the first census data from 1921 mentioned that 8,7 million of Czechs and Slovaks lived in Czechoslovakia (Boháč 1926, 161).

Slovak mutuality in the 19th century, which was based on a broader idea of Slavic mutuality. The forced Magyarization after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise (1867) led to hard ethnic oppression of Slovaks, which, alongside the unsatisfactory economic situation, caused mass migration of Slovaks overseas in the late 19th century.⁹ The cultural ties between Czechs and Slovaks, created in the 19th century, were also reflected at the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in Prague in 1895, which demonstrated the maturity of the folk culture of both nations, and which, as a mass event, was to force through political targets (Brouček 1979).¹⁰ Slovaks proclaimed their allegiance to the common state with Czechs through their political representation by the “Martin Declaration” on 30 October 1918 (Rychlík 2018).

The number of Germans living in the Czech lands was higher than the number of Slovaks;¹¹ in negotiations with West-European and American politicians during World War I, Tomáš G. Masaryk¹² argued for the existence of one Czechoslovak nation with two branches, i.e. for the idea of Czechoslovakism, which became an official political doctrine in the interwar Czechoslovakia.¹³ However, it became apparent that the defence and fulfilment of this idea is considerably problematic, because it was especially rejected by Slovaks, as it called their national peculiarity into question.¹⁴ On the Czech side, the idea was grounded in the genealogic relationship of languages, and consequently in the cultural closeness of both nations. However, even the idea of one political Czechoslovak nation with the safeguarded cultural and language dissimilarity between Czechs and Slovaks, which appeared in declarations of several Slovak politicians, could not be fulfilled due to the former distinct development of both nations and the very short existence of the First Czechoslovak Republic (Rychlík 2012, 133).

⁹ The above migration followed the older agrarian migration heading to the “Lower Lands”, meaning Hungary, and to the territory of “military boundary”, meaning to Banat, Bačka, and Srem (Botík 2011).

¹⁰ Even though Slovaks did not receive an invitation from Czechs due to the concern about the reaction of Hungarian governmental circles, which were unusually sensitive to Czech-Slovak contacts, Slovak traditional culture was present at the exhibition by courtesy of the architect Dušan Jurkovič and the ethnographer Pavel Sochán (Brouček 2015).

¹¹ The first census in Czechoslovakia in 1921 did not find out the number of Czechs and Slovaks separately, but as a single figure based on the Czechoslovak nation declared by the Constitutional Charter of the Czechoslovak Republic. For this reason, the number of Slovaks – 2 million people – is just an estimation resulting from the data acquired in Slovakia (Boháč 1926, 160).

¹² Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk (1850–1937), a philosopher, sociologist, university professor, Czech and Czechoslovak politician, the first president of the Czechoslovak Republic, in the formation of which he was instrumental as a representative of resistance abroad.

¹³ At the turn of the years 1920 and 1921, Karel Chotek was charged with conducting a propaganda mission among American Czechs and at Slovak League, where his task was to demonstrate the idea of the Czechoslovak unity through ethnographic material (Ducháček 2017, 36).

¹⁴ At the time of the independent Slovak State during World War II, the term “Czechoslovakist” stood for the “traitor to the nation” (Rychlík 2012, 131). Likewise, Slovaks were irritated by the Czech idea of a Slovak as a “younger and smaller brother” (Podoba 2006).

As compared with Slovaks, the contacts between Czechs and Carpathian Ruthenians (Ukrainians) were only rare before World War I, in contrast to Ruthenian population in Galicia, which was part of the Cisleithanian territory of the Habsburg Monarchy (Valášková 2015). Carpathian Ruthenia was unified with Czechoslovakia thanks to the efforts of Ruthenians living abroad, especially those living overseas (Rychlík & Rychlíková 2016). The creation of group identity in Carpathian Ruthenia was complicated due to the varied national orientation of political and cultural elites that were aimed at Russia and Ukraine. The third direction, which could be called Ruthenian (national), endeavoured to constitute the independent Ruthenian nation. This also related to different names given to Slavic inhabitants in Carpathian Ruthenia¹⁵ who mostly self-identified with Greek-Catholic religion,¹⁶ or with regionally defined ethnographic groups of Lemkos, Boykos, and Hutsuls (Magocsi 2014); however, a common (group) identity was not present there. In addition to Ruthenians, also Hungarian minority, Slovaks, Rumanians, Germans and, of course, Jews lived in Carpathian Ruthenia.¹⁷ The struggle to break Ruthenians free from the thrall to Hungary led to their unification with Czechoslovakia, where they were to reach autonomy, which they never saw in the end. Czechoslovak governmental authorities argued for the insufficient level of civil development of the Ruthenian population (Rychlík & Rychlíková 2016, 67). The complexity of ethnic situation in the east of Czechoslovakia is reflected in the monograph *Národopisná hranice mezi Slováky a Karpatorusy* [The Ethnographic Boundary between Slovaks and Carpathian Russians] (Húsek 1925).¹⁸ Moreover, a part of Ruthenians ended up in eastern Slovakia after the Slovak-Carpathian border was determined.¹⁹

¹⁵ They are called Ruthenians, Rusyns, Carpathian Russians, or Ukrainians (Lesser Russia inhabitants). We use the term Ruthenians, Ruthenian in our text.

¹⁶ The Greek-Catholic Church (Uniate) refers to a number of Eastern Catholic Churches following the Byzantine liturgy, but recognizing the authority of the Pope. They share the dogmatic theology with the Roman-Catholic Church. In Hungary, eastern Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia, this church began to develop based on the Uzhorod Union after the year 1649 (Magocsi 2014).

¹⁷ According to the census in 1921, the ethnic composition of population in Carpathian Ruthenia was, as follows: Great-Russians, Ukrainians, Belarussians, and Ruthenian Russians 372 884 inhabitants (62,17 %), Czechs and Slovaks 19 737 inhabitants, Hungarians 102 144 inhabitants, Jews 80 059 inhabitants, Rumanians 10 810 inhabitants, Germans 10 460 inhabitants, others 914 inhabitants (Boháč 1926, 161).

¹⁸ Speaking about the issue of nationality's boundary demarcation, Húsek comes to the conclusion, that: "Our Czech-Russian ethnographic boundary is not based solely on the language, solely on the faith, or the combination thereof; it is based on a pure psychological moment (on tribal consciousness, or on instinctively anticipated feeling, on a tendency, will etc.), which is not of a static, but of a dynamic nature, being often subject to the frame of mind (especially with a nation that is less or not at all conscious)" (Húsek 1925, 496). The work was published in the "Průdy" Library, which focussed on the care for Czech-Slovak mutuality.

¹⁹ In eastern Slovakia, 85 644 inhabitants declared their Ruthenian ethnicity in 1921 (Boháč 1926, 160).

Poles living in Silesia, in the Cieszyn area, were another Slavic minority in Czechoslovakia.²⁰ This territory was claimed by the renewed Poland after World War II, referring to the ethnicity of local population. Also, economic factors, meaning coal reserves in the area between the towns of Ostrava and Karviná and metal-lurgy, as well as the strategic railway connecting the Czech lands with Slovakia were at the stake. A short war conflict of both successor states was resolved in a peace way – the former Duchy of Teschen' territory was divided between both states along the River of Olše/Olza, and Poland was given a part of Slovak regions of Orava and Spiš, where the Gorals, speaking Lesser Polish dialect, lived.

The issue of German inhabitants was a significant problem the interwar Czechoslovakia had to be equal with. We must become aware of the fact that the Czechoslovak population included more than three million of inhabitants with German nationality, who lived in the Czech border regions (the Sudetenland) and in inland language islands from the Middle Ages.²¹ Their disagreement with the formation of Czechoslovakia was expressed by their attempts to join the territory to German Austria, a successor state of Austrian Germans, so the local armed protests of Czech Germans had to be locally suppressed by military force. The German minority also lived in several enclaves in Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia, where they were generally called Carpathian Germans.²² Although German residents were granted political and cultural rights in Czechoslovakia, they did not self-identify with the new state and at the end of the 1930s, they took an active part in its destruction.

As we concluded above, it was the idea of Czechoslovakism that was the basic political doctrine of the First Czechoslovak Republic. The representatives of the scientific community took different stand on this idea. We can find its apologetics mainly in popular-scientific works and official state works. According to Viktor Dvorský, founder of the Czech anthropogeography,²³ the formation of Czechoslovakia meant the fulfilment of an idea for self-determination of the nation (Dvorský 1920). This idea found its staunch exponents among historians, e.g. Václav

²⁰ Pursuant to statistical data from the first census in 1921, 75 853 Poles lived in Czechoslovakia (Boháč 1926, 161).

²¹ Pursuant to official statistical data from 1921, the number of Germans equalled 3.218.005 persons in Czechoslovakia (Boháč 1926, 161).

²² The large German minority that also lived in Slovakia (139 900 persons) was concentrated in western Slovakia in the territory of the Little Carpathians (Pezinok, Modra), in mining towns in Central Slovakia (Kremnica, B. Štiavnica, Prievidza, B. Bystrica), in north-eastern Slovakia (Spiš), and in the regions of Gelnica and Dobšiná (Boháč 1926, 160). In Carpathian Ruthenia 10 460 persons declared their German ethnicity (Boháč 1926, 161).

²³ Viktor Dvorský (1882–1960), an anthropogeographer, professor at the Faculty of Natural Science at Charles University in Prague; he was awarded the senior lecturer degree for the discipline of economic geography at Czech Technical University in Prague as well. His study trips to the Balkans became a basis for his dissertation *Ekonomicko-geografická studie z Černé Hory* [The Economic-Geographical Study from Monte Negro] (1907). He was a member of the Czechoslovak delegation at the Paris Peace Conference, and he took part in the delimitation negotiations concerning Czechoslovak borders (Jefábek 2007, 47).

Chaloupecký, professor of Czechoslovak history at Comenius University in Bratislava. As a staunch Czechoslovakist, he subordinated his scientific works devoted to Slovakia to this concept.

Ethnographic works are politically correct on the one hand, while on the other one the authors are aware of the essential difference in folk culture of both countries. In official national publications, we can find arguments that support the above-mentioned unity, as in the case of Karel Chotek who works with the term “Czechoslovak nation”, but he admits that: “It is indisputable that Slovakia has many different and own features and that in the Czechoslovak area there is a division into the western and the eastern part in terms of ethnography” (Chotek 1925, 203). Chotek could only hardly find cogent arguments even in *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects] (1936), which was to represent the science of new democratic state, to defend Czechoslovakism. He was aware of the differences in folk culture of “both fundamental groups” of the new state.²⁴

With the benefit of hindsight, the relationship between Czechs and Slovaks in one common state was assessed in different ways. One of the critical opinions, which appeared in discipline’s press after the division of Czechoslovakia, came to the conclusion that Slovakia became a “Czech colony” (Kandert 2005). It is necessary to become aware of the fact that after the departure of Hungarian intelligentsia and officials who rejected to be loyal to the new Czechoslovak state, it was Czechs who built up the functioning state administration, the health care and the system of education including the university degree in Slovakia; the judiciary and police guaranteed the democratic political system and the rule of law. Czechs developed an emotional relationship to Slovakia (Pospíšilová 2018). On the other hand, it is not possible to hide negative cases of Czech officials’ behaviour, as some of them were moved to Slovakia based on their wrongdoing.

During the 1930s, political situation in Czechoslovakia became complicated not only as a result of the international situation after the ascent of Fascism in the neighbouring Germany, but also due to the strengthening nationalistic trends in the domestic political arena, which were represented by the Sudeten German Party in Bohemia and Moravia,²⁵ and by Hlinka’s Slovak People’s Party in Slovakia.²⁶ All

²⁴ As late as in the late 1930s, he came to the following conclusion: “In this complicated analysis of Czechoslovak problems in the sense of ethnography, which, however, with its results supports the Czechoslovak unity more than we would expect, the study of Moravian ethnography and the importance of Moravia as such in unusually importance. There we can find a lot of interesting premises and dispositions that determined and formed both the crucial features of Czech ethnography, and a lot of components and influences, which with full force operated in the eastern part of the Czechoslovak ethnographic area” (Chotek 1937, 22).

²⁵ The policy of the Sudeten German Party (Sudetendeutsche Partei, Henlein-Partei), founded by Konrad Henlein in 1933, took an essential part in the breakage of Czechoslovakia. See https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sudeton%C4%9Bmeck%C3%A1_l_strana (accessed March 30, 2019).

²⁶ Hlinka’s Slovak People’s Party (HSLŠ) was a Slovak right-wing party. Its target was the autonomy of Slovakia; gradually nearly Fascist tendencies began to dominate in it. It was a leading

the above factors contributed to the dissolution of Czechoslovakia as a sovereign state, and to the disappearance of a history chapter, called the First Czechoslovak Republic (Rychlík 2012).²⁷ For the entire period of its existence, Czechoslovakia was a unitary state, but, in contrast to other successor states, the one that adhered to the principles of Parliamentary democracy.

Folk and Folk Culture in the Period of the First Czechoslovak Republic

As Václav V. Štech, an important Czech interwar art historian, stated: “The Czech modern culture has its roots in rural folk” (Štech 1923, 116). For this reason, traditional folk culture could fulfil ethnic-identification functions, and appropriate attention was paid to it in the interwar Czechoslovakia not only by ethnographers,²⁸ art historians,²⁹ and architects;³⁰ it appeared in the practice of political parties and at state acts in the form of applied ethnography (Hájková 2018). In the 19th century and at the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition (1895), folk culture was equated with national culture, because its creator – rural folk – was considered to be the core of the nation. National identity and specific features were seen in life, customs, and culture of the pre-industrial village at that time.

The gradual transformation of the Czechoslovak society after World War I as a consequence of the modernization of lifestyle contributed to the fact that the content of the word “folk” and the acceptance of its culture were subject to a remarkable transformation. The category “folk” was newly defined, as the representatives of Czech avant-garde extended the category by labourers (proletariat) in addition to the inhabitants of agrarian villages (peasants). The avant-garde understood

political force in the “Slovak State” (1939–1945). See https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hlinkova_slovensk%C3%A1_%C4%BEudov%C3%A1_strana (accessed March 30, 2019).

²⁷ Czechoslovakia was re-established in 1945, after the Nazi Germany’s defeat, however, in a different geopolitical situation defined by the results of World War II. After coup-d’état on February 25, 1948, Czechoslovakia became firmly integrated in the Eastern (Soviet) Bloc.

²⁸ An overview of ethnographic and folkloristic research is contained in a synthetic work in *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], in particular in the volume *Člověk* [Human Being] (Horák 1933).

²⁹ Opinions of several art historians (Z. Wirth, V. Mencl), who over-rated the influence of stylized art in folk environment, proved to be wrong already in the interwar period, and they were substituted by more objective pieces of knowledge, which were grounded in functional structuralism (K. Šourek, V. V. Štech).

³⁰ Speaking about architects, whose creation was inspired by vernacular architecture, especially the timbered one, we have to mention Dušan S. Jurkovič (1868–1947) on the first place. He participated in the installation of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition (1895) and his constructions can be classified as part of a specific stream of Art Nouveau, or of the attempts to create a “national” style in architecture. The interwar period, when he lived in Slovakia, brought to his works the inspiration by Classicism, which he applied in his state contracts (Válka 2015, 116–124). When assessing the vernacular architecture (*Vlna rustikalismu – A Wave of Rusticalism*), the architect Karel Honzík (1900–1966) proceeded from functionalistic positions (*Tvorba životního slohu* [The Formation of Life Style] 1946).

the folk as a unified natural and joint layer of population, modern proletariat.³¹ As a consequence of this re-definition, we can encounter both positions in the interest in folk's culture in the interwar Czechoslovakia; besides the disappearing rural (traditional) forms, it is the "artistic" expressions linked to urban environment, but called and classified in different ways, that were newly observed (Čapek 1920).

Also, the interwar sociology brought its contribution to the discussion about the category "folk". Inocenc A. Bláha, professor at Masaryk University in Brno and author of *Sociologie sedláka a dělníka* [The Sociology of the Farmer and the Labourer] (1925), defines in this work both social classes and the differences between them, but he always emphasizes the importance of the countryside: *Becoming aware of the farmer's estate, we become aware of the nation in its structural and functional aspects. The farmer is also the nation* (Bláha 1925, 89). Bláha became involved in the "Velká Study Association", whose intention was to publish a sociological monograph focussed on the village of Velká nad Veličkou.³² Besides sociologists, the team consisted of natural scientists and ethnographers, so the monograph was to bring up an inter-disciplinary view of the contemporary countryside in south-eastern Moravia, where significant expressions of traditional peasant culture were slowly ceasing to exist.

The artistic and historical explanation of traditional rural culture, declared as the new "scientific" approach to its assessment, appeared in the publication *Umění československého lidu* [The Art of the Czechoslovak Folk] (1928). On one hand, it was still based on the value criteria of the Viennese school of the history of art,³³ but is also responded to the viable streams of opinion coming from the German environment.³⁴ This illustrated publication presents different forms of traditional art in the pre-industrial village, such as paintings, sculptures, architecture, folk garments, and embroideries. The introductory analysis of authors, who are art historians, can be summed up to assertions that folk art is derived from stylized art and it belongs to the past; it can be considered to be secondary, and it lacks creative

³¹ "There is one folk from pole to pole: the modern proletariat. And the modern proletariat neither wears Tyrol, Slovácko, and Zulu folk costumes, nor sings carols" (Teige 1922, 378).

³² The Velká Study Association was established in 1931, but it did not succeed in fulfilling its targets. Among its leading persons was Vladimír Úlehla (1888–1947), professor of biology at Masaryk University in Brno and author of the movie *Mizející svět* [Disappearing World] (1932), which was inspired by living traditional culture in Moravian-Slovak borderlands. His monograph *Živá píseň* [Living Song] (1949) submits valuable information on folklore's ecology (Jeřábek 2007, 236–237).

³³ Franz Wickhoff, Alois Riegel, and Max Dvořák were among its representatives. Its primary focus on the formal qualities of an artistic work led to the rejection of debates about its content. In M. Dvořák's conception the history of art meant the history of ideas.

³⁴ According to the Swiss ethnographer Eduard Hoffmann-Krayer "the folk does not produce, it re-produces" (*Die Volkskunde als Wissenschaft*, 1902). The German literary scientists and folklorists Hans Naumann (1886–1951) forced through the "theory of decayed cultural values", in which he called creative capabilities of folk classes in question (*Grundzüge der deutschen Volkskunde*, 1922) (Jeřábek 2013, 144).

values in its forms (Wirth, Matějček & Lábek 1928). As a historical category, folk art cannot be a source of inspiration for the contemporary modern production and culture.

Ethnographers' diametrically different opinions rejected to assess traditional folk art using the methods of art history, because it fulfilled other than just aesthetical functions. Antonín Václavík specifies these functions in his works, which are based on Slovak ethnographic material, with an example of folk wood-carving (Václavík 1936; 1937). Karel Šourek, a theoretician of art, solved the above issues using the functional-structural method: "Folk creation cannot be identified through the methods of art history. The thing is that folk creation is a different purposeful structure rather than a kind of art" (Šourek 1942, 5).³⁵

The interest in working class's culture, which was understood as an integral part of the innovated category "folk" and glorified in tendentious literary works written by left-wing intellectuals, led to the situation that in the interwar Czechoslovakia the phenomenon of "the art without preconditions" came into play, meaning the creation by artisans, untrained self-taught persons, and dilettantes from among the folk connected rather with urban and suburban areas; this art was given different names, such as art of everyday life, works of popular culture, or amateur, primitive, naive, random and festive art (Čapek 1920). In the interwar period, the Czech avant-garde understood that as a counterbalance to rural, rustic art.³⁶ The theoretician of culture Karel Teige as well as the painter Josef Čapek did not consider folk's art to be national art, and they criticized the use of folk costumes and the misuse of folk culture at state acts and representative events.³⁷

It can be stated that the perception of folk culture and art was diversified, and it was related to the affiliation to a certain part of political spectrum in the First Czechoslovak Republic. Agrarian parties supported the revitalization of traditional "rustic" culture, while the left-wing intellectuals tended to adore the culture of proletariat. The research conducted by ethnographers, art historians and left-wing artists came to diverse conclusions.

³⁵ In the late 1930s, at the time of national emergency, art historians came with an assertion that folk art actively re-formulated the ideas and motives applied in "high-art" works, adapting them creatively to the conditions of its social class. There are ties and relations between folk art and national identity, because the Czech folk art differs from the Hungarian and the German ones, but, on the other hand, it shows a blood relationship to the Slovak folk art. These formal concurrences between the Czech lands and Slovakia served as an evidence for the existence of a single nation (Štech 1941).

³⁶ "He [K. Čapek] is not concerned about the past rural art; the contemporary folk creation is rather an urban and suburban art, often as inflexible, non-elegant, and drastic as a common vulgar ditty or joke, talked by people in the streets" (Teige 1921, 152).

³⁷ "...it is traditional to show the national awareness and the Hussite trait of our character by pulling on the Slovácko folk costume" (Teige 1921, 150).

References

- Bláha, Inocenc Arnošt. 1925. *Sociologie sedláka a dělníka* [The Sociology of the Farmer and the Labourer]. Praha: Orbis.
- Boháč, Antonín. 1926. *Národopisná mapa Republiky československé. Podrobný popis národnostních hranic, ostrovů a menšin* [The Ethnographic Map of the Czechoslovak Republic. A Thorough Description of Ethnic Boundaries, Islands, and Minorities]. Praha: Národopisná společnost československá.
- Botík, Ján. 2011. *Dolnozemskí Slováci* [Lower-Land Slovaks]. Nadlak: Ivan Krasko.
- Brouček, Stanislav. 1979. *České národopisné hnutí na konci 19. století* [Czech Ethnographic Movement in the late 19th Century]. Praha: Ústav pro etnografii a folkloristiku ČSAV.
- Brouček, Stanislav. 2015. “Účast Slováků a Slovenska na přípravách Národopisné výstavy československé 1895” [Participation of Slovaks and Slovakia in the Preparations for the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in 1895]. *Prameny a studie* 56: 45–58.
- Chotek, Karel. 1925. “Československá kultura národopisná” [Czechoslovak Ethnographic Culture]. In *Politika. Co má vědět o Československé republice každý občan 2/II. Státní národ. Jeho duchovní kultura*, 197–206. Praha: Československý kompas.
- Chotek, Karel. 1937. *Lidová kultura a kroje v Československu* [Folk Culture and Folk Costumes in Czechoslovakia]. Praha: Novina.
- Chotek, Karel & Drahomíra Stránská. 1936. *Československá vlastivěda. Řada II. Národopis* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects. Series II. Ethnography]. Praha: Sfinx.
- Čapek, Josef. 1920. *Nejskromnější umění* [The Most Modest Art]. Praha: Aventinum.
- Dejmek, Jindřich et al. 2011. *Zrod nové Evropy. Versailles, St.-Germain, Trianon a dotváření poválečného mírového systému* [The Birth of New Europe. Versailles, St.-Germain, Trianon, and the Finalization of Post-War Peace System]. Praha: Historický ústav AV ČR.
- Dejmek, Jindřich. 2018. *Československo. Dějiny státu* [Czechoslovakia. A History of the State]. Praha: Libri.
- Doušek, Roman, Petr Holub, Zuzana Holubová, Petr Janeček & Jan Obrovský. 2014. *Úvod do etnologického výzkumu* [Introduction to the Ethnological Research]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Ducháček, Milan. 2017. “Dilemata čechoslovakismu: etnograf Karel Chotek mezi vědou a propagandou” [The Dilemmas of Czechoslovakism: the Ethno-

- grapher Karel Chotek between the Science and the Propaganda]. In *Co bylo Československo? Kulturní konstrukce státní identity*, eds. Milena Bartlová et al., 28–54. Praha: Vysoká škola uměleckoprůmyslová.
- Dvorský, Viktor. 1920. *Hranice československé republiky* [Borders of the Czechoslovak Republic]. Praha: Státovědecká společnost.
- Hájková, Dagmar & Pavel Horák. eds. 2018. *Republika Československá 1918–1939* [The Czechoslovak Republic 1918–1939]. Praha: Lidové noviny.
- Hájková, Dagmar, Pavel Horák, Vojtěch Kessler & Miroslav Michela. 2018. *Sláva republice! Oficiální svátky a oslavy v meziválečném Československu* [Glory Be to the Republic! Official holidays and celebration in the interwar Czechoslovakia]. Praha: Academia.
- Horák, Jiří. 1933. “Národopis československý. Přehledný nástin” [Czechoslovak Ethnography. A Synoptic Indication]. In *Československá vlastivěda II. Člověk*, 305–472. Praha: Sfinx Bohumil Janda.
- Húsek, Jan. 1925. *Národopisná hranice mezi Slováky a Karpatorusy* [The Ethnographic Boundary between Slovaks and Carpathian Russians]. Bratislava: Prúdy.
- Hvízďala, Karel & Jiří Příbáň. 2018. *Hledání dějin. O české státnosti a identitě* [The Search for History. On Czech Statehood and Identity]. Praha: Karolinum.
- Jeřábek, Richard, ed. 2007. *Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska I. 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.
- Kandert, Josef. 2005. “Etnografické výzkumné techniky v českých zemích a důsledky jejich používání” [Ethnographic Research Techniques in the Czech Lands, and the Consequences of Using Them]. *Lidé města* 15 (1): 33–51.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. 2014. *Národ odnikud. Ilustrované dějiny karpatských Rusínů* [A Folk from Nowhere. The Illustrated History of Carpathian Ruthenians]. Užhorod: Vydavateľství V. Paďaka.
- Podoba, Juraj. 2006. “Menší brat strážcom tradície: ‘úděl bílého muže’, českí intelektuáři a slovenský národopis v 20. storočí” [The Smaller Brother to Guard the Tradition: “the Destiny of the White Man”, Czech Intellectuals and Slovak Ethnography in the 20th Century]. In *Od lidové písně k evropské etnologii*, eds. Jana Pospíšilová & Jana Nosková, 269–281. Brno: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.

- Pospíšilová, Jana. 2018. “‘Já tu Bratislavu miluji.’ Ze vzpomínek a dokumentů rodiny českého lékaře” [“I Love the Bratislava.” Memories and documents of the family of a Czech physician]. *Slovenský národopis* 66 (3): 318–330.
- Rychlík, Jan. 2012. *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století. Spolupráce a konflikty 1914–1992* [Czechs and Slovaks in the 20th Century. Cooperation and Conflicts 1914–1992]. Praha: Vyšehrad.
- Rychlík, Jan. 2018. *1918. Rozpad Rakouska-Uherska a vznik Československa* [1918. The Disintegration of Austro-Hungary and the Formation of Czechoslovakia]. Praha: Vyšehrad.
- Rychlík, Jan & Magdalena Rychlíková. 2016. *Podkarpatská Rus v dějinách Československa 1918–1946* [Carpathian Ruthenia in the History of Czechoslovakia 1918–1946]. Praha: Vyšehrad.
- Šourek, Karel. 1942. *Lidové umění v Čechách a na Moravě. Poznámky k jeho povaze* [Folk art in Bohemia and Moravia. Notes on its nature]. Praha: Umělecká beseda.
- Štech, Václav Vilém. 1923. “Dekorativní umění československé” [Czechoslovak Decorative Art]. *Výtvarná práce* 2: 116–122.
- Štech, Václav Vilém. 1941. “Podstata lidového umění” [Essence of Folk Art]. In *Pod povrchem tvaru*, 43–51. Praha: Václav Petr.
- Teige, Karel. 1921. “Nové umění a lidová tvorba” [New Art and Folk Creation]. In Vlašín, Štěpán, ed. 1971. *Avantgarda známá a neznámá I. Od proletářského umění k poetismu 1919–1924*. Praha: Svoboda.
- Teige, Karel. 1922. “Umění dnes a zítra” [The Art Today and Tomorrow]. In Vlašín, Štěpán, ed. 1971. *Avantgarda známá neznámá I. Od proletářského umění k poetismu 1919–1924*. Praha: Svoboda.
- Uhlíř, Jan Boris. 2017. *Protektorát Čechy a Morava 1939–1942* [The Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia 1939–1942]. Praha: Ottovo nakladatelství.
- Václavík, Antonín. 1936. *Tradicie ľudovej drevorezby* [Traditions of Folk Wood-Carving]. Bratislava: Rolnícká osвета.
- Václavík, Antonín. 1937. *Slovenské palice* [Slovak Sticks]. T. Sv. Martin: Nákladem vlastním.
- Valášková, Naďa. 2015. “Národopisná výstava československá v roce 1895 a její ohlas ve východní Haliči” [The Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in 1895 and its Echoes in Eastern Galicia]. *Prameny a studie* 56: 68–79.
- Válka, Miroslav. 2015. “Lidový dům a národní kulturní dědictví” [Folk House and National Cultural Heritage]. In Křížová, Alena, Martina Pavlicová & Miroslav Válka, eds. *Lidové tradice jako součást kulturního dědictví*, 89–164. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Wirth, Zdeněk, Antonín Matějček & Ladislav Lábek. 1928. *Umění československého lidu* [The Art of the Czechoslovak People]. Praha: Vesmír.

Zídek, Petr et al. 2018. *Budovatelé státu. Příběhy osobností, které ovlivnily vznik Československa*. [Builders of the State. Stories of important persons who influenced the formation of Czechoslovakia] Praha: Universum.

Примљено / Received: 10. 12. 2019.

Прихваћено / Accepted: 29. 04. 2020.