



THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF CZECH ETHNOLOGY

Josef Wolf

The hundred years which have elapsed since the foundation of the ethnographic journal "Český lid" („The Czech People") and sixty years which have passed since the foundation of the ethnologic seminar at the Charles University in Prague became the impulse for a reflection on the historical evolution of a branch of science which was not, it is true, coming into existence in our country until less than a century ago but whose significance was in the course of the 20th century quickly growing until it in the end became an integral part of historical and linguistic education and at present of general and national education, too.

The acquaintance with the ways of life and with the cultures of different peoples of the world is today not only a part of the every-day allotment of information from the world but also a sort of an imperative of mankind which has entered the period of peak decision-making about the future picture of the world and further existence of human society on the Earth.

The term ethnology was used in Tylor's founding times for the designation of almost all anthropological studies, including; the physical anthropology and prehistory. The British anthropologists (Malinowski and others) have, however, soon concentrated their studies non-Europe and nature peoples and societies and their cultures. It was only after the First World War, when new historical circumstances of the

cultural and social development of numerous non-European nations came to light, that the ethnologists broadened their studies to all the regions of the world and laid the foundations of new comparative studies of cultures and societies - of modern ethnology.

In this sense the contemporary ethnology is a science which studies and classifies the nations in terms of their racial, cultural and social character and development and tries to explain their ethnogenesis and historical evolution. It is therefore a historical science - not, however, an auxiliary or secondary but a basic one, and that above all in relation to the regional and general ethnography and to the folklore studies.

The ethnology, which is in Anglo-Saxon countries also called cultural and social anthropology - in our country it was most frequently called general an "exotic" ethnography (which, however, does not fully exhaust its subject) - has in our country also its remarkable history which is connected with a number of prominent scholars orientalists, anthropologists and ethnographers etc. At its foundations at the close of the 19th century were e. g. Prof. Lubor Niederle and his school, and furthermore Karel Chotek, Jindřich Matiegka, Otakar Pertold and others.

At the Prague university ethnology as a study specialization and a branch of science was introduced only at the turn of the century, it is true, but the scientific interest in the study of foreign peoples and cultures as well as works from this field were coming into being on university soil already from the middle of the 19th century.

As the first pioneer work in this field of knowledge can be regarded the book of Jan Slavomír Tomíček „The Era of the First Humankind“ which was published in Prague in 1846, as well as his „Pictures of the World, or the Description of Various Peoples, their Way of Life, Customs, Manners etc.“ (Prague 1847).

One of the leading representatives of the Czech revivalist science, the scientist, physician, poet and philosopher Jan Evangelista Purkyně (1787-1869), had a significant founding share in the inclusion of ethnology into the system of sciences in our country. He worked out and in 1862 published a complete proposal of a Czech academy of sciences which already presupposed and gave reasons for the creation of an anthropological and ethnographic institute, a proposal which one century later became an ideal model and point of departure during the organization and foundation of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in 1952.

Unlike most natural and social sciences, the Czech ethnology had not in the second half of the 19th century any outstanding representative at

the university. In the Bohemian Museum such a representative was indisputably Vojta Náprstek (1826-1894), the Czech awakener, Mecenás and creator of first collections of ethnographic articles on whose basis he began in 1862 to build the Czech Ethnologic and industrial Museum around which grouped almost all our travellers and scholars from the field of ethnography and a number of other natural and social sciences.

At the university the first representative of ethnology was Lubor Niederle (1865-1944), who was appointed in 1898 extraordinary professor of archeology and ethnology. This happened at the suggestion of Prof. Jaroslav Goll and ethnology got in this way for the first time representation at the Prague university.

Niederle's and Masaryk's founding attempts were realized above all in the Journal „Atheneum“, and besides they made themselves clearly felt at the Ethnographic Exhibition in Prague in 1895 and later also in independent scientific and literary work of both scholars.

The first outline of the history of ethnology in Czech gave Prof. Emanuel Kovář in 1891 in „Atheneum“; then followed well-informed translations of the book of E.B. Tylor „Introduction into the Study of Man and Civilization (Anthropology)“ in 1899 and the first Czech translation of the work of F. Engels „The Origin of the Family, the Private Property and the State“ (1906) to which wrote preface Bohumír Šmeral, and also the abridged translation of Ch. Darwin's work On the Origin of Man by the Czech physician Václav Staněk etc.

In this period were also published a number of original works, one of the most voluminous of which was the three-volume encyclopaedic work of Prof. Jaroslav Vlach completed in 1927 which has altogether 1 500 pages - „The Ethnography of All Continents“, „The Woman in the Customs and Manners of the Peoples“ and „The Child in the Customs and Manners of the Peoples“.

At the Charles University in Prague was established in 1931 the chair of general ethnography and this main representative became Prof. Karel Chotek (1881 - 1967), a Czech antropologist and ethnographer who had been working at the Prague university already from 1912 when he had been appointed docent (senior lecturer) of general ethnography. In that period he was still devoting himself to the study of the physical constitution of the Czech and Slovak people and was also taking part in the delimitation of ethnic borders in the region of East Slovakia. Chotek had the intention of creating the ethnologic seminar already in 1921 but in the same year he got an attractive proposal from Bratislava which he accepted and

became at the same time the professor of general ethnography and of Slavonic ethnography there: during ten years of his work he built the foundations of this branch of science pathians, the study "The Ethnic Differences in the Anthropology of the Child" /1922/etc.).

In the development of ethnology in the interwar period had its part not only the growing interest of the broad public in the life, literature and art of other nations but in particular the conspicuous successes of the Czechoslovak orientalist school whose representatives were coming into prominence on the worldwide scale by their scholarly discoveries, works and pedagogic activities: Bedřich Hrozný, František Lexa, František Rypka, Vincenc Lesný, Jaroslav Průšek and others peoples and cultures of the world in the first postwar years collided with a very strong nationalist wave which accentuated the ethnographic and folklore interests and tendencies of the traditional domestic ethnography to which was given preference (an analogous situation repeated itself also after the Second World War) especially at the university.

The ethnology was therefore asserting itself more markedly elsewhere: e.g. in Otto's Encyclopaedia (Ottův slovník naučný) and in, "Československá vlastivěda" (a series of representative books dealing with national history and geography etc.) where in these activities took part almost all the representatives of the Czech and Slovak anthropology and ethnography. Otto's Encyclopaedia acted at the same time for a long time as a substitute for the textbook and the basic handbooks of ethnology, and that both by its extent and by the conception of the respective entries to which was devoted greater space and attached greater significance than to other entries from related fields.

In the course of the first half of the 20th century were also published in Czech translation some works of world scholars, such as "Man as his Creator" of Gordon Child (1936), "The History of Man" of George Elliot Smith (1938) etc.

It was only in 1935 that Prof. Karel Chotek succeeded in establishing at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University in Prague the ethnologic seminar in which he directed his main attention at the general questions of ethnology and also at the ethnography of southern Slavs. On the basis of his studies in Holland, Germany, France and the USA where he became a pupil of the outstanding anthropologist Aleš Hrdlička who was a Czech by origin he got an erudition in the field of ethnology by which he overstepped the antiquated conception of ethnography and created a modern conception of ethnologic and ethnographic research.

It was in the ethnologic seminar, in which also the philosopher Josef Král, Prof. Otakar Pertold and others were collaborating with him, that he demonstrated his broad international outlook. Chotek engaged also in extensive research activities and realized several expeditions and field trips to the Balkan and the Caucasus. From his original ethnologic and anthropologic works are more important e.g. "The Czechs in the Caucasus" "Abkhasia and the Abkhasians" and a number of other studies dealing with the way of life and the character of Slav and other nations.

Although the "centre of gravity" of his work consisted more in the Czech and Slovak ethnography, he devoted himself also to the questions of general and non-European ethnography. As an anthropologist and ethnologist, an excellent organizer and educator he made an impact on the whole pre-war generation of our scholars (also in his capacity of the chairman of the Czechoslovak Anthropological and ethnographic Society during the 1930s and shortly also after the Second World War). He created above all another centre of professional activities in the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Society and in the professional periodicals "The Czechoslovak Ethnographic Bulletin" and "The Czech People". By his work "On the Character and Significance of the Culture of the Czechoslovak People" (Československá vlastivěda, Vol. 2, 1933) he also laid the foundations for later ethnographic research, for his conception of ethnography included not only the Czech and Slovak ethnography but also the general and non-European ethnography as an inseparable, integral part of this specialization at the Charles University in Prague.

Like Karel Chotek, also Otakar Pertold (1884 -1965) worked in the field of ethnology for about forty years but his main place of work was the seminar for comparative religious sciences at the Charles University in Prague. Otakar Pertold as an expert in Indian and Ceylonese indigenous societies and cultures occupied himself at the Faculty of Philosophy with the problems of the origin and the development of oriental religious systems and thought and their cultural and social influence. When he in the years 1920-23 became in addition the consul of the Czechoslovak Republic in Bombay he devoted himself also to the solution of the problems of the origin of the non-Indo-European population of India etc. His works, published also abroad, ensured him one of the most prominent places in our ethnology, too. Pertold worked after 1945 also as the head of the department of ethnography at the Charles University. He published in particular contributions to the study of the Ceylonese

and Indian folk religions and also the first Hindustani vocabulary etc. Pertold, too, was a member of several international organizations and represented in our country the type of the many-sided scholar - he was an orientalist, historian, ethnologist and traveller at the same time. He also wrote several dozens of popularizing works: "The Pearl of the Indian Ocean" (1936), "Remembrances from Ceylon", "From the Forgotten Corners of India" etc.

Beside him worked at the Charles University in the field of ethnology docent (senior lecturer) Josef Voráček (1910), a sociologist and ethnologist who devoted himself in particular to the questions of the origin and development of the family, ("The Primitive Family", 1941) and theoretical questions of social organization ("The Origins of Property and Law in the Light of Ethnology and Sociology", 1936; "An Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilization", 1940) and others. Another scholar in ethnology here was docent (senior lecturer) Vladimír Kadlec (1905-1969), originally a lawyer and sociologist, who, however, specialized in the ethnologic problems of the languages and cultures of Polynesia and devoted himself also to some general questions of ethnology ("The Sociology of Culture, Cultural Anthropology, Ethnography and Ethnology", 1946, etc.).

Prof. Karel Chotek tried even after 1945 to renew the work of the ethnologic seminar but in this succeeded only his successors and continuators in the freer atmosphere of the 1960s. From his ethnologic school came on the one hand a number of erudite ethnographers who focused on Slavonic ethnography, but also a number of scholars who asserted themselves in Czechoslovak oriental studies, American studies etc.

In general ethnography there continued at the department ethnography of Charles University in the years 1954 -60 Prof. Otakar Nahodil (1923-1996), as a pupil of the Soviet ethnographic school in Moscow and Leningrad, devoted himself above all to the solution of generally ethnographic questions (the origin and development of religion, the study of residues, superstitions, maternity cults etc.), later also to ethnologic questions: *Through the Mountains and Oases*, Prague 1962; *Kultur und Humanität*, Freiburg 1970; *Menschliche Kultur und Tradition*, München 1983; *Stimmen der Völker*, Freiburg 1988 etc.

The Czechoslovak ethnology in the period between the two world wars made on the one hand a significant progress in the sense that it constituted itself also at the university as a study specialization and gained here its representatives, Professor Karel Chotek, and besides Otakar Pertold,

Josef Voráček and others, and on the other hand it also proved by its results its advanced international level. It also contributed to the use of ethnographic materials in the solution of crucial ideological, religious and national problems in the Czechoslovak republic. It is also necessary to stress that none of our ethnologists and ethnographers became an active exponent of reactionary policy, and that neither during the First Republic nor in the period of Nazi occupation, but that by their scientific work and civic activities they were on the contrary mature continuators of the humanistic tradition of the struggle against racism, fascism and colonialism. Many of them had even to give their life, some of them for their Jewish origin, as e.g. the traveller, scientist and ethnologist Jiří Baum (1900-1944) who died prematurely in the Nazi concentration camp in Auschwitz, etc.

Almost forgotten remained the extraordinarily important work of Prof. Karel Chotek and of other Czechoslovak ethnologists, anthropologists and ethnographers on the soil of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Society. His personal managerial and organizational work and his work in the field of international co-operation has not yet been fully valued and it is necessary to emphasize above all its results. His activities as the chairman of this society culminated immediately after 1945 when he led the preparations of the first post-war international congress of anthropologic and ethnologic sciences which was to be held in August 1947 in Prague. He succeeded not only in getting prominent foreign and our scholars but also in preparing a work program which outlined the perspectives of international cooperation for the following two decades. In the preparatory committee of the congress were also Prof. Jiří Malý, Vojtěch Suk, Jindřich Valšík, Otakar Pertold, Josef Král, Ladislav Borovanský and others. It was beyond dispute one of the most significant international events to whose success contributed without doubt also the Czech anthropologist and ethnologist Karel Chotek.

The direct continuator and successor of Karel Chotek in the field of ethnology at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University in Prague became in 1960 – 1972 Josef Wolf (1927) who as an anthropologist and ethnologist satisfied also the requirements for the application of the integral conception of the comparative study of peoples and cultures within the framework of the newly built department of ethnography and folklore studies (from the year 1960/61).

He tried to develop here at the same time paedagogic and research activities in the field of cultural and social anthropology and published a number of topical studies and study texts from anthropology

and ethnology ("An Introduction to the Study of Man and Culture", Volume I-IV, 1965-69, "Cultural and Social Anthropology", Svoboda, Prague 1971 etc.), among other things he also founded a number of miscellanies whose editor he was: "Acta Ethnologica" (Charles University, Prague 1971) and "Studia Anthropologica" (Charles University, Prague 1972) etc. which are devoted to an appraisal of the life and work of Czech anthropologists and ethnologists, such as Prof. Otakar Pertold, Prof. Vojtěch Suk, Prof. Vojtěch Fetter, Prof. Jaroslav Suchý etc. The volume devoted to the work of Prof. Karel Chotek was prepared in the manuscript so that it might be published on the occasion of his jubilee but is published only now (1991).

The ethnology as a fully modern branch of science fully asserted itself at the Faculty of Philosophy of Charles University especially in the years 1960-1972 when it became an inseparable part of the education of the new generation of Czechoslovak orientologists, prehistorians, ethnographers etc., and when it also was an important specialization in the education of foreign students at the international University of 17th November in Prague. The chapters from anthropology, ethnology, cultural history and ethnography of the individual peoples and regions of the world formed a rounded-off system e. g. within the framework of African studies, American studies and other study specializations and lectures from ethnology were gradually introduced also at the universities in Brno (Jan Jelínek and others) and in Bratislava (Milan Pospíšil and others).

The independent centre of research in ethnology which already had a long historical tradition in the Náprstek Museum attached to the National Museum in Prague was further broadened and besides the processing of museum collections and the preparation of museum exhibitions and cycles of lectures there also came into existence the individual sections for the study of the non-European cultures of Africa, Asia and both Americas here. Of the development of ethnologic studies deserved here well above all Václav Šolc (1919-1995) an ethnologist and archeologist who studied in Prague and in Rome and from 1945 has been working in the Náprstek Museum in the section of American studies. He travelled through South America, China, Korea Vietnam and Mongolia where he helped to found ethnologic collections and museums. In the Náprstek Museum he contributed, along with E. Herold, V. Hrdličková, M. Stuchlík, E. Strouhal, J. Kandert, Vl. Novotný and others, to the creation of a not only museum but also research centre in ethnology. Together with his collaborators he began the publication of regular miscel-

lanies of the Náprstek Museum - Annals of the Náprstek Museum (since 1962).

At the present time, too the centre of these research and educational activities in the field of ethnology is the Náprstek Museum of the National Museum in Prague. As the bearer of the best traditions and of the heritage of Czech travellers - ethnographers, anthropologists, scientists and other scholars it will certainly fulfill this function in the future, too. At the present time it also develops activities by which it follows up with the results of the original ethnologic seminar at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University where the specialization "Ethnology" has been after several reprofiliations reduced and wholly subordinated to the utilitarian needs of the instruction of ethnography and folklore studies.

Another important centre of pedagogic, scientific and organizational work in the field of ethnology has been from the beginning of the 1960s up to the middle of the 1970s the collaboration with the workplaces of the international University of 17th November in Prague, especially with the departments of non-European cultures, cultural policy and sociology. At this university, founded in 1961, were studying predominantly students from African, Asian and Latin American countries so that our ethnologists could directly participate in the education of new generations of scientific and field and museum workers not only in our country but at the same time also in developing countries, represented at the University of 17th November by students from almost the whole world.

In the second half of the 20th century the "point of gravity" of the educational and research work as well as of the work in the field of ethnology quite unequivocally, but only for two decades, moved over to three most important workplaces: to the Náprstek Museum of non-European Cultures, to the Department of ethnography and folklore studies at the Faculty of Philosophy of Charles University and also to the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences where was established in 1956 the section for the study of general ethnography and where in 1960 its director, Prof. Jiří Horák, founded the commission for general and medial ethnography which devoted itself to the preparation of the 7th international congress of antropological and ethnological sciences in Moscow in 1964. It can be said that here, too, the expert studies and research of our ethnographers-specialists soon attained an international level.

Simultaneously with these efforts was at the end of the 1960s being prepared also a reform programme of the Czech and Slovak ethnography, and in particular the evaluation of the development of this specialization at the Charles University in the period between the two world wars and in the years 1945-68. The principal points of support in the analysis of the Czech ethnography during these periods were:

1. summarizing works on Czechoslovak ethnography (Otto's Encyclopaedia and "Československá vlastivěda", Vol.2: Man, Prague 1933 etc.),

2. the resolution and the perspective plan of work of Czechoslovak ethnographers and folklorists, proclaimed at the first congress of Czechoslovak ethnographers in 1949,

3. the published articles and evaluations of the activities and work of Czechoslovak ethnographers during the 15 years of the independent existence (published in the Journal "Etnografie", No.1, 1960), as well as later studies, including partial reports on the results of the work of Czechoslovak ethnographers, and possibly other jubilee articles and studies dealing with the history of Czech and Slovak ethnography and folklor studies.

Simultaneously with the performance of the analysis of hitherto activities were also made preparations for the formulation of plans and new tasks within the framework of the given branch of sciences, and that both at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University in Prague and at other workplaces in Czechoslovakia.

In the interest of the unification of the topics, of the instruction and of the principles of the team work were adopted at the department of ethnography and folklore studies at the Faculty of Philosophy of Charles University in October 1971 the following principles:

1. one's own scientific and research work in connection with the instruction, directed also at the solution of the tasks and needs concerning the whole society,

2. one's own scientific and research work in connection with scientific documentation within the framework of the given branch of science. This work was concentrated into the team work "Traditional and contemporary village" (contributions to the ethnographic problems in agriculture).

3. later was approved in the state plan the synthetic work on Czech folk culture, but the co-ordinator of this task has not been appointed. The partial task dealing with the state of Czech and German folk literature in our territory was put off and studies on the relationship

between the folk literature and old Czech exempla (Prof. K. Dvořák) were included instead.¹

The general ethnography and its contemporary questions, as well as the topical questions of cultural and social anthropology become in the 2nd half of the 20th century urgent questions also for us and it will be necessary to solve them.

Still a few notes on some basic theoretical and methodological questions: in the first place on the disputes over the conception and the extent of research in ethnology, furthermore on the questions concerning the mutual relationship and collaboration between ethnology and its nearest disciplines and finally on the present situation and perspectives in the Czech and Slovak ethnology.

The topic is not new; for a new conception and a more precise conception of the field of ethnology, or at least for a narrower collaboration of ethnography above all with history, prehistory, anthropology, sociology and linguistics, have been striving most ethnographic schools and currents already since the end of the last century. In Czechoslovakia were for the most part prevailing historicizing tendencies which aimed rather at the original or - better said - classic conception of ethnography. In the last period of development, since the beginning of the 1960s, these efforts led mainly to the internal differentiation of the field - to the development of folklore studies on the one hand and to the efforts at a specific and at the same time more precise delimitation of the subject and of the methods of work in ethnography itself. On the other hand, however, were not for the time being solved satisfactorily the contemporary interdisciplinary questions or the urgent questions of perspective development especially of general ethnography in our country.

After the reintroduction of sociology in Czechoslovakia and especially from the beginning of the 1960s there also appear more pronounced integrating efforts along with the interest for broader cultural and especially social problems which in my opinion must necessarily influence the hitherto conception and orientation of Czech and Slovak ethnography. This has in fact already happened in the discussion which, was taking place at the universities and on the pages of specialized Journals. It was opened in 1963 in the "Brno Anthropos" (J. Wolf) and a year later in "Český lid" (V. Tůmová, L. Holý and M. Stuchlík). We dealt especially

¹ Except from the study of J. Wolf "On the profile analysis of the specialization "ethnography" at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University (manuscript 1971).

with the relationship of ethnography to sociology and anthropology and with the present state of the conception of our specialization. A similar character had the contributions of Karel Fojtík, Vladimír Podborský, Václav Frolec and Dušan Holý in "Národopisné aktuality". To the questions of the mutual relationships between ethnography, anthropology and sociology has been in the last time paid considerable attention also abroad, e.g. in the Journals *Current Anthropology*, *L'Homme*, *Man*, *Ethnologia Europaea* etc. There predominate in them in a striking way the efforts at the application of contemporary structural and functional comparative methods and the generalization of work results. What is the reason for it?

One of the general reasons can be seen in the present-day complex conception of man and culture, of the social and cultural development of mankind, and in the attempts at a synthetic conception of their study which are adequate to this. These efforts are not artificial but were brought about by the basic methodological problems, and, last but not least, the integrating efforts and the need for the solution of the interdisciplinary topics make also felt themselves here. These are therefore not questions which would concern only the conception of one branch of science but questions which are already anchored e.g. in the conception of general history, sociology and psychology.

Especially the International congress of anthropological and ethnographic sciences in Moscow in 1964 showed that at present there exist at least two different conceptions of ethnography and anthropology. On the one hand there was applied the original positivist conception of ethnography as a historical and mostly descriptive science *sui generis* - and similarly also of anthropology as an exclusively natural science about man, and one of three basic biological disciplines. Such a conception of both disciplines leads e.g. in ethnography to an independent and separate study of culture - both material and spiritual - without regard to the physical and in general to the anthropological character and development of its bearers - the people. In the same way, to be sure, is then in anthropology reduced the study and the conception of man only to his conception as a biological factor in his natural environment and conditions, and that without regard to his cultural and social development, function and the structurality of human groups. We encounter the beginnings of this conception already at the cradle of modern anthropology in the 19th century when it definitively separated from natural and medical sciences as an independent biological discipline dealing now exclusively with the study of man as an individual and as a species and that with his physical

characteristics, his racial and genetic peculiarities, his development and position in nature and in the world.

Ethnography, too, formed in this period as an independent science of a markedly national character, dealing with the historical study of the material and spiritual culture of the people. On its classic conception from the end of the last century were in essence built also the theoretical and methodological foundations of the official Marxist conception of ethnography. In the last time, however, there increasingly make themselves felt in ethnography and in other historical sciences tendencies and methods which study and understand man not only as the people, masses or working animal but as a speaking, cultured and social being. We encounter here, as a matter of fact, an anthropological and philosophical conception of man which has its original foundations in Aristotle's definition of man as *zoon politicon* a social creature and whose evolution has been characterized by today's experts as the transition from mere morphology and physiology of man to the history of mankind. At present it is a still much more exacting and more complex study of man in which makes itself felt also the ancient philosophical and methodological requirement which was expressed so truthfully by Goethe as "Einheit von Somma und Psyché", a conception which we designate today by the terms "integral" or "synthetic". It is interesting that along with this conception of man as a member of human society (*Der Mensch als kulturschaffendes Wesen*; Behrendt) anthropology also becomes an increasingly social science, and becomes therefore also much nearer to ethnography. This is so only from the second half of the 19th century when thanks to Darwin, Tylor, Lubbock, McLennan, Morgan and later Frazer, Boas, Malinowski, Radcliff-Brown, Lévi-Strauss and other scholars were laid the foundations of two important branches of science - cultural and social anthropology. They now both represent, together with physical and applied anthropology, as a rule a single integrated discipline which we can call anthropology in the broader sense of the word. This is so especially in the United States of America and in the Great Britain where anthropology has already established itself as the science about man, his biological, cultural and social development, as the science dealing above all with human nature, the cultural and social environment of man, the structure and function of human groups, e. g. not only with natural, but also and above all with social laws and cultural changes and also with other aspects of the life of human society.

Some anthropological schools in the USA, e. g. the Californian Mandelbaum's school, include in anthropology besides ethnography and ethnology also other branches of science such as prehistory, linguistics and folklore studies and so create from anthropology a larger group of sciences about man which is then classified separately beside the groups of natural and social sciences.

No less important question is in my opinion the mutual relationship and interpretation of ethnography and ethnology. In Western Europe and formerly also in the United States of America predominated the term "ethnology" which originally represented here a separate branch of science dealing mostly only with the comparative study of natural peoples. In the past period it has been in our country and in cold socialist countries for the most part included in ethnography and conceived as its part; elsewhere it was mostly conceived as part of cultural, or also social anthropology. The conception of ethnology (in German *Völkerkunde*) in the traditional sense of the word as the general comparative study of cultures is preserved mainly in the Great Britain.

On the other hand the term ethnography (in German *Volkskunde*) has been in the last decades increasingly used for the designation of the descriptive study above all of folk, popular cultures and ethnography is conceived as a predominantly regional historical discipline.

In the Czechoslovak ethnography, too, there now markedly make themselves felt efforts at a broader theoretical and methodological conception of this branch of science but they remain in mere outline and assert themselves for the most part only sporadically. By the term "ethnography" is generally meant the study of advanced national cultures and societies, whereas ethnology includes besides the study of primitive societies and cultures (so-called non-European or exotic ethnography) also the comparative study of cultures in the process of evolution of human society (general ethnography).

At present these questions are in our country again more lively discussed - but this time it is mainly a terminological problem: the efforts at the introduction of the term "ethnology" instead of "ethnography" with regard to its etymological meaning and with regard to the internationally valid terminology. These efforts are in my opinion, it is true, fully justified, and even necessary, but I regard them in spite of it as purely formal especially because of the fact that they leave quite intact the hitherto existing conception of ethnography. So was for instance the department of ethnography and folklore studies renamed the department of ethnology, and that from March 1, 1991.

This different conception and methodological orientation of the study of man and culture represents, to be sure, one of serious obstacles also in the solution of basic problems of the sciences about man on the world scale. In Western Europe and in the USA there is an increasing tendency to regard ethnography or ethnology as a part of cultural anthropology, or of anthropology in general. The study of man and culture is then conceived and realized on a much broader theoretical and practical basis. In this conception culture means not only art and literature but all aspects of the cultural and civilization progress of mankind. The basic questions then concern the classification of the nature of man and of the behaviour of human groups and the determination of the relationships and functions of the individual members of these groups and societies, how and when they change or last, whether there exists a parallel development of man and culture or whether the historical and cultural development depends of the biological evolution of man as the species *Homo sapiens* etc. The hitherto ethnography and anthropology had not any definitive answers to most of these questions and we still encounter at least four wholly different explanations of the development of man and culture, culture and society. In essence it is a question of creating such a natural model of culture and man which would correspond with the contemporary scientific knowledge in natural and social sciences and would be at the same time a creative philosophical contribution, for during the solution of such complex and fundamental questions it is not possible to dispense with philosophy in ethnography, either. This requires, to be sure, first the clarification of the above-mentioned conceptual and terminological questions which are, especially in our country, by far not solved.

In Czech ethnology, ethnography and anthropology were pursued in the narrower sense of the word as independent disciplines. In the relation to history or sociology, however, they rather remained auxiliary sciences from which the historian or sociologist can draw the data on the influence of the character of the natural, cultural and social environment on man, to use the results of the inquiry among different social strata of the population etc. In the same way he just draw the comparative material of a cultural, linguistic, ethnic or other character from ethnography, linguistics and other disciplines. In such cases it would therefore be appropriate to create permanent groups of experts who would within the framework of their own profession permanently concentrate on a certain broader sociological, anthropological or historical subject area. The tasks

are more or less urgent. This is attested among other things also by the fact that until now has not been fulfilled even the basic plan of ethnic research which was formulated by Prof. Jiří Malý several years ago and which included e.g. the research on the old ethnic groups in our country (the Chods, the /Moravian/ Valachians etc.), the tracing of original influences of non-European groups and cultures (especially Asian) in our country, the detailed research on the Czech and Slovak gypsies - the Roma, and furthermore the study of the population of the border regions with its problems of emigrants, reemigrants and national minorities. One of the most important tasks remains, however, the endeavour (lasting many years) to build a basic research institute which would devote itself to the study of the physical and psychic nature of our population and other anthropological questions. We have for the time being such an anthropological institute neither in the National Museum nor in the Czech Academy of Sciences where are represented the nature and the material and spiritual culture of the Czech and Slovak people, it is true, but an institution for the study of its bearer proper, man, is lacking here. It seems that we have made progress in the study of general questions, it is true, but in the practical knowledges of the national nature of the Czech and Slovak people we are still lagging behind very much.

In this situation had its role the normalization régime under the leadership of docent (later professor) Antonín Robek which was hindering the development of Czech ethnology, ethnography and folklore (studies for nearly twenty years - 1972 - 1989). But only this, for it reduced the Czechoslovak ethnography and folklor studies to a politically subordinated and scientifically insignificant propaganda. It was not only a return to predominantly descriptive, collecting and chronicler as activities and a mere completion of materials which were still lacking in the sets of studies from the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, but it was also an inadmissible depreciation of the research work of our prominent ethnographers - non-Communists. Antonín Robek who was at the head of the department, of the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, of the Czechoslovak Ethnographic Society, of the journal "Český lid" etc., subordinated all the activities in the discipline to the ideology of the party and its utilitarian needs. And so devised "the study of the ethnography of the working class", "the study of the socialist present", "the study of class and ethnic processes" etc., but the basic theoretical and methodological questions of the discipline were not worked out. Even the historical survey of the Czech and Slovak

ethnology or the required interdisciplinary studies in our country and abroad were not elaborated.

The ignorance of the world problems of ethnology and the ignoring of the results of modern Czech and Slovak ethnography caused here greater damage than the normalization regime in other disciplines. Antonín Robek an exemplary totalitarian representative of the discipline for which he was for whole twenty years theoretically and practically personally responsible at all levels of management (in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia., in the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, at the Charles University etc.) bears with his collaborators responsibility not only for the liquidation of the traditional and advanced level of the discipline but also for the damage which he, as the leading educator, caused in the whole generation of young Czechoslovak ethnographers and folklorists, and not only of them. It is namely not possible to pass over his liquidatory and inquisitorial activities which concerned not only work specialization, orientation, topics and literature but also the activities of the individual students, teachers and workers in the discipline who did not share not only the official but above all his personal ideas and opinions about anything. This "Czech Richelieu" as he until recently called himself was in fact a product of the Czech workers and "peasants" Bolshevism.

None of his works has a more significant theoretical value, yet each of them leaves in the Czechoslovak ethnography a deep scar with a taste of wormwood. A classic example was his opposition to the ethnology, to the anthropology and also to the study of the life and work of our compatriots abroad: as late as at the beginning of 1990 he held the view that to this work can devote itself only this State Security Police, not ethnology, and with this corresponds also his present professional work to which he devotes himself after he has been devastated of all the scientific functions and positions in the discipline.

While in the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore Studies of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences there took place after November 17, 1989 significant work and personal changes, at the department of ethnography and folklor studies at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University the situation in essence did not change. Instead of docent (senior lecturer) Bohuslav Šalanda, who as a long time and carefully prepared party cadre became the head of department after Antonín Robek (1988-89), the leadership of the department was from January 1990 entrusted to another member of many years standing, docent (senior lecturer) František Vrhel, who was not, it is true, saddled with the

party practices of Antonín Robek but who with his scientific erudition reaches the discipline only marginally (Hispanic and Iberoamerican studies, etnolinguistics). His efforts at the rehabilitation of the discipline at the Charles university are until now taking place without any personal changes whatever and also without a perceptible scientific shift. Vrhel's attempt at the change of the name of the department and of the disciplines - to ethnology (from the beginning of the summer term of 1991) - has also become only an inexpressive step towards the rectification of human affairs. The only visible change consists in the new lectures of external collaborators who have in this way replaced the sterile instruction of some hitherto experts. The basic shortcoming, however, remains to be the inexpressive and non-perspective conception in the work of the department of ethnology at the Faculty of Philosophy at Charles University. Its activities remain in essence anchored in the study of the traditional Czech and Slovak ethnography and folklore studies and the study of ethnology is limited only to introductory and survey lectures and seminars. The cultural and social anthropology did not yet become a part of the regular instruction either, as it was in the 1960s, and the attempts at their introduction are strictly refused. In the same way failed the attempts at the restoration of the comparative study of religion from the pre-war years and the years 1945-48. Up to now it was possible to put through only selective and extraordinary lectures of guest professors - anthropologists and ethnologists from abroad.

The branch of science ethnology and its study are therefore not, even at the beginning of the academic year 1998/99, at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Charles University by far so clear and perspective as we could suppose. They are even more covered in mist than before. We must seek the clue to the solution in those personalities which are working and were working earlier in this field of science, as well as in internal and interdisciplinary connections and finally also in the contemporary and supposed social needs not only of this discipline but also of other more important disciplines of social sciences at the Charles University in Prague.