

Miroslav VÁLKA*, Jana POSPÍŠILOVÁ**

ENCYCLOPAEDIAS IN CZECH ETHNOLOGY***

Abstract: In certain era, encyclopaedias and encyclopaedic dictionaries crown human knowledge in general, or they focus on particular scientific disciplines. In the present-day Czech Republic, the modern tradition of general encyclopaedias is substantiated by *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary], edited by the politician František Ladislav Rieger in 1860–1874, *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] from the turn of the 20th century, or *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] published at the time of the First Czechoslovak Republic. The idea of an ethnographic encyclopaedia of the Czechoslavic people, which has never been implemented, emerged already at the time of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition (1895). In the inter-war Czechoslovakia, the synthesis of the then knowledge about folk culture was included in the volumes *Člověk* [The Human Being] (1933) and *Národopis* [Ethnography] (1936) within an extended edition of *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects]. The socialist Czechoslovak ethnography and folkloristics published its perception of the discipline in the volume *Lidová kultura* [Folk Culture] (1968). The discipline's lexicographic work was crowned by the work *Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska* [Folk Culture. Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia] (2007), which reflects traditional perception of the discipline, and also changes heading towards European ethnology. The compendium includes the Biographic Section (1 Volume) and the Subject Section (2 and 3 Volumes) consisting of seven lexicographic groups: 1) Theory and methodology of the discipline; 2) History of ethnography; 3) Ethnographic areas; 4) Tangible culture; 5) Folk visual arts; 6) Folklore and folkloristics, and 7) Spiritual culture. The Encyclopaedia was a result of the cooperation between the Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences and the Institute of European Ethnology at the Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University.

Key words: *Czech Republic, encyclopaedia, ethnology, history of science*

* Miroslav Válka, Institute of European Ethnology at the Faculty of Arts of Masaryk University, Brno, valka@phil.muni.cz

** Jana Pospíšilová, jana.pospisilova@iach.cz

*** The paper was prepared with the support of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University. The paper was supported by the funds for a long-term conceptual development of research organization RVO: 68378076.

Encyclopaedias represent the synthesis of human knowledge, and they are an essential instrument to spread scientific knowledge and education. This can be exemplified by the French *Encyclopaedia, or a Systematic Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts, and Crafts* (*Encyclopédie, ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*) from 1751–1766, which helped disseminate ideas of the Enlightenment and whose criticism of the Feudal order brought about a new view of the society and role of unprivileged classes (“the people”).

It is also the *Encyclopædia Britannica* that had its origin in the Enlightenment. In 1985, when its fifteenth edition was revised, it included thirty-two volumes. Since the 1990s, the *Encyclopædia Britannica* has been published on CDs.¹ The multi-lingual on-line encyclopaedia Wikipedia, which can be edited by anybody, was launched in 2001.² It can be used free of charge.

In terms of their formal classification, printed encyclopaedias are structured in alphabetically sorted entries, or in a coherent academic text that is divided into chapters. According to their focus and function, encyclopaedias can be divided into: 1) general encyclopaedias; and 2) special (disciplinary) encyclopaedias, which we will deal with the focus on the discipline and the Czech Republic. However, in the introduction we will summarize modern attempts to publish Czech general encyclopaedic compendia.

THE OLDEST CZECH ENCYCLOPAEDIAS

The first modern encyclopaedia that originated in the Czech lands, which were part of the Austrian Empire (converted into the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1867) in the 19th century, was written between 1860 and 1874. The authors who compiled it used the list of entries and materials intended for an encyclopaedia that was prepared by František Palacký;³ this was one of *Malice Česká* patriotic acts, which, however, was not implemented (Hartmanová 2000a, 15). The issued encyclopaedia was termed *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary], and included 11 volumes. The then leading Czech politician František Ladislav Rieger (1818–1903) became its

¹ https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Encyclop%C3%A6dia_Britannica (cit. 16. 2. 2020).

² <https://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedie> (cit. 16. 2. 2020).

³ František Palacký (1798–1876), a Czech politician (called „Father of the Nation“) and a historian (*Dějiny národu českého v Čechách a v Moravě* [The History of the Czech Nation in Bohemia and Moravia]. 1848–1872). The author of one of the conceptions of Czech nation’s history.

editor-in-chief; the Dictionary also got its working title after him.⁴ Particular entries were created by eminent people of Czech science and culture, who contributed to the formation of Czech ethnography, such as Karel Jaromír Erben⁵ and Václav Hanka⁶; the Viennese Slavic scholar Vatroslav Jagić demonstrates the ties to Slavic nations.⁷

In addition to knowledge from various scientific disciplines, the Rieger's *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary] also includes general ethnologic entries, such as *Národ* [Nation];⁸ the entry *Ethnografie* [Ethnography] contains brief data about the newly constituting scientific discipline which broke away from geography and which deals both with learning about spiritual properties of particular nations based on language, literature, religion, administration, and history, and with explanation of their mutual relations and their relationship to the mankind. The entry reveals that the new discipline is lacking general treatises; only writings concerning particular nations are available. As the entry (without a mentioned author) states, ethnic issues in multi-ethnic countries are complicated.⁹ The large entry *Jihoslované* [South Slavs]¹⁰ was partially conceived by Vatroslav Jagić, and partially by the Czech philologist Jan Gebauer;¹¹ however, its section *Národopis* [>> literally nation writing, or nationography, which differentiates the period of Turkish and Austrian rule, was written by František

⁴ Jakub Malý (1811–1885), a lexicographer, was a co-editor of the *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary]; he took up the essential editor's work after F. L. Rieger returned to the political activity (1879).

⁵ Karel Jaromír Erben (1811–1870), a historian, poet, and collector of Czech folk songs and fairy-tales (*Sto prstonárodních pohádek a pověstí slovanských v nářečích původních* [One Hundred Slavic Folk Tales and Legends in Original Dialects] 1865; *Prstonárodní české písně a říkadla* [Czech Folk Songs and Nursery Rhymes]. 1864). He looked for the remnants of old myths in folk literature: *Slovanské bájesloví* [Slavic Mythology] (2009).

⁶ Václav Hanka (1791–1861), a linguist, librarian, and archivist; editor of (forged) old-Bohemian monuments (*Rukopis královédvorský* [Dvůr Králové Manuscript], 1819), translator of Serbian folk epics (*Prstonárodní srbská Musa do Čech převedená* [Folk Serbian Musa Transferred to Bohemia]. 1817).

⁷ Vatroslav Jagić (1838–1923), professor of Slavic studies in Berlin, Moscow, and Vienna. Author of works in philology and literary science (*Historija književnosti naroda hrvatskoga i srbskoga. I. Staro doba*. 1867; *Razum i filosofija iz srpskih književnih starina*. 1892).

⁸ *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary] V. 1866: 644.

⁹ *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary] II. 1862: 506–507.

¹⁰ *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary] IV. 1865: 284–380.

¹¹ Jan Gebauer (1838–1907), a Bohemist, founder of Department of Slavic Philology at Charles University. He took part in proving the Manuscripts to be a forgery.

Čupr.¹² The briefer entry *Černá Hora* [Montenegro] was written by Jan Vaclík, princely secretary in Montenegro, and Václav Křížek, a k. u. k. secondary-school teacher in Varaždin. They consider Montenegrins to be a Serbian tribe, and they understand Montenegrins' various "national" customs to prove "the pure and unimpaired nature of a safeguarded nation". They consider baptismal and wedding rituals as well as *pobratimstvo* [sworn brotherhood] and *kumstvo* [god-parenthood] to be the major and characteristic rituals.¹³

From the perspective of its conception, the Rieger's *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary] received a favourable opinion from Slavic nations; many entries from the Dictionary were published as offprints, and they were translated into Slavic and other languages. In addition to detailed information about Slavic nations, the Rieger's Dictionary also submits valuable knowledge about eminent people from the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries.

The growing economic potential in the Czech lands alongside the social and cultural development of Czech society led to publishing a representative work of the 19th-century Czech science, namely *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] with the sub-title *Ilustrovaná encyklopedie obecných vědomostí* [An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Universal Knowledge]. This universal encyclopaedia, which Jan Otto publishing house prepared in 1888–1909, consists, in its original version, of twenty-seven regular volumes (+ 1 volume with supplements).¹⁴ More than one thousand experts from all academic disciplines took part in this publication, among others also those who contributed to the development of ethnography, such as historian of the Balkans Konstantin Jireček,¹⁵ archaeologist and anthropologist Lubor

¹² František Čupr (1821–1882), a Czech philosopher, teacher, and politician.

¹³ *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary] II. 1862: 498–507.

¹⁴ The conception of Otto's dictionary was elaborated by Jakub Malý, who proved his ability as the editor of Rieger's Encyclopaedic Dictionary, but after his death, it was Tomáš Masaryk, professor at Prague University and future first Czechoslovak president, became the main editor for a short time. The preparatory works began under Masaryk's leadership in 1885, but due to his engagement in the battle for the authenticity of Manuscripts, he renounced his position, and it was Josef J. Kořán, Rudolf Dvořák, and Primus Sobotka who successively worked as editors. (Hartmanová 2000a, 17–18).

¹⁵ Konstantin Jireček (1854–1918), a historian, politician, and founder of Czech Balkan studies (*Dějiny bulharského národa* [The History of the Bulgarian Nation]. 1876; *Geschichte der Serben* I, II. 1911–1918).

Niederle,¹⁶ historian of culture Čeněk Zíbrt,¹⁷ literary scientist and folklorist Jiří Polívka,¹⁸ and founders of domestic ethnographic research František Bartoš¹⁹ and Josef Klvaňa;²⁰ from foreign authors it is possible to mention the Serbian statistician Bogoljub Jovanović²¹ and the Slavist Matija Murko.²² Several entries in the *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] are unusually thorough and wide, for example the group entry *Čechy Bohemia*²³ has even more than five hundred pages, and in addition to common data about nature, ethnic composition of the population, industry, trade, history and

¹⁶ Lubor Niederle (1865–1944), an archaeologist, anthropologist and ethnographer. Together with Čeněk Zíbrt, he founded the disciplinary journal *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] (1891), and he took part in the organization of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition (1895). He is author of *Slovanských starožitností* [Slavic Antiquities] I–IV (1902–1924) and its cultural section titled *Život starých Slovanů* [The Life of Old Slavs] I–III (1911–1925).

¹⁷ Čeněk Zíbrt (1864–1932), a historian of culture, ethnographer, bibliographer, long-time editor of the journal *Český lid* [The Czech Folk] (1891–1932), publisher of old-Bohemian literary monuments, author of monographs about folk dances, clothing, customs and habits (*Staročeské výroční obyčeje, pověry, slavnosti a zábavy prostonárodní* [Old-Bohemian Annual Customs, Superstitions, Festivities, and Folk Festivals. 1889]). See *Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue* [Bibliographic Addendum to the Journal of Ethnology] 26. 2012. Strážnice: NULK.

¹⁸ Jiří Polívka (1858–1933), a philologist, folklorist, professor of Slavic studies, foreign member of the Academy of Sciences in Belgrade. He dealt with the study of folk fairy-tales (*Pohádkoslovné studie* [Fairy-Tales Literary Studies]. 1904), he became known as author of inventory works, and he was editor of folk literature. See *Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue* [Bibliographic Addendum to the Journal of Ethnology] 20. 2006. Strážnice: NULK.

¹⁹ František Bartoš (1837–1906), a dialectologist, ethnographer, and collector of folk songs. His ethnographical works were published in several anthologies; collections of songs were titled *Nové národní písně moravské s nápěvy do textu vřaděnými* [New National Moravian Songs with Melodies Integrated to Text] (1882), *Národní písně moravské v nově nasbírané* [Newly Collected National Moravian Songs] (1899, 1901, together with Leoš Janáček).

²⁰ Josef Klvaňa (1857–1919), a natural scientist, ethnographer, and photographer. With his work, he contributed to the documentation and treatment of folk clothing in Moravia. (*Národopisná výstava československá* [Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition] 1895, *Moravské Slovensko* [Moravian Slovakia] 1918).

²¹ Bogoljub Jovanović (1839–1924), a Serbian statistician, of Czech origin, a full member of the Serbian Learned Society and an honorary member of the Serbian Royal Academy. He is author of the work *Das Königreich Serbien und das Serbenvolk von der Römerzeit bis zur Gegenwart* I–III (1904, 1909, 1919), together with F. Kanitz.

²² Matija Murko (1861–1952), a Slovenia philologist, literary scientist, folklorist; professor at Charles University in Prague, founder of the Slavic Institute, and editor of the magazine *Slavia*.

²³ *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] VI, 1893: 1–572.

culture, it also includes a section *Z minulosti obyvatelstva. I. Kroj* [From the Past of the Population. I. Folk Costume],²⁴ accompanied by coloured drawings of Bohemian folk dress by the national painter Mikoláš Aleš. Similarly, in the section about Bohemian architecture we can find drawings of wooden buildings from many places in Bohemia. A quite brief entry explains the other historical province of the Czech lands, *Moravia*, but it also includes data about folk culture.²⁵ This demonstrates the increasing credit of ethnography as a scientific discipline that is mentioned in the Otto's encyclopaedia under the Czech term *Národopis* [» literally nation writing, or nationography; it is defined as a science about nation as a social unit with the aim to get to know its peculiarity. In the Czech lands, the above discipline experienced its top event in the organization of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition (1895), in the establishment of the Ethnographical Society with a museum, and in the preparation of an encyclopaedia focused on the Czechoslavic folk.²⁶ The entry *Jihoslované* [South Slavs, written by Matija Murko and other authors, covers more than one hundred pages in Otto's encyclopaedia.²⁷ It also includes ethnographical sections, in which the Slovenians are described by Murko and a young author Ivan Kunšič;²⁸ the sections about Serbians and Croats were written by Jan Palacký.²⁹ The larger part of the entry *Černá Hora* [Montenegro] was written by Konstantin Jireček and it also includes a map of the country (including the Bay of Kotor) and a picture of Montenegrin folk types and traditional clothing as annexes.³⁰

In its time, the *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] was considered to be one of the best encyclopaedias, and as to the number of entries and illustrations included in it, it was compared with other world encyclopaedias. After the finished National Revival, it demonstrated the follow-up development of Czech society in the late 19th century and before the First World War, it used a positivistic-liberal approach to scientific knowledge, and besides domestic Czech issues it also focused on Slavic nations. Due to the obsolescence of entries, especially those in natural sciences, it

²⁴ *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] VI, 1893: 444–450.

²⁵ *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] XVII, 1897: 600–712.

²⁶ *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] XVII, 1897: 1051.

²⁷ *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] XIII, 1890: 361–507.

²⁸ Ivan Kunšič (1874–1899), a Slovenia philologist, Slavist and ethnographer, working in Prague.

²⁹ Jan Palacký (1830–1908), a geographer, politician, and university professor; son of František Palacký.

³⁰ *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] VI, 1893: 602–612.

was repeatedly published, however, never in the planned volume.³¹ Representative editions of the *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] were and remain adornment to home and public libraries in the Czech Republic.

As we have already stated, the second half of the 19th century was associated with the formation of a new discipline focused on the study of folk (rural) culture that was considered to be the basis of national culture. In the Czech lands, the beginnings of scientific ethnography are associated with the nationwide movement that was to support Czech constitutional requirements towards the Austria-Hungarian government (Brouček 1979). Political pressure towards Vienna had different forms, among which the 1895 Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in Prague played an important role. The exhibition was initiated by František Adolf Šubert (1849–1915), an “old-Bohemian” politician and director of the National Theatre. The Prague Exhibition was preceded by regional exhibitions accompanied by “national” festivals, at which living folk traditions were performed; meaning the preparations and holding of the Exhibition were accompanied by the surging wave of Czech patriotism (Brouček 1996).

The representative anthology called *Národopisná výstava československá v Praze 1895* [The Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in Prague in 1895], published after its end, is the first attempt to work out a synthesis of knowledge about folk culture of the Czech ethnic group with focus on rural house, folk clothing, and folklore traditions; it can be considered to be a predecessor of subsequent encyclopaedias. It thoroughly describes the preparation of the Exhibition and its organization. The importance of the anthology consists not only in the fact that it tried to compile a complex picture of folk culture (called national culture in the terminology of that time) of Czechs (and partially Slovaks), but also in initiating the follow-up ethnographic research and in the formation of an independent scientific discipline that was supposed to solve tasks arisen from the Ethnographic Exhibition. One of them was the foundation of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Museum; this was realized in the year following the Exhibition (Smrčka 2011, 37). The implementation of the idea to elaborate an encyclopaedia of the “Czechoslovak” folk was more complicated. The first conception of the ethnographic encyclopaedia was worked out by Emanuel Kovář, a historian of culture

³¹ *Ottův slovník naučný nové doby* [Otto's Encyclopaedia of Modern Times] I–VI (12 volumes). 1930–1943. The intention was not completed due to the war and post-war political development in Czechoslovakia.

and secretary of the Ethnographic Exhibition.³² It included all social classes of the Czech nation and their culture (Kovář 1897), but it was rejected due to its extensiveness. The conception by the ethnographer Karel Chotek (1881–1967) focused only on traditional folk (rural) culture and the materials needful for it were to be collected in the form of regional monographs. The above-mentioned project called *Program soupisu národopisného* [The Programme of Ethnographic Inventory] (Chotek 1914) was announced but its implementation was interrupted by the First World War, after the end of which the geopolitical and societal situation essentially changed not only in Central Europe.

ENCYCLOPAEDIAS THE REPRESENT CZECHOSLOVAK SCIENCE OF THE INTERWAR PERIOD

The formation of independent Czechoslovakia (1918) as one of the successor states of the Austro-Hungarian Empire facilitated further economic, social, and cultural development of Czechs and Slovaks in their common state built on democratic principles of Parliamentary democracy (Rychlík 2018). Although the ethnic composition of the population generated the same problems in Czechoslovakia as were those in the former Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, Czechoslovakia, in comparison to other authoritarian regimes in the then Europe, maintained a high credit of the state of law until its extinction. The above-mentioned ethnic background alongside differentiated traditional folk (rural) culture contributed to the further development of ethnography, which became a university discipline in Czechoslovakia and which gradually professionalized. It was at Comenius University in Bratislava that Karel Chotek was appointed as the first Czechoslovak professor of ethnography (1921); Antonín Václavík was awarded a private senior lecturer degree in ethnography at Masaryk University in Brno in 1933,³³ but ethnological themes were taught there as part of relative disciplines, meaning historical geography, physical anthropology, and literary science. At Charles University in Prague, the discipline was taught as an independent discipline

³² Emanuel Kovář (1861–1898), a historian of culture (he died untimely), he took part in the organization of the Czechoslavic Ethnographic Exhibition (1895), author of conception works.

³³ Antonín Václavík (1891–1959), an ethnographer, museologist, and university professor; he wrote about Slovak folk art and he is an author of ethnographic monographs (*Podunajská dedina v Československu* [The Danube Village in Czechoslovakia]. 1925; *Luhačovské Zálesí*, 1930) and of a work about the genesis of folk art (*Výroční obyčeje a lidové umění* [Annual Customs and Folk Art]. 1959). See *Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue* [Bibliographic Addendum to the Journal of Ethnology] 1. 1991. Strážnice: NULK.

first in the German section of Charles University (Lozoviuk 2006), and beginning with the 1930s, when Karel Chotek moved to Prague, also in its Czech section. The research was managed by the Ethnographical Society that focussed on publishing and research activity after the Ethnographic Museum had been incorporated into the National Museum (Stránská 1936).

Free science of the new state was to be represented by two encyclopaedias. *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] was the first one; its seven volumes were published between 1925 and 1933 with a subtitle: “*Lidová encyklopedie všeobecných vědomostí*” [A Folk Encyclopaedia of Universal Knowledge] and with the creed: “*Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary is a practical encyclopaedia of all knowledge, which is based on scientific results and which is delivered in the Czechoslovak, Slavic, progressive, democratic and socially fair spirit*”.³⁴ The Dictionary is defined as the third attempt to publish a nationwide Czechoslovak encyclopaedia. As is evident, the publishers relied on a wide reading public, and the title containing the name of the first Czechoslovak president was to promote Masaryk’s philosophy and world view. It was Emanuel Rádl, a biologist and philosopher, Masaryk’s student, who was the editor-in-chief for the Dictionary; he was followed by the librarian Zdeněk V. Tobolka who took over his work. Among ethnographers, authors of the entries, it is possible to notice the already mentioned Lubor Niederle, Václav Fabián, director of the Ethnographic Museum³⁵, and Drahomíra Stránská, an employee at the same institution and private senior lecturer at Charles University.³⁶ The Dictionary as an official work respected the idea of Czechoslovakism, meaning the political doctrine of the interwar Czechoslovakia,³⁷ which was rejected by

³⁴ *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] I. 1925: VIII.

³⁵ Václav Fabián (1877–1931), an ethnographer, historian, museum worker, and author of the entries *Národopis* [Ethnography], *Národopyt* [literally Nation exploration], *Národopisná společnost československá* [Czechoslovak Ethnographical Society], and *Národopisné muzeum československé* [Czechoslovak Ethnographical Museum] in *Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary* (1926: 628).

³⁶ Drahomíra Stránská (1899–1964), an ethnographer, employee at the National Museum, and senior lecturer at Charles University in Prague. After a study stay in Belgrade (1925) also a promoter of J. Cvijič’s anthropo-geographic method and of the idea of publishing an ethnographical atlas. Author of works about folk costumes (*Lidové kroje v Československu I, Čechy* [Folk Costumes in Czechoslovakia I, Bohemia]. 1949), rural houses and methodology for ethnographic research (*Příručka lidopisného pracovníka* [Handbook of an Ethnographer], 1936). See *Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue* [Bibliographic Addendum to the Journal of Ethnology] 13. 1999.

³⁷ The idea of Czechoslovakism, one nation with two branches, was a political way out of the problem with ethnic composition of the population in the First Czechoslovak Republic, in which a high number of German inhabitants lived.

a group of Slovak political representation already in the interwar period: *Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary is our first encyclopaedia which is given to the Czechoslovak nation at the time of its full independence and which writes openly and in accordance with truth about our free republic.*³⁸ Masaryk dictionary also reflects the new geopolitical situation in Europe after the First World War, not only in Central Europe, but also in the Balkans. For this reason, in addition to the traditional entry *Jihoslované* [South Slavs, a quite large entry with information about anthropology of southern Slavs, their folk costumes, traditional occupation, language, literature, and science,³⁹ we can find there also the entry *Jugoslávie* [Yugoslavia] with an annotation: officially the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.⁴⁰ This fact documents that the name “Yugoslavia” had been used even before it became the official name of this south-Slavic state. The entry describes natural conditions, ethnic composition of the population, economy, political situation, and state administration; information of cultural nature are given in the above-mentioned entry “South Slavs”. The entry Montenegro is drawn up in a different way.⁴¹ The explanation of natural conditions is followed by the history of the country until 1918, meaning until its integration into the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

As further entries, their volume and selection show, Masaryk dictionary reflects the modernization of life after the First World War with emphasis put on the development of technology and natural sciences. The Dictionary compilers’ utilitarian view of the needs of its users sidelined social sciences, which were preferred in both previous Czech encyclopaedic compendia. Despite the mentioned reservation, the Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary is an educative creditable work, which represented the science of the interwar Czechoslovakia and which fulfilled its mission to serve for practical needs of the wide public and “*to become a basis for universal guidance to the members of our Czechoslovak nation*”⁴²

The other work to reflect the idea of free science in the new republic was *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], a series

³⁸ Masarykův slovník naučný [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] I. 1925: VII.

³⁹ Jihoslované [South Slavs]. In *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] III. 1927: 771–783. The entry has a pictorial addendum with examples south-Slavic architecture, visual art, and folk culture.

⁴⁰ Jugoslávie [Yugoslavia]. In *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] III. 1927: 824.

⁴¹ Černá Hora [Montenegro]. In *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] I. 1925: 996–997.

⁴² *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] VII. 1933: II.

published from the late 1920s, which included the volumes *Příroda* [Nature], *Jazyk* [Language], *Dějiny* [History], *Stát* [State], *Práce* [Labour], *Písemnictví* [Literature], *Umění* [Art], *Technika* [Technology], and *Osvěta* [Education of the Public]. In addition to its anthropological section, the volume *Člověk* [The Human Being] (1933) also included the historiography of the Czech and Slovak ethnographic and folkloristic research (Horák 1933); in the volume *Národopis* [Ethnography] (1936) Karel Chotek and Drahomíra Stránská described the background of traditional folk culture in Czechoslovakia's historical provinces, meaning the Czech lands, Slovakia, and Carpathian Ruthenia. The traditional culture of Sudeten and Carpathian Germans was treated separately (Jungbauer 1936). However, the above-mentioned positive development was interrupted by the disintegration of Czechoslovakia (1939)⁴³ and events of the Second World War, which paralysed the research in the realm of ethnography and all social sciences.

ENCYCLOPAEDIAS PUBLISHED IN THE SOCIALIST CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Political changes associated with the Second World War and with the year 1948 integrated the renewed Czechoslovakia into the Soviet (Eastern) Bloc. The expulsion of German residents from Czech borderlands (Sudetenland) set into motion massive migration processes heading towards the formation of a mono-ethnic state, which was a general development trend that did not concern only Czechoslovakia. In the field of economy, the private sector was liquidated, and the hitherto individual farming was collectivized in the countryside. Scientific research, especially in the field of social sciences, exposed to the pressure of official Communist ideology, led to the criticism of "bourgeois" science and to the new interpretation of social processes based on dialectic and historic materialism. The discipline "ethnography and folkloristics" was also declared to be a historical science, and its methodology was narrowed due to the rejection of functional structuralism and other approaches. Politically committed ethnographic research that focused on working classes' culture and cooperative (collectivized) countryside meant a departure from the unilateral interest in traditional (pre-industrial) rural culture in the direction of urban culture and research into the present (Skalníková and Fojtík, 1971). The foundation of the Czechoslovak

⁴³ After the forced cession of the region inhabited by German residents (Sudetenland) based on the Munich Agreement (1938), the rest of Czechoslovak territory was occupied by Nazi German as a Protectorate of Böhmen und Mähren (1939). The Slovak people formed their own state reduced by southern regions inhabited by Hungarians.

Academy of Sciences (1953) contributed to further professionalization of the science. The Institute of Ethnography and Folkloristics with seats in Prague and Brno was one of its institutions (Woitsch 2017). In Bratislava, the analogous Institute of Ethnography was founded as part of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (Kiliánová and Zajonc 2016). The discipline was accredited at all Czechoslovak universities, in Prague (Janeček 2017), Brno (Válka 2016), and in Bratislava (Paríková 2011), but only in the 1960s it broke free from its formal connection with history and other disciplines. The post-war Czechoslovakia cultivated ethnographic museology at various levels, and also specialized disciplinary institutions were established, such as the Institute of Folk Art (Culture) in Strážnice, which organized the international folklore festival, fulfilled museum functions, and began to issue another disciplinary periodical titled *Národopisné aktuality* [Current Events in Ethnography] with the nationwide coverage.

The strict centralization, which became a focal point of economic, social and cultural life in the socialist Czechoslovakia, was also reflected in the field of encyclopaedic work. This also became one of the instruments used by the communist politics and ideology. In 1959, the Encyclopaedic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (CSAV) was established; its task was to fulfill the official political order for publishing an encyclopaedia the target of which was to reflect requirements of the new political regime, meaning the principle of folksiness, to be based on scientific world view, and to apply class-oriented approach to persons and world events, whereby it was the revolutionary proletarian movement and formation of socialist world bloc that played the central role among these events. The above-mentioned principles were first applied in the *Příruční slovník naučný I–IV* [The Desk Encyclopaedic Dictionary], which was published by the Encyclopaedic Institute in the CSAV publishing house between 1962 and 1967. The Dictionary thus was the first post-war “socialist-oriented” dictionary, but quite an unbalanced one, as the entries concerning social sciences (61%) prevail over the entries concerning natural sciences and technology (Hartmanová 2000b, 81). This logically referred to the fact that the fight between the Western capitalistic (bourgeois) society and the Eastern (Socialist) bloc was going on ideological basis, in the field of world view, in philosophy, and in social sciences. However, the political circumstances experienced easing in Czechoslovakia in the mid-1960s, which became evident not only when comparing the first and the fourth volume of the *Příruční slovník naučný* [The Desk Encyclopaedic

Dictionary], but also on further encyclopaedias which could be published in that relaxed time.⁴⁴

The socialist science was also represented by new series of the *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects],⁴⁵ which included, among other things, also the volume titled *Lidová kultura* [Folk Culture] (1968); this summarized the knowledge from the post-war ethnographic and folkloristic research and partially even the above-mentioned shift in research priorities. Andrej Melicherčík, professor at Comenius University in Bratislava, became editor-in-chief of the work;⁴⁶ Vladimír Scheufler was responsible for the ethnographic section,⁴⁷ and Vladimír Karbusický for the folkloristic section,⁴⁸ both were employees of the Prague Institute of Ethnography and Folkloristics of the CSAV. The work included two sections conceived in an analogous way, the Czech and the Slovak one, and worked-out by ethnographers and folklorists from Czech and Slovak departments of the Academy of Sciences. The work focussed on traditional cultural forms in the pre-industrial countryside, even though it took into consideration working-classes' culture and social development in the 20th century. In the introduction,

⁴⁴ The liberalization of the political situation in Czechoslovakia can also be noticed in *Malý encyklopedický slovník A–Ž* [The Little Encyclopaedic Dictionary A–Ž]. 1972. Praha: Academia, which was an excerpt from the above-mentioned *Příruční slovník naučný* [The Desk Encyclopaedic Dictionary, (1962–1967)].

⁴⁵ The socialist *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects] included volumes titled *Příroda* [Nature], *Dějiny* [History], *Lidová kultura* [Folk Culture], *Umění* [Art], *Hudba* [Music], *Umění* [Art], *Divadlo* [Theatre]; they were published step-by-step between 1963 and 1971.

⁴⁶ Andrej Melicherčík (1917–1966), a Slovak folklorist and author of works about the history and theory of the discipline; in folkloristics, he substituted the functional and structural method by the historic approach (*Jánošíkovská tradícia na Slovensku* [Janošík Tradition in Slovakia]. 1952, a product of its time), and editor of folk literature and collections of songs (*Slovenský folklór. Chrestomatia* [Slovak Folklore. Chrestomathy]. 1959).

⁴⁷ Vladimír Scheufler (1922–1995 Prague), a musicologist and ethnographer. He is author of works about folk ceramics (*Lidové hrnčičtství v českých zemích* [Folk Pottery in the Czech Lands]. 1972), timber rafting (*Já jsem plavec od vody. Historie jihočeské voroplavy* [I Am a Rafter from the Riverside. A History of South-Bohemian Timber Rafting]. 1986). See *Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue* [Bibliographic Addendum to the Journal of Ethnology] 23. 2009. Strážnice: NULK

⁴⁸ Vladimír Karbusický (1925–2002), a musicologist, folklorist, and sociologist. He dealt with Bohemian legends (*Nejstarší pověsti české* [The Oldest Bohemian Legends]. 1966; *Báje, mýty, dějiny. Nejstarší české pověsti v kontextu evropské kultury* [Fables, Myths, History. The Oldest Bohemian Legends in the Context of European Culture]. 1995), and he observed the relationship between music genres and styles (*Mezi lidovou písní a šlágrelem* [Between the Folk Song and the Hit]. 1968). See *Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue* [Bibliographic Addendum to the Journal of Ethnology] 24. 2010. Strážnice: NULK.

the authors explain the term “the folk” that they understand “from the economic point of view as a class which does not own any means of production, and which is, for this reason, exploited, from the political point of view as an unorganized mass of people that must be organized through political ideas, from the cultural point of view as a closed group of people with strong cultural attributes [...]”.⁴⁹ In the introductory chapter, the historical approach to the research into folk culture is reflected in dividing the folk culture into three development stages as well as in outlining the contemporary problems and new themes, which included the research into working-classes, industrial areas, big cities, folklorism, and relations between nationalism and folk culture.⁵⁰ The structure of both sections is based on traditional ethnographic systematics, but it sorts out occupation and production from the whole of the tangible culture. Chapters speaking about spiritual culture are incorporated into “Superstitious Ideas and Customs of the Czech Folk”; in the Slovak section they are titled “Opinions, Ideas, and Customs of the Slovak Folk”. The theoretical chapter “Folk Art”, common for both sections, is placed quite illogically at the end, whereby the sources are mentioned in different places of previous chapters.⁵¹

The period of “normalization”, which was started by the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia (1968), returned the country to tough communist regime, and it subsequently resulted in the “real socialism”. At that time, the least successful works of the Encyclopaedic Institute of the CSAV came into being, namely *Ilustrovaný encyklopedický slovník* [The Illustrated Encyclopaedic Dictionary] I–III (1980–1982) and *Malá československá encyklopedie* [The Little Czechoslovak Encyclopaedia] I–VI (1984–1987), the task of which was to reflect social and technical progress, but the political indoctrination in the realm of humanities, which was more than evident, significantly devalued the publications. This was apparent in the selection of biographic entries concerning the people who either became “persona non grata” for the new political regime, or the mentioned data about whom were biasedly distorted; subject entries display shallow ideologization.

⁴⁹ Lidová kultura [Folk Culture]. 1968: 19. In *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects] III. Praha: ČSAV.

⁵⁰ Ibid. 24.

⁵¹ Ibid. 782.

FOLK CULTURE. THE ETHNOGRAPHIC
ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF BOHEMIA,
MORAVIA, AND SILESIA.

The year 1989 saw in Czechoslovakia, as well as in other countries of the former Soviet Bloc, a change in political situation and the end of the rule of communist ideology. Czechoslovakia split into the Czech Republic and Slovakia (1993), and both new states were subsequently integrated into western-European political and military structures. Market economy had fatal consequences for the state economy deprived of central planning. The above-mentioned processes resulted, among other things, in the dissolution of the Encyclopaedic Institute of the CSAV in 1992. Before its dissolution, the Institute published its first “free” encyclopaedia *Československý biografický slovník* [The Czechoslovak Biographical Dictionary] (1992), which tried to redress class-oriented selective approach of socialist lexicographers. Eminent persons of the discipline were chosen by Richard Jeřábek, the head of the Institute of European Ethnology at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University in Brno, who gave lectures in lexicography and bibliography on a long-term basis and who was the author of several own lexicographic works.⁵²

The new system of research funding got the form of grants in the Czech Republic. The discipline accepted ethnological discourse; in addition, cultural and social anthropology were established again. The Czech Science Foundation with its funds allocated in two stages, in 1993 and 1996, allowed the ethnologists to work on a new encyclopaedia. This collective work resulted from the cooperation between the Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague and the Institute of European Ethnology of Masaryk University in Brno, from which also both leading editors, PhDr. Stanislav Brouček, CSC. (Prague) and Prof. PhDr. Richard Jeřábek, DrSc. (Brno), came. Senior Lecturer Lubomír Tyllner, CSc. (Prague) became scientific secretary of the editorial board.

Taking into consideration the presumed users of the work and upon the publisher's wish, the authors chose the older, still used and understandable title *Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska* Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and

⁵² Richard Jeřábek (1931–2006), an ethnologist and author of works about folk visual arts culture and about historiography of the discipline (*Počátky národopisu na Moravě* [The Beginnings of the Ethnography in Moravia]. 1997). He edited the *Biographic Section of Folk Culture in the Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia* (2013). See *Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue* [Bibliographic Addendum to the Journal of Ethnology] 32. 2018. Strážnice: NULK.

Silesia]. In connection to the almost finished *Biografický slovník českých národopisců* [The Biographic Dictionary of Czech Ethnographers], prepared by Richard Jeřábek, it was decided that entries relating to persons would be published simultaneously, in the independent first volume of the encyclopaedia. Its editing remained under the control of the above-mentioned compiler.

The subject section of the encyclopaedia contained seven lexicographic (thematic) groups, each with an own responsible leader: 1) Theory and methodology of the discipline (Václav Hubinger, then Jiří Traxler); 2) The history of ethnography (Stanislav Brouček); 3) Ethnographic areas (Richard Jeřábek, Josef Vařeka); 4) Tangible culture (Miroslav Válka, Josef Vařeka); 5) Folk visual art (Richard Jeřábek); 6) Folklore and folkloristics (Dušan Holý, Lubomír Tyllner); 7) Spiritual culture (Lydie Petrářová).

While discussing about the structure of the work, the editors decided to divide the alphabetically-ordered entries into three categories according to their importance (short — up to one page; middle-sized — up to three pages; long — up to five pages). However, the authors did not always adhere to the above range. The struggle was to give the entries a unified concept based on lexicographic principles, meaning the entry title was followed by the definition of a term and then by its explanation. All entries included a chronologically-ordered bibliography of work relating to the observed theme. The first factual proofreading of the texts was done by leaders of the lexical groups, but the follow-up proofreading was ensured by an authorized employee of the Mladá Fronta publishing house, which was the publisher of the encyclopaedia.

The leaders of the thematic groups also drew up particular lists of entries. After that, the lists of entries passed an external examination by further experts. The lists of entries were created as an open structure, compiled according to the importance of the entries, meaning one proceeded from universal and wider entries to those narrower and concrete. When compiling the lists of entries, the group of authors uses the experience gained by Slovak colleagues, who produced their encyclopaedia not long ago, publishing it in two volumes under the title *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska* [The Encyclopaedia of Folk Culture in Slovakia I, II (Botík and Slavkovský, 1995)].

The authors of entries were chosen among experts in a particular thematic group: academics, museum ethnographers, or emeritus scholars. The entries include a cipher which specifies them; a total of 122 ethnologists, including several anthropologist and historians, participated in the work. The leaders of the thematic groups together with the authors of the entries also prepared pictorial documentation (drawings, photos). The entries are

accompanied by black-and-white pictures, and the subject volume of the encyclopaedia includes colour tables, relating to particular themes: 1. Folk dress and embroidery; 2) Visual arts culture; 3) Vernacular architecture; 4) Family ceremonies, annual customs, and folk song and dance.

From 2001, technical editing was led by Jiří Traxler and his three colleagues. They ensured linguistic proofreading and compiled the subject, geographical, and name indexes. Lubomír Tyllner elaborated the editorial note for the Subject Section of the encyclopaedia, which includes the following information: 1. Authors; 2. Conception of the subject section; 3. Categories and volume of entries; 4. Composition of entries; 5. Spelling; 6. Pictures; 7. Indexes. The editorial note for the Biographic Section was written by Richard Jeřábek. In addition to Czech authors, who dealt with the collection of folk literature or their own research from the 18th century, also foreign scholars who conducted research into the folk culture of Czech ethnic group are mentioned (Piotr G. Bogatyriov, Roman O. Jakobson, Milovan Gavazzi, Natalia N. Gracianskaja, Heide Nixdorff, Matija Murko, and Orest Zilynskyj).

After many adventures caused by the privatization of the Mladá Fronta publishing house, the encyclopaedia was published in 2007 under the title *Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska* [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia] in three volumes: Volume 1: *Biografická část* [Biographic Section] (collectors, researchers, including the foreign ones if they dealt with the culture of Czech ethnic group, 284 pages); Volume 2 and 3: *Věcná část* [Subject Section] (A–N, 634 pages) and (0–Ž, 655 pages); this includes theory, historiography, realia of folk culture etc. The compendium was peer-reviewed in the disciplinary press, both in the Czech (Měřínský 2008; Veselská 2008; Benža and Švecová 2008) and the international one (Botík and Botíková 2008; Slavkovský 2008; Luković 2009), as well as in several Czech dailies.⁵³ The reviewers reproached the authors for shortcomings in indexes, absence of entries about several German-writing authors and topographers of the 18th and 19th centuries, and for an overly critical and open assessment of the politically active representatives of the discipline in the era of socialism; the circle of information was not always closed in several subject entries, because the compilers abandoned the reference apparatus, they did not sufficiently use museum collections, and, in some places, they did not mention updated information about institutions. Despite the above formal and factual shortcomings, the reviews considered the publication to be monumental, impressive, and featuring indisputable qualities.

⁵³ *Lidové noviny*. 2007. 20: III (z 22. 12.); *Týden*. 2007 (49): 80 (z 3.12.); *Dějiny a současnost*. 2008. 30 (5): 44; *Vesmír* 2008. 87 (12): 882–884.

CONCLUSION

In the Czech lands, the tradition of modern encyclopaedias reaches back to the 19th century, to the period of the National Revival. Universal encyclopaedias not only fulfilled the utilitarian mission as a source of information from various disciplines of human activity, but they also were of symbolic and representative importance for society, because they documented the level of education and cultural maturity of a national unit. For this reason, encyclopaedias as nationwide projects drew corresponding attention, and significant representatives of science and culture participated in their creation; on the other hand, the conception of encyclopaedias was influenced by period political situation, as is documented by the oldest Czech encyclopaedic compendia *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary], edited by the politician František Ladislav Rieger in 1860–1874, *Ottův slovník naučný* [Otto's Encyclopaedia] from the turn of the 20th century, or *Masarykův slovník naučný* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary] published at the time of the First Czechoslovak Republic. The political indoctrination was most evident in encyclopaedic works from the era of socialism, especially in the realm of social sciences. Alongside the formation of ethnography as an independent social-scientific discipline, anthologies and then also encyclopaedias were produced within that discipline. If we ignore the representative almanac about the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition (1895), it is the volumes *Národopis* [Ethnography] (1936) and *Lidová kultura* [Folk Culture] (1968), which were worked-out for the edition of *Československá vlastivěda* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects], that are among those works published in the inter-war and post-war Czechoslovakia. They witness the discipline's old focus on the culture of the pre-industrial countryside, where national specific features were searched for and found. Even though the idea of a special ethnographic encyclopaedia was proclaimed already by the organizers of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition, it could be implemented only after more than one hundred years, in the late 20th century and in new societal conditions of the independent Czech Republic. The encyclopaedic work *Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska* [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia] (2007) crowned the development stage of the discipline that is named using the domestic term *národopis* [» literally nation writing, or nationgraphy], or wider terms ethnography and folkloristics. The work established the discipline in the eyes of the domestic public, and also the Czech ethnology abroad. The prize for the best publication act in the discipline in 2007 which the authors were awarded by the Czech Ethnological Society, a top professional organization of Czech ethnologists, demonstrates that the encyclopaedia was really an extraordinary work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Benža, Martin and Soňa Švecová. 2008. „Lidová kultura: Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska“ [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia]. *Český lid* 95 (1): 93–102.
- [2] Botík, Ján and Marta Botíková. 2008. „Lidová kultura: Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia] 1 - 3“. *Slovenský národopis* 56 (1): 94–96.
- [3] Botík, Ján and Peter Slavkovský (ed.). 1995. *Encyklopédia ľudovej kultúry Slovenska* [The Encyclopaedia of Folk Culture in Slovakia] I, II. Bratislava: Veda.
- [4] 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.
- [5] Brouček, Stanislav et. al. 1996. *Mýtus českého národa aneb Národopisná výstava československá 1895* [A Myth of Czech Nation or Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in 1895]. Praha: Littera Bohemica.
- [6] Hartmanová, Dagmar. 2000a. „Historie československé encyklopedistiky do roku 1945 [The History of Czechoslovak Encyclopaedic Studies until 1945]“. *Národní knihovna. Knihovnická revue* 11 (1): 15–21.
- [7] Hartmanová, Dagmar. 2000b. „Historie československé encyklopedistiky 1945–1992 [The History of Czechoslovak Encyclopaedic Studies until 1945–1992]“. *Národní knihovna. Knihovnická revue* 11 (2–3): 80–88.
- [8] Horák, Jiří. 1933. „Národopis československý. Přehledný nástin [Czechoslovak Ethnography. An Overview Outline]“. In *Československá vlastivěda II. Člověk*, 305–472. Praha: Sfinx.
- [9] Chotek, Karel and Drahomíra Stránská. 1936. *Československá vlastivěda. Řada II. Národopis* [Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects. Series II. Ethnography]. Praha: Sfinx.
- [10] Janeček, Petr. 2017. „Ústav etnologie Filozofické fakulty Univerzity Karlovy v kontextu vývoje českých etnologických věd [The Institute of Ethnology at the Faculty of Art of Charles University in the Context of the Development of Czech Ethnological Sciences]“. *Studia Ethnologica Pragensia* 28, 1: 129–163.
- [11] Jungbauer, Gustav. 1936. „Německý národopis v ČSR [German Ethnography in the Czechoslovak Republic]“. In *Československá vlastivěda. Řada II. Národopis*, 341–378. Praha: Sfinx.
- [12] Kiliánová, Gabriela and Juraj Zajonc. 2016. *70 rokov Ústavu etnológie Slovenskej akadémie vied. Kontinuity a diskontinuity bádania a jednej inštitúcie* [70 Years of the Institute of Ethnology of the Slovak Academy of Sciences: Continuity and Discontinuity of the Research and One Institution]. Bratislava: Veda.
- [13] Kovář, Emanuel. 1897. „Národopis a úkoly Národopisné Společnosti Československé [Ethnography and Tasks of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Society]“. *Národopisný sborník československý* 1: 1–13.
- [14] *Lidová kultura. Československá vlastivěda III* [Folk Culture. Czechoslovakia in All Its Aspects]. 1968, ed. Andrej Melicherčík. Praha: Orbis.
- [15] *Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska* [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia] I–III. 2007, ed. Stanislav Brouček and Richard Jeřábek. Praha: Mladá fronta.

- [16] Lozoviuk, Petr. 2006. „Dějiny německy psaného národopisu v Čechách. Úvod do problematiky [The History of the German-Written Ethnography in Bohemia. The Introduction into the Theme]”. In *Kultura — společnost — tradice II*, ed. Zdeněk Uherek, 13–51. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR.
- [17] Luković, Miloš. 2009. „Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia]“. *Glasnik Etnografskog instituta SANU* 57 (2): 169–167.
- [18] *Masarykův slovník naučný. Lidová encyklopedie všeobecných vědomostí* [Masaryk Encyclopaedic Dictionary. A Folk Encyclopaedia of Universal Knowledge] I–VII. 1925–1933, ed. Emanuel Rádl and Zdeněk V. Tobolka. Praha: Československý kompas.
- [19] Měřínský, Zdeněk. 2008. „Lidová kultura: Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia]“. 2007. *Česky lid* 95 (3): 325–329.
- [20] *Národopisná výstava československá v Praze 1895* [Czechoslovak Ethnographic Exhibition in Prague in 1895]. [1897]. Praha: Jan Otto.
- [21] *Ottův slovník naučný. Ilustrovaná encyklopedie obecných vědomostí* [Otto's Encyclopaedia. An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Universal Knowledge] I–XXVIII. 1888–1909. Praha: J. Otto.
- [22] Paríková, Magdaléna (ed.) 2011. „Katedra etnologie a kulturní antropologie. Dějiny oboru a katedry [The Department of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology. A History of the Discipline and Department]“. In *Ethnologia slovacica et slavica* 34.
- [23] *Slovník naučný* [The Encyclopaedic Dictionary] I–XI. 1860–1874, ed. František Ladislav Rieger. Praha: Kober a Markgraf.
- [24] Rychlík, Jan. 2018. *1918. Rozpad Rakouska-Uherska a vznik Československa* [The Disintegration of Austro-Hungary and the Formation of Czechoslovakia]. Praha: Vyšehrad.
- [25] Skalníková, Olga and Karel Fojtík. 1971. *K teorii etnografie současnosti* [Towards a Theory of the Ethnography of the Present]. Praha: Academia.
- [26] Smrčka, Vít. 2011. *Dějiny psané národopisem* [History Written by Ethnography]. Praha: Česká národopisná společnost.
- [27] Stránská, Drahomíra. 1936. *Příručka lidopisného pracovníka* [Handbook of an Ethnographer]. Praha: Národopisná společnost československá.
- [28] Válka, Miroslav et al. 2016. *Od národopisu k evropské etnologii. 70 let Ústavu evropské etnologie Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy university* [From Ethnography to European Ethnology. 70 Years of the Institute of European Ethnology at the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University]. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- [29] Veselská, Jiřina. 2008. „Lidová kultura. Národopisná encyklopedie Čech, Moravy a Slezska [Folk Culture. The Ethnographic Encyclopaedia of Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia]“. *Národopisný věstník* 25/67 (2): 100–104.
- [30] Woitsch, Jiří. 2017. „Evropská etnologie v Etnologickém ústavu Akademie věd České republiky, v. v. i. [European Ethnology at the Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences]“ *Studia Ethnologica Pragensia* 28 (1): 168–171.