University of Alberta

Ethnological Research and Canonization of Autochthonous Folk Textiles in Croatia, 1896 to 1940: A Polysystem Study

by

Vjera Bonifačić

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

Clothing and Textiles

Department of Human Ecology

Edmonton, Alberta

Fall 1996

ISBN 0-612-18021-2

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Vjera Bonifačić

Title of Thesis: Ethnological Research and Canonization of Autochthonous Folk Textiles in Croatia, 1896 to 1940: A Polysystem Study

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 1996

8653-108A St.
Edmonton, Alberta
Canada T6E 4M7

July 2nd, 1996

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Ethnological Research and Canonization of Autochthonous Folk Textiles in Croatia, 1896 to 1940: A Polysystem Study* submitted by Vjera Bonifačić in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Clothing and Textiles.

Prof. J. Oakes, Co-supervisor

Prof. B. Medwidsky, Co-supervisor

Prof. M. V. Dimić

Prof. E. M. Crown

Prof. N. Kerr

Dr. S. Baizerman, External Examiner

ABSTRACT

One of the central issues in contemporary textile studies is the relationship between "traditional" and "modern" textiles. This study explores this relationship through the example of Croatian folk textiles, utilizing for heuristic purposes the Polysystem Theory. The study was designed to describe and explain: 1) how changes in ethnological research between 1896 and 1940 contributed to the social construction of a hierarchy between traditional (autochthonous) and modern (applied and popular) folk textiles; and 2) the interrelationship between these different types of folk textiles and their changing functions in Croatian society.

The data were collected from a variety of sources. First, publications in ethnological journals provided data for documenting changes in Croatian ethnological textile research. Second, publications of museums and peasant cultural organizations were used to document political and economic functions of autochthonous and applied folk textiles in Croatia in the first half of this century.

The results show that folk textiles first became a symbol of emerging national identity in Croatia in the early 19th century. Between the 1890s and 1940s, modified folk textiles were made in home industries and marketed internationally as Croatian national art. Concurrently, the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts initiated systematic research of folk culture. The initially broad design of Croatian ethnology gradually narrowed during the 1930's when canonization of the diffusionist research model began to take place. This further led to the canonization of selected folk textiles, suitable for that type of study, as the autochthonous Croatian folk textile art. This contributed to a shift

in Croatian culture in general towards the preservation of autochthonous folk textiles in ethnographic museums and at staged folk festivals.

This research suggests that the Polysystem Theory opens up new areas of investigation in historical research of folk textiles. It also provides increased analytical precision and clarity and, therefore, better potential for fruitful comparative analysis with other regions.

Acknowledgments

Throughout the course of my doctoral studies I have received guidance and support from the doctoral committee members from my two cooperating departments. Special thanks are due to my co-supervisor, Prof. Jill Oakes, formerly from the Department of Human Ecology at the University of Alberta, who agreed to continue in a supervisory role after transferring to the University of Manitoba. I am grateful for her encouragement to pursue my interests in an interdisciplinary approach to the study of textiles. Even at such a long distance, she offered unfailing support and guidance in completing this dissertation. Prof. Elizabeth M. Crown, the Head of the Department of Human Ecology, has offered continuous support and interest in my work, as well as help and advice in shaping my graduate program throughout the course of my studies.

Equal thanks are due to my committee members from the cooperating Department of Modern Languages and Comparative Studies. My co-supervisor, Prof. Bohdan Medwidsky, has guided me in situating my work within the field of Slavic and East European folklore. Last but not least, my thanks are due to Prof. Milan V. Dimić. His concept of the "space and boundaries of literature" inspired me to think about the "space and boundaries of cloth", and consequently to learn about the Polysystem Theory and apply it as a theoretical model in this dissertation. His continued interest and belief in my work is deeply appreciated.

I am also grateful to Prof. Anne Lambert and Prof. Sandra Niessen for their guidance and support during the early stages of my graduate studies, and for sharing their insights about museological and anthropological studies of textiles. Prof. Patricia Prestwich offered valuable guidance in the area of women's history.

I wish to thank everyone who attended my lectures at the departmental seminars, conferences, and lecture series at the University of Alberta, who in this way afforded me a chance to practice my skills of public speaking, and who also offered interest and input during question periods. These are all the faculty members, students, and staff at the Department of Human Ecology, David Goa and Adriana Davies from the Alberta Museums Association, Prof. Andrij Nahachewsky from the Department of Modern Languages and Comparative Studies, and many others.

My research trips to Croatia provided yet another dimension to my work on this dissertation. Many of my colleagues from Croatia offered invaluable help in collecting relevant literature. I am particularly indebted to Tihana Petrović and Ljubica Katunar from the Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb; Željka Jelavić, Aida Brenko, and Nerina Echkel from the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb; Aleksandra Muraj and Anamarija Starčević from the Institute for Ethnology and Folklore Studies; Jelena Ivoš from the Museum of Arts and Crafts in Zagreb; and museologists Jelka Radauš-Ribarić, Zdenka Lechner, and Zvonimir Toldi who provided me with publications and bibliographies of their own work.

I am also indebted to my daughters Maria and Ema, as well as to Steven Ness, Melissa Ness, and Chris Peet for their enthusiastic and acute help in editing this manuscript.

In support of my doctoral studies and dissertation research I have received the following funding: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Doctoral Scholarship, Walter H. Johns Graduate Fellowship, Province of Alberta Doctoral Fellowship, Province of Alberta Graduate Scholarship, 'Persons Case' Scholarship, as well as research grants from the

Alberta Museums Association, the Department of Human Ecology, and the University of Alberta.

Finally, I am grateful to my mother, a gifted textile artisan herself, for initiating my interest in Croatian popular textile traditions, to my family, among whom I learned that one's foremost duty is to praise life, and to Maria and Ema, my daughters who are companions and fellow students, for so much joy, and for love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The social construction (political, economic, academic) of "autochthonous" folk textiles in Croatia is an unexplored topic in the available literature on Croatian textiles. Autochthonous folk textiles may be defined as selected popular costumes and textiles from the rural regions of Croatia dating from the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. From the 1930s onwards, these selected folk costumes and textiles were canonized as the "authentic" Croatian national textile heritage, and have been both preserved in museums, and publicly displayed in various staged performances and folk festivals.

These autochthonous folk costumes and textiles may be contrasted with: 1) "applied" folk costumes and textiles which were produced in rural home industries in Croatia for international urban consumption in the first half of the 20th century, and which continue to be produced in both spontaneous and organized production for tourist consumption in the second half of this century; and 2) "popular" clothing and domestic textiles that have been produced and/or used in real life by the non-elite rural and urban population in Croatia.

In Croatia, the ethnological research of folk textiles was initiated by the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1896. At first, it concerned itself with the documentation of functions of popular folk costumes and textiles in rural regions, and inquired about changes that were taking place in patterns of production, exchange, and consumption of popular folk textiles at the turn of the century. From the late 1920's onwards, however, the diffusionist research model began to gradually prevail in ethnological research in Croatia.

Diffusionist research concerned itself with determining origins and layers of influences inscribed in older folk costumes and textiles, which ethnologists designated as "authentic" or autochthonous Croatian folk textile heritage. Popular folk costumes and textiles that continued to change during this century were not only subsequently ignored by Croatian ethnologists, but also devalued as "inauthentic".

The question of how and why this shift in the scope of the subject matter as well as in the employed methodologies occurred in Croatian ethnological textile research constitutes the major topic of this dissertation. A larger question became: how did this shift in ethnological research manifest itself in practice, and affect changes and interrelationships between autochthonous, applied, and popular folk textile types and their functions in Croatian culture?

By introducing into textile studies the Polysystem Theory which has thus far been used only in the study of literature, this dissertation describes and explains how the research of folk textiles, as well as the folk textiles themselves, functioned and changed within the broader (poly)system of folk arts in Croatia, with emphasis on the period between 1896 and 1940.

Chapter II situates the central problem addressed in this dissertation within the context of contemporary ethnological and folklore research in Croatia. This chapter also points out the contribution this study makes to Croatian as well as North American textile studies.

Chapter III describes the theoretical framework employed in the dissertation. It first gives an overall description of the theoretical model as defined by the Polysystem Theory, as well as the basic aims and constraints of the theory. This is followed by one example of its applications in textile studies,

namely in explaining the mechanism of change in basic styles and functions of folk textiles in Croatia, with emphasis on the first half of this century.

Chapter IV examines the first period of systematic ethnological research in Croatia between 1896 and 1920, and its broad design for the comparative study of the totality of folk culture of the South Slavs. As well, the research findings of selected publications from that period are analyzed with a focus on costumes and textiles.

Chapter V investigates the way Croatian ethnological research changed between 1920 and 1940 due to the expansion in institutions devoted to the research of rural culture. Particular attention is given to the diversification of ethnological research in terms of research models employed during the 1920s, followed by the gradual canonization of the diffusionist research model as the only "true" model for studying and interpreting folk culture, including folk costumes and textiles.

Chapter VI offers an analysis of the manner in which the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, one of the central institutions in the Croatian folk art (poly)system, approached the collection, research, and exhibition of folk costumes and textiles from the time of its establishment in 1919 onwards. This chapter also examines the role of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb in the broader process of institutional evaluation and hierarchization of autochthonous, applied and popular folk textiles in Croatian culture in general.

Finally, Chapter VII offers general conclusions that can be drawn from the above collection of papers, and offers suggestions for further research.

Limitations of the Study

Certain limitations of this study should be mentioned here. As explained in Chapter III, Polysystem Theory requires the use of many sources of data. An analysis that applies the Polysystem Theory therefore does not aim to be exhaustive, but rather aims to explain various shifts and points of change within the selected (poly)system, in this case the semiotic system of folk arts. Particular shifts selected for description and explanation in this study are the canonization of the diffusionist research model within Croatian ethnological research, the subsequent canonization of selected folk textiles as autochthonous Croatian folk textiles, and the return effects of such canonizations on practice. The reader should note that since this thesis was designed in the form of papers, a certain fragmentation of the major topic, as well as a certain amount of overlap between the papers that is necessary to support the main thesis of each individual paper, could not be avoided.

In Chapters IV and V, only research publications on folk textiles within the discipline of ethnology in Croatia were taken into account, and not those published outside of Croatia or among other disciplines in Croatia. Furthermore, only those ethnological publications which were relevant in explaining the first period of stability (1896-1919) and the subsequent processes of broadening and canonization of research models (1919-1940) were selected for analysis.

In Chapter VI, analysis is limited to selected ethnological research publications, publications of museums with ethnographic collections of textiles in Zagreb, and publications of the Croatian political/cultural organization, Peasant Unity.

The reader should also note that all Croatian texts have been translated into English by the author of the thesis. Names of journals, institutions, states, political parties, and organizations are given in the text in English translation; original Croatian names can be found in the Appendix to the thesis.

CHAPTER II
PROBLEM: DEFINITION AND CONTEXT

Introduction

The central task of this dissertation is to explore the interrelationship between different types of folk textiles ("autochthonous", "applied", "popular") and their changing functions in Croatian society. The more specific aim is to explain the role of Croatian ethnological research in the social construction of hierarchy between these different types of folk textiles, with a focus on the period between 1896 and 1940.

To answer this problem I have adopted for heuristic purposes the Polysystem Theory as the theoretical/methodological framework for this study (Even-Zohar, 1990). Such an approach requires an examination of how the research of folk textiles, as well as different types of folk textiles, functioned and changed within the broader (poly)system of folk arts in Croatia in the early part of this century.

This study contributes to the recent initiatives in ethnological and folklore studies to explore processes of the social construction of folk arts, in this case of folk textile arts, and their return effects on the practice of elite and non-elite groups in a given society, or to use Hobsbawm's well known phrase "the invention of tradition" (Bošković-Stulli, 1971; Hobsbawm, 1983; Hofer, 1984; Lofgren, 1991). This study partakes, therefore, in international and interdisciplinary discussions about the need to reexamine past research approaches which defined the so called "traditional" cultures as *closed* systems perceived to have been destroyed by "modernization". At the same time, this

study contributes to the emerging interdisciplinary research approaches in the social sciences and humanities which define all cultures (Western and non-Western, elite and non-elite) as *open* systems that are dynamic, functional, and that are subject to change over time (Burke, 1978; Bourdieu, 1980/1990a; Clifford, 1988; Even-Zohar, 1990; Wolf, 1982).

From the 1970s onwards, such theoretical/methodological issues have entered discussions and affected the research practice of ethnological and folklore studies in Croatia. In the rest of this introductory chapter a selective review of relevant literature will be given in order to situate this study within the contemporary discourse of Croatian ethnologists and folklorists, as well as comment on its contribution to both Croatian and North American textile studies. Finally, a discussion of basic concepts and related terminology will be given.

Ethnological and Folklore Research in Croatia: An Overview

The discovery of *peoples* or *folk* and their *folk culture* emerged in Croatia during the early 19th century within the Croatian National Revival or Illyrian Movement, amid political struggles of national liberation. Under the influence of the ideas of Herder and German Romanticism which spread among intellectuals across Europe and especially among those of the newly emerging nations, the folk culture of peasant populations, in contrast to the elite culture associated with towns and foreign rulers, became a symbol of the emerging national identity (Bošković-Stulli, 1971; Burke, 1978; Hobsbawm, 1990). The Illyrian Movement introduced elements of rural costumes into Croatian urban fashions (Balog, 1987; Maruševski, 1978; Schneider, 1985), and initiated the

process of collecting and preserving various manifestations of folk culture as "true" Croatian national arts and cultural heritage (Gjetvaj, 1989). Towards the end of the 19th century, when many European universities were establishing new academic disciplines of anthropology and ethnology for studying European folk cultures, as well as the so called "primitive" non-European cultures, the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb also initiated the systematic study of the folk culture of South Slavs.

It was in 1896 that the Academy in Zagreb provided concrete conditions for the development of systematic ethnological research in Croatia, by beginning to regularly publish the first ethnological journal in Croatia, *The Journal for Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs*. At the same time, the first editor of the journal, Antun Radić, defined the initial framework and program of work for the newly established discipline of ethnology in Croatia. This also marked the beginning of the systematic research of folk textiles in Croatia, which has grown and changed in many ways over the past one hundred years.

To begin with, additional institutions or departments within institutions devoted to ethnological and folklore research were established, such as the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb (1919), the Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb (1924), the Institute of Folk Arts (recently changed to the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research) in Zagreb (1949), Center for Ethnology (1963), Center for Ethnological Cartography at the University of Zagreb (1982), and numerous ethnographic museums or ethnographic divisions within historical museums in other cities, towns, and rural areas (Gušić, 1963; Prosperov-Novak, 1992; Supek, 1983). Secondly, a number of the newly established institutions engaged in publishing additional scholarly journals devoted to ethnological and folklore research, such as: *National Heritage*

[Narodna starina] (1922-1935), Ethnological Library [Etnološka biblioteka] (1925-1934; *Journal of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb* [Vjesnik Etnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu] (1935-1938); *Ethnological Research and Data* [Etnološka istraživanja i građa] (1934-1942); *Ethnological Research* [Etnološka istraživanja] (1982 -); *Ethnological Forum* [Etnološka tribina] (1944 -); *Folk Arts* [Narodna umjetnost] (1962 -); *Studia Ethnologica Croatica* (1989 -); and *Ethnologica Dalmatica* (1992 -).

Over the years, these institutions also organized a number of national and international conferences on selected themes, and published their proceedings. As well, additional Croatian and Yugoslav ethnological and folklore societies were established, providing yet another forum for discussion and sharing of ideas and results through publications and organized research conferences and published proceedings (Rihtman-Auguštin, 1984b; Supek, 1983). At the same time, the majority of written and audiovisual ethnographic data collected by ethnologists and folklorists over the past one hundred years have been stored in their respective research institutions, and have therefore remained accessible to other scholars.

As a result, the quantity of information that has been collected and published over the past one hundred years on different aspects of Croatian folklore, including folk textiles, is enormous and varied. However, I became intrigued with certain underlying features of the whole corpus of Croatian folk textile research which remained fixed, some that changed very gradually, as well as certain points in time that signalled changes and established new directions in research. For example, why has Croatian folk textile research been largely focused on folk costumes and textiles from around the turn of this century? Secondly, why has the initial focus on the historical context and practice

associated with the production, exchange, and consumption of popular folk costumes and textiles at the turn of the century, gradually shifted to only selected folk textile objects and exploration of their technical, visual or functional origins? What occurred during the 1930s, when only selected older folk costumes and textiles gradually became the focus of ethnological research, while popular costumes that continued to change and assume new functions during this century began not only to be ignored but devalued as "inauthentic"? At the same time, how "authentic" were the selected folk costumes and textiles that scholars described as autochthonous Croatian folk arts or cultural heritage, presenting them as remnants from an often mythologized past?

During the last few decades, Croatian scholars associated with the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research (formerly the Institute of Folk Arts, and the Institute of Folklore Research) in Zagreb have posed similar questions and engaged in the related international and interdisciplinary debate in cultural studies. An outline of their response to these questions, as well as subsequent changes in their research practice, will be discussed in the next section.

Changes in Ethnological and Folklore Research in Croatia from the 1970s onwards

First, a brief overview of how ethnological and folklore studies coexisted in Croatia over the years is in order. From its beginnings in 1896 until 1948, ethnological studies in Croatia dealt with all aspects of folk culture (material, social, spiritual). When the new Institute of Folk Arts was established in 1948,

however, the task of studying folk culture became divided between ethnological and folklore studies. The Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb, and ethnographic museums across Croatia, retained the term *ethnological studies* but largely shifted their focus to material aspects of folk culture (textiles, architecture, utensils, tools, etc. and related customs). The new Institute of Folk Arts focused on the study of spiritual aspects of folk culture (literature, music, dance and related customs), which they termed *folklore studies.*

The initial division of the subject matter soon brought about increasing differences in theoretical/methodological orientations. Scholars associated with the Institute of Folk Arts introduced many innovations into their research practice, which I shall describe shortly. With time, they have also broadened their area of study to include material culture, but with different theoretical and methodological orientations than those employed by ethnological studies. The ongoing changes in their research practice prompted the Institute of Folk Arts to change their institution's name to the Institute of Folklore Research in 1977, and the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research in 1991. In Rihtman-Auguštin's words, these changes in institution's name signified "a shift away from the study of 'folk arts'...towards a study of folklore phenomena and customs both in the past and present" (Rihtman-Auguštin, 1984b, p. 16).

Other institutions devoted to the study of material culture have not readily responded to such changes. As a result, an ongoing struggle among institutions has ensued over the areas of study, research models, concepts, naming and terminology, or to put it simply - the struggle over classifications and methodologies which are at the heart of every scholarly activity. While these struggles are certainly healthy, they are difficult to describe with clarity in

a short review such as this one. For example, I decided to avoid using terms such as "old ethnology" and "new ethnology" as these are also not singular categories. The "old ethnology" was not uniform, since several disciplinary paradigms existed in the past, while a number of new ones are being proposed or used at present. The reader is therefore asked to take into account that from the 1970s onwards, ethnological and folklore studies in Croatia have been undergoing many changes, and disciplinary "space and boundaries" and much of the terminology are less fixed than they were during more stable periods.

In terms of publications I consider two articles published in Croatia in the early 1970s to have been seminal in introducing new theoretical approaches to the study of folklore into Croatian ethnological and folklore research. In 1973, the internationally renowned scholar and current director of the Institute of Folk Arts, Maja Bošković-Stulli, published her article "O pojmovima usmena i pučka književnost i njihovim nazivima" [About concepts of oral and popular literature and related terminology], in which she reviewed past approaches to the study of literary forms of folklore, and introduced the new theoretical/ methodological developments within Eastern European, Western European, and American folklore studies (Bošković-Stully, 1973/1983b). Through an extensive review of literature, Bošković-Stulli demonstrated in her analysis why she favoured theoretical developments based on the model of folklore as a communication act. This model was developed during the 1930s within the Prague School of Structuralism by Jakobson and Bogatyrev (1929/1971) and later adopted with minor differences by Čistov (1972) in Russia and Ben-Amos (1971) in North America. She accordingly proposed to discontinue using the term *folk literature* because of its multivalent associations centered around the conception of folklore as a static body of "traditional" literature and other arts

that are being irrevocably lost and therefore need to be preserved in their "authentic" forms. Instead, she proposed new terms *oral literature* and *popular literature* in order to reflect the new approach to the study of folklore as a communication act: hence the distinction between (elite and non-elite) orally performed and transmitted literature, popular written literature, and elite written literature, which can of course include the study of their interactions. While this discussion by Bošković-Stulli (1973/1983b) was centered on the literary forms of folklore, she suggested that these new approaches are equally valid for studying other folklore forms, such as music, dance, or visual and material forms such as textiles (p. 36). Most importantly, in such a research approach folklore is defined as a dynamic and changing process. The older folklore forms are perceived as neither static nor "authentic", but are rather distinguished by their functions and by modes of production, transmission, and reception in a specified place and time period. The contemporary folklore forms are perceived as equally valid subjects of study, and naturally more accessible for observing certain aspects of their functioning .

In her second article, "O folklorizmu" [On Folklorism], Bošković-Stulli introduced the new theoretical/methodological discussions and developments in ethnological studies that were taking place in Germany at that time, and reflected upon their significance for studying Croatian folklore (Bošković-Stulli, 1971). During the 1960s, German ethnologists Hans Moser and Herman Bausinger introduced distinctions between: 1) *folklore*, which they defined as a living and changing culture of non-elite social groups in their local context; and 2) *folklorism*, which they defined as "second-hand" applications of folklore that served different functions within the broader context of the given nation or society, such as political, ideological and economic use of folk arts as symbols of

national or regional identities (Bošković-Stully, 1971, pp. 171-173). The introduction of the concept of folklorism opened up another area of study relevant for the 19th and 20th century, including processes of interaction between folklore and folklorism.

Not surprisingly, these new theoretical concepts brought into question what was currently the very focus of much ethnological research, and to a lesser extent folklore research in Croatia: namely, the study of only "authentic" manifestations of folklore, which were perceived as remnants of "traditional" or autochthonous folk culture and often studied outside of the immediate socio-historical context in which they functioned.

An intense dialogue was thus opened among Croatian scholars about related theoretical and methodological issues in ethnological and folklore studies. Soon after, these discussions acquired a much broader interdisciplinary character, and further inquired into the interrelationships of the discipline of ethnology and folklore with the disciplines of sociology, anthropology, literary theory, philosophy, social history, and cultural history (Bošković-Stulli, 1983a, 1988; Čapo, 1988, 1991; Čapo-Žmegač, 1993; Lozica, 1987; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1984a, 1987, 1988a; Supek, 1988a, 1988b). Naturally, these developments also influenced the research practice of scholars associated with the Institute of Folk Arts. In their work they began to examine the new social functions of "authentic" or canonized folk arts (Bošković-Stulli, 1971; Lozica, 1986; Rihtman-Auguštin & Povrzanović, 1989; Sremac, 1978). They broadened the areas of study to include long neglected non-canonized "applied" folk arts and popular folklore that had continued to change with time; they also examined the interactions between canonized and non-canonized forms of folklore

(Bonifačić, 1991; Bošković-Stulli, 1983a; Karanović, 1989; Rajković, 1988; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1988a, 1988b, 1991; Zečević, 1989).

Generally speaking, these changes in research practice have largely, though not exclusively, shifted the focus towards the post Second World War period in socialist Yugoslavia, while relatively less attention has been paid to the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century. While there are many reasons for this, perhaps the most important one has been the recent political instability in Croatia. This instability has drawn Croatian ethnologists into a broader cultural discourse surrounding the rapid decline of socialism in Croatia during the 1980s, followed by the dramatic events of the creation of an independent Croatian state in 1991, and the subsequent beginning of the war in the former Yugoslavia. These processes and events shifted both the interests and often urgent engagements of ethnologists towards explorations of contemporary manifestations of folklore and folklorism. For example, as soon as the war began, the study of contemporary folklore shifted to the most marginalized groups in Croatian society, namely to displaced people, war refugees, and families of war victims who elicited a spontaneous response among scholars to focus on, what they termed, "the ethnography of the war" (Čale-Feldman, Prica, & Senjković, 1992, 1993; Povrzanović, 1992, 1995; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1993). With regards to folklorism, they largely examined the ideological manipulations and uses of various forms of folklorism in socialist Yugoslavia, and more recently in post-communist Yugoslavia and independent Croatia (Bonifačić, 1995; Čolović, 1990; Prošić-Dvornić, 1991; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1990, 1992a, 1992b).

Without minimizing the urgency and the special circumstances under which Croatian ethnologists and folklorists have been working, I consider that the period of time before the Second World War deserves more attention

because of its historical interest, and also because it provides the basis for a better understanding of contemporary forms of both folklore and folklorism in Croatia. For example, it has been suggested that the functions of folklorism before the Second World War were primarily political, serving to create Yugoslav and later Croatian national identities, while after the Second World War they became: 1) ideological, in promoting "brotherhood and unity" in socialist Yugoslavia and more recently post-communist nationalism; and 2) economical, in response to the development of the tourism and entertainment industry (Bošković-Stulli, 1971; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1988b). While this is largely true for non-material manifestations of folklore, it does not hold true when it comes to the domain of folk textiles. My focus on folk textiles elucidates the fact that economic folklorism, in terms of production of "applied" folk textiles, was perhaps more significant and varied before rather than after the Second World War. This dissertation will demonstrate the relevance of studying the early history of folklorism in Croatia for a better understanding of its more recent and contemporary manifestations in the domain of folk clothing and textiles.

The second point I wish to emphasize is that Croatian studies which have dealt with various forms of folklorism have described their political, ideological, and economic functions in Croatia, but have not given serious attention to the role that ethnological institutions and individual ethnologists have directly or indirectly played in those processes. In her initial article, "On Folklorism", Maja Bošković-Stulli (1971) mentioned the direct role of ethnological institutions in determining, or attempting to determine, standards of "authenticity" of staged performances of folklore. As well, she described ardent appeals of some individual ethnologists to preserve only "authentic" forms of folklore and

discourage, what they considered to be, the vulgarization of folklore through commercial and amateur applications. Several other scholars have voiced their own concerns about such matters through publications, or described direct involvement of individual ethnologists in maintaining the standards of "authenticity" of staged or displayed folklore (Benc-Bošković, 1964-65; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1988b; Sremac, 1976). However, the more indirect role of research models used in ethnological research in determining the norms, values, and hierarchy of different types of folk products (songs, dances, textiles, etc.) which eventually brought about the canonization of "authentic" folk products in Croatian culture, has neither been investigated nor historically situated with precision thus far. One of the main reasons I have selected the Polysystem Theory as a heuristic tool in this study, was the fact that it considers the role of various institutions, including research institutions, and their struggles over canonization of models and products as central to the understanding of change, as well as periods of stability, in a given cultural activity (Even-Zohar, 1990, p. 13). I consider that Even-Zohar's model of the functioning of the semiotic (poly)system of folk arts offers a more sophisticated tool to study what European ethnologists have termed as various forms of *folklorism*. By utilizing the Polysystem Theory, this study will bring new insights and more specific knowledge regarding the role of ethnological research in the functioning of the whole (poly)system of Croatian folk arts.

Ethnological Research of Folk Textiles in Croatia: Active and Passive Resistance to Change

As mentioned earlier, from 1949 onwards, ethnologists associated with the Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb, the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, and numerous other ethnographic museums across Croatia have largely focused on material aspects of folk culture, including folk costumes and textiles. Throughout that period, these scholars have largely employed the diffusionist research model to study folk textiles, which inquired into the origins and historical and spatial diffusion of "traditional" or "autochthonous" folk textiles that can be found on the territory of Croatia (Gušić, 1955; Radauš-Ribarić, 1975).

In ethnographic museums across Croatia, folk costumes and textiles usually hold the central place among other material culture in terms of collection, research, and exhibition practice. Museum curators, the great majority of whom hold a university degree in ethnology, have been very slow in responding to the aforementioned broadening of the subject matter as well as the theoretical/methodological orientations in their research practice. Some changes in terms of the broadening of subject matter, as well as placing more emphasis on historical contextualization, is becoming evident mostly in exhibition programming (Benc-Bošković, 1983; Brenko & Jelavić, 1994; Moslavac, 1995; Salopek, 1988; Šprem-Lovrić, 1995; Toldi, 1978). However, they have not as yet adopted the new theoretical/methodological orientations that would more radically affect the museums' collection, research, and exhibition practices.

Ethnologists associated with the Department of Ethnology, on the other hand, responded by more actively resisting changes to their already established

theoretical/methodological orientations in the study of folk textiles and other material culture, and engaged in struggles to retain them as dominant methodologies in their research practice (Belaj, 1989a; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1984b; Sklevicky, 1991). In their arguments they have stressed the need to retain the concept of "peoples" or "folk" as the bearer of ethnic characteristics of the Croatian nation. They considered this concept to be intrinsically incorporated in the diffusionist research model they have been using, its aim being "to reconstruct ethnic history through research of culture" (Belaj, 1989a, p. 13). Equally importantly, the diffusionist research model has guided the collection of data for an ambitious project, by the Department of Ethnology, of creating ethnological maps for the territory of Croatia (Belaj, 1989b; Vince-Pallua, 1994). The purpose of creating ethnological maps has been to document the evidence of geographical dispersion of "traditional" cultural forms, from which conclusions can be drawn about their historical origins and diffusion patterns (Supek, 1983). The Department of Ethnology has suggested that the discipline of Croatian ethnology be divided into "archeological ethnology" which they would pursue with their established diffusionist methodology, and the ethnology of contemporary life which would be pursued by other institutions (Supek, 1983, p. 54).

It remains to be seen how ethnological research of folk textiles will develop in the future among all relevant Croatian institutions. There is little doubt, however, that changes in both the broadening of the subject matter and theoretical/methodological orientations in the research of folk textiles that have already begun to take place in Croatia are bound to accelerate in the near future due to several pressures. Firstly, changes that have already taken place among scholars associated with the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Studies have

consistently exerted pressures not only by including contemporary folklore as a valid subject of study, but also by introducing new theoretical/methodological orientations in the historical research of folklore phenomena. By definition, new research approaches study different historical processes and use different sources of data, rather than only those associated with the "authentic" manifestations of folklore (Bošković-Stulli, 1983a, 1984; Supek, 1983, in press; Zečević, 1988, 1991; 1993). As well, as I mentioned earlier, scholars associated with the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research have begun to exert additional pressures by broadening their scope to include material culture studies, and by adopting from the start an interdisciplinary approach to the study of material culture, including clothing and textiles (Braica, 1991; Muraj, 1981, 1991; Povrzanović, 1988; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1988a; Senjković, 1994). Moreover, pressure to change has been exerted not only through publications and exchanges among scholars during symposiums and conferences, but also "from below", namely from graduate students of ethnology who are increasingly seeking advisors with research orientations that partake in the current international debate in ethnological and folklore scholarship.

Secondly, recent political changes, which resulted in the disintegration of the former socialist Yugoslavia and the formation of an independent and democratic Croatian state, have destabilized the whole Croatian cultural system. This has resulted in a rapid opening to Western European and North American influences in many cultural practices, including in scholarly research among various disciplines. This phenomenon is bound to continue to exert pressure on ethnological research of material culture to alter more radically their educational and museum programming, and to open up to the international trends that have

already influenced other areas of social sciences and humanities scholarship in Croatia (Gross, in press).

Thirdly, recent political and cultural shifts in Croatia have also triggered the process of (re)defining the Croatian national identity. There has been less emphasis lately on old Balkan and especially pan-Slavic roots of Croatian culture, which was the primary focus of difussionists, and more emphasis on the relatively recent cultural connections with the Western and Central European cultural circle (Bonifačić, 1995; Prica, 1995). This shift will likely favor the exploration of the more recent history of folk heritage in Croatia, thus rendering the diffusionist research model not only outdated, but simply inadequate. As Even-Zohar (1990) writes :

> Without the stimulation of a strong "sub-culture", any canonized activity tends to gradually become petrified. The first steps towards petrification manifest themselves in a high degree of boundness and growing stereotypization of the various repertoires. For the system, petrification is an operational disturbance: in the long run it does not allow it to cope with the changing needs of the society in which it functions. (p. 17)

In the long run, broadening the scope and diversification of research approaches appears to be inevitable if ethnological studies of textiles and other material culture wish to play a more viable and relevant role in modern Croatia. This study will be a significant contribution in that direction. As well, since one of the major tasks of this thesis is to explain the role of ethnological research in the functioning of the whole folk art (poly)system in Croatian society in the past, it is hoped that such a "reflexive" analysis will aid Croatian ethnologists to perceive and determine more consciously their present position within Croatian

and international scholarship, as well as their participation in contemporary Croatian culture (Bourdieu, 1990b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Contributions to North American Textiles Studies

The contribution of this thesis to North American textile studies will be twofold. Unlike Croatian studies that focus only on Croatian textiles, North American textile studies are much broader, and embrace the study of textiles from all over the world. The area of the world that has been least explored or discussed, as evident in the review article by Jane Schneider (1987), *The Anthropology of Cloth*, is the area of Eastern Europe. The reason is, perhaps, that East European scholars have extensively studied their folk textiles and, to a lesser extent, elite textiles. Nevertheless, the language barrier, and possibly past political differences, have not facilitated the exchange of knowledge. For example, a number of museums and universities in North America hold relatively large collections of Croatian folk textiles (the University of Alberta Costume and Textile Collection in Edmonton, the Glenbow Museum in Calgary, the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto in Canada, as well as Phoebe Hearst Museum of Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley and the Blanche Payne Collection at the Henry Art Gallery, University of Washington, Seattle, in the United States). These collections have not been utilized well thus far due to the lack of knowledge about the historical and social context in which these textiles functioned. As well, folk costumes and textiles that have been made and/or used by Croatian immigrants in North America represent as yet an unexplored topic, which cannot be properly understood without the knowledge of their past functions in the former Yugoslavia and Croatia. The

thesis facilitates the exchange of knowledge and contributes towards establishing a dialogue between textile scholars in Croatia and North America.

Secondly, the thesis contributes to the theoretical/methodological issues in North American textile studies. The distinction between "traditional" (authentic) and "modern" (inauthentic) folk textiles in Croatia is but one example of a broader phenomenon encountered in cross-cultural textile studies in North America. Only, in North America, the "other" is not a native peasant or non-elite culture, but native Indian, Inuit, or other non-Western culture. This presence of the traditional/modern dichotomy in North American textile studies has been first addressed in a comprehensive manner by Jane Schneider (1987) in her seminal review article, "The Anthropology of Cloth", in which she shifted North American textile studies towards historical and comparative study of textiles. As a result, the scope of textile studies has broadened to include the processes of "modernization" and, not unrelatedly, has contributed towards diversification and development of new research methodologies as evident in more recent publications (see, for example, Baizerman, 1987, 1990; Bean, 1989; Cohn, 1989; Cort, 1989; Graburn, 1976; Niessen, 1990; Phillips, 1989, 1990; Schevill, Berlo & Dwyer, 1991; Weiner & Schneider, 1989).

However, the presence of the traditional/modern dichotomy in past textile scholarship in North America has not been historically situated with precision or studied more extensively. Instead, it has usually been denounced in rather general and moralistic terms, namely, as a consequence of: 1)Western colonial ideology of seeing the Western elite culture as dynamic and historical, while other cultures as static and a-historical; 2) patriarchal attitudes of not taking women's discourse through textiles seriously; and 3) ethnocentric and/or elite aesthetic judgments within academic disciplines. While all of the above

reasons are certainly true, they are too broad to be useful except for political purposes of asserting moral superiority of the new, over the old, areas of research.

I consider that the presence of a traditional/modern dichotomy in North American textile scholarship provides an interesting and challenging topic of study, and poses questions that require more precise answers. Firstly, North American textile studies have been divided between a number of disciplines, such as anthropology, ethnohistory, native art history, museum studies, home economics, human ecology, folklore studies, and native studies. It would be very interesting to situate more precisely the timing and manner in which various research models among these disciplines contributed to the construction of traditional/modern dichotomy in the research of textiles. Also, in the studies of native textiles, for example, it would be interesting to examine more precisely when such canonization of research models took place and if it contributed to the creation of canonized "traditional" native textiles which functioned within broader semiotic system(s) of native arts. Comparative analysis in various regions of Americas of the possible reciprocal effects of such canonization on actual practice of textile production and/or consumption, would bring new insights about the interactions of such macro phenomena with micro dynamics of textiles in a specified place and time.

Such a "reflexive" analysis of North American textile research and the consequent "imprints" of the traditional/modern dichotomy on practice would offer new insights in textile history. Furthermore, such an examination would facilitate the work of textile scholars in perceiving and determining more consciously their (unavoidable) role in the social construction of values and classifications in a society. I consider that accusations or denials of social

stratifications and heterogeneity as basic characteristics of all cultures and societies is less useful and effective in the long term, than a more precise and conscious understanding of its functioning, which in turn can serve to perhaps minimize the symbolic violence inherent in all institutional, and especially scholarly, classifications (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

The Polysystem Theory, which has thus far been applied only in the study of literature but is applicable to the study of other cultural activities, including textiles, offers a tool for such an analysis. It is an approach that is verifiable and more specific in explaining the historical patterns of change in textile research, how textile research participates in broader cultural activities, as well as its reciprocal effects on the practice of textile production and consumption in a meaningfully selected space and time. The application of the Polysystem Theory to textile studies is limited in this dissertation by both the specific subject matter and the quantity of materials that could be handled. The potential that the theory holds for textile studies is much greater, as can be seen in its advanced applications in the study of literature (Dimić, 1993; Even-Zohar, 1990). Nevertheless, the results of this dissertation will provide the initial measure of its usefulness and potential contribution to the discipline of textile studies in general.

Concepts and Definitions: Folk, Folk Textiles, and Folk Culture

The meanings and definitions of the terms *folk, folk culture,* and *folk textiles* have historically differed among different countries in their popular usage and in scientific discourse, and have also changed with time. In other

words, the meanings and definitions of these concepts have at no time been straightforward or fixed, instead they have always been multivalent and changing (Bošković-Stulli, 1973/1983b, p.9).

The beginning of the modern usage of these terms is considered to be the last decades of the 18th century when the German philosopher, Herder, used the term *folk* (Volk) to denote "peoples as carriers of traditions". Herder first contrasted the *folk culture* of rural population with the *elite culture* associated with towns, and in this way prepared the way for the later study of folk culture. Notably, Herder also spoke of folk character and folk soul, and such a personification of "peoples" led at the time to the identification of *folk* and *folk culture* with *nation* and *national culture* at first in Germany, and later among other emerging nations in Europe, including Croatia (Bošković-Stulli, 1973/1983b, p. 9).

The use of these concepts within the discipline of ethnology in Croatia and other European countries has a somewhat shorter history, going back to the latter part of the 19th century. In his *General Ethnological Concepts* (International Dictionary of Regional European Ethnology and Folklore, Vol. 1), A. Kultkrantz (1960) gives five basic types of definitions of *folk* that have been relevant for European ethnological studies until the 1960s: 1) folk as nation; 2) folk as lower stratum; 3) folk as archaic segment within civilization, in Europe identical with peasantry as the most conservative part of the populace; 4) folk as the basic social stratum, carrier of culture; 5) folk as a social group connected by shared traditions and feelings of connectedness on the basis of a shared past. (p. 126-129). This list of definitions gives an indication of multivalent meanings and connotations associated with the concept *folk* and numerous other words derived from it (folk culture, folk music, folk poetry, folk dance, folk textiles, and

others). Different research approaches that were used until the 1960s placed at times more emphasis on one or two of the above definitions, but did not introduce contradictions into the multiplicity of the meanings, and therefore did not create the real need for new terminology. Ethnologists from those countries or institutions that continued to use older research models after the 1960s naturally continued to use term *folk* and its numerous derivatives in their scholarly discourse.

From the 1960s onwards, however, ethnologists who developed or adopted new interdisciplinary research models in ethnological and folklore research in Europe began to introduce a new terminology. For example, from the 1970's onwards scholars of literary forms of folklore in Croatia have gradually begun to replace the term *folk literature* with two new terms: *oral literature* and *popular literature.* As Maja Bošković-Stulli (1973/1983b) stated, the main reason for introducing a new terminology has been to signal the change in research approaches to the study of folklore, in this case to stress the adoption of a communication model which brought into focus the study of differences in the production, transmission and reception of oral forms of literature from those of written literature (p. 97). At the same time, this new terminology was needed in order to create a distance from multivalent meanings of the old terminology which were no longer desirable or appropriate.

Folk textiles: As regards the term *folk textiles*, an analogous list of definitions given by Kultkrantz would read: 1) national textiles; 2) textiles of lower strata; 3) textiles of peasantry; 4) ethnic textiles; 5) regional textiles.

Since older approaches still prevail in the research of folk textiles in Croatia, terms such as *folk costumes* and *folk textiles* continue to be used in accordance

with these multivalent meanings. Some innovations in terminology can be observed, but they have not as yet received wider acceptance in Croatian textile scholarship. For example, Muraj (1981) has used the term *traditional costume* instead of *folk costume*. She defined *traditional costume* in contradistinction to the modern urban style clothing on the basis of its functions in rural life, rather than on the basis of its origins or "authenticity". Rihtman-Auguštin (1988a) has suggested that the term *folk costume* be restricted to the historical costume of peasants in Croatia, but noted that extensive research would likely not sustain even such use of the term folk costume. She suggested that the lasting use of this term will likely serve only to describe costumes that continue to be used in staged performances, namely in various forms of folklorism (p.115).

This is in agreement with the more general statement of Bošković-Stulli (1973/1983b):

> ...the term *folk poetry* (and other related terms with the attribute *folk*)....cannot be avoided even today when the manifestations of traditional oral literature [other traditional arts] are studied in a cultural-historical context which is not limited to the phenomenon of oral-literary forms [other traditional art forms], but encompasses the historical approach to that phenomenon. (p. 16)

I therefore consider it appropriate to retain in some parts of this dissertation the basic broad term *folk textiles*, since it is a historical study of the social construction of different types of folk textiles in Croatia between 1896 and 1940. For the sake of the clarity of analysis, however, aside from using a more general term such as *folk textiles*, I also use terms: autochthonous folk textiles, authentic folk textiles, rural textiles, modified rural textiles, applied folk

textiles, peasant textiles, popular folk textiles, popular textiles, in order to distinguish between different types of textiles present in a specific context and at a certain point in time.

It must be remembered, however, that behind each *type* of textile there are numerous variations in individual textile objects; for example, popular types of costumes at the turn of this century varied by regions, by villages or parishes within those regions, while another span of variations could be found within each village.

As well, each *type* of costume or textile can also change in time; popular types of costume from the 19th century, for example, differed greatly from those in the first half and latter half of the 20th century, in terms of their material and visual characteristics and their functions. When it comes to folk textiles which were made for trade, or those used for staged performances, these too, changed with time and their function.

Folk culture: Following the definitions that Kultkrantz gives for the concept of *folk* in European ethnological studies, the following analogous list of definitions can be made for the multivalent meanings contained within the concept of *folk culture*: 1) national culture; 2) culture of lower stratum; 3) peasant culture; 4) ethnic culture, and 5) regional culture.

In this dissertation I use these definitions of folk culture in order to describe which of them were relevant for different research models used by Croatian ethnologists between 1896 and 1940. However, I do not use any of the above definitions as a working hypothesis in this dissertation. Instead, I have adopted for heuristic purposes Even-Zohar's theoretical model of cultural activities (or larger systems such as culture) as open, dynamic, functional,

heterogeneous and stratified semiotic systems, which will be described in Chapter III.

References

Baizerman, Suzanne. (1987). Textiles, traditions, and tourist arts: Hispanic weaving in Northern New Mexico. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48*, 2621B. (University Microfilms No. 87-26,028)

Baizerman, Suzanne. (1990). Trade in Hispanic weavings of Northern New Mexico and the social construction of tradition. *Proceedings of the Textile Society of America Biennual Symposium* (pp. 233-240). Washington, D. C.

Balog, Zdenko. (1987). Modne slike u Zagrebačkoj "Luni": Počeci modne žurnalistike u Hrvatskoj [Fashion plates in Zagreb magazine "Luna": The beginnings of fashion journalism in Croatia]. *Život umjetnosti, 41-42*, 15-24.

Bean, Susan, S. (1989). Gandhi and khadi, the fabric of Indian independence. In A. Weiner & J. Schneider (Eds.), *Cloth and human experience* (pp. 355-376). Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Belaj, Vitomir. (1989a). Plaidoyer za etnologiju kao historijsku znanost o etničkim skupinama [A case for ethnology as a historical science of ethnic groups]. *Studia ethnologica, 1*, 9-17.

Belaj, Vitomir. (1989b). Etnološki atlas Jugoslavije: Karte s komentarima, svezak 1 [Ethnological atlas of Yugoslavia: Maps with commentaries, volume 1]. Zagreb: Centar za Etnološku Kartografiju.

Ben-Amos, Dan. (1971). Toward a definition of folklore in context. *Journal of American Folklore, 84* (331), 3-15.

Benc-Bošković, Katica. (1964-65). O mogućnostima suvremene primjene folklornog kostima [On the possibilities of contemporary applications of folk costume]. *Narodna umjetnost, 3*, 171-176.

Benc-Bošković, Katica. (1983). Konavle: Tekstilno rukotvorstvo i narodna nošnja [Konavle: Textile craft and folk costumes]. *Etnološka istraživanja, 2*, 5-182.

Bonifačić, Ruža. (1991). Mi ćemo zak'antat glason od slavića [We will sing with the voice of the nightingale]. *Narodna umjetnost, 28,* 49-86.

Bonifačić, Vjera. (1995). Craft innitiatives in war refugee centres in Croatia. In S. Niessen & M. Hardy (Eds.), *Exploring new horizons: Craft emerges* (pp. 21-30). Edmonton: Department of Human Ecology, University of Alberta.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1971). O folklorizmu [About folklorism]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 45,* 165-186.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1983a). *Usmena književnost nekad i danas* [Oral literature in the past and present]. Beograd: Prosveta.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1983b). O pojmovima usmena i pučka književnost i njihovim nazivima [On concepts of oral and popular literature and related terminology]. In M. Bošković-Stulli, *Usmena književnost nekad i danas* (pp. 5-114). Beograd: Prosveta. (Original work published 1973)

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1984). *Usmeno pjesništvo u obzorju književnosti* [Oral poetry in litarary space]. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1988). Telling about life (On questions of contemporary oral literary genres). *Narodna umjetnost, Special Issue 2,* 11-42.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990a). *The logic of practice* (R. Nice, trans.). Polity Press: Cambridge. (Original work published in 1980)

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990b). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology* (M. Adamson, Trans.). Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre, & Wacquant, Loic, J. D. (Eds.). (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Braica, Silvio. (1991). Jezička analiza torbe kao oznake identiteta [Linguistic analysis of a handbag as a symbol of identity]. In D. Rihtman-Auguštin (Ed.), *Simboli identiteta: Studije, eseji, grada* (pp. 159-165). Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Brenko, Aida & Jelavić, Željka. (1994). *Zagrebačke uspomene: Etnografske slike grada* [Zagreb memories: Ethnographic pictures of the town]. Zagreb: Etnografski Muzej. (Exhibition catalog)

Burke, Peter. (1978). *Popular culture in early modern Europe.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Clifford, James. (1988). *The predicament of culture: Twentieth-century ethnography, literature, and art.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harward University Press.

Cohn, Bernard, S. (1989). Cloth, clothes, and colonialism: India in the nineteenth century. In A. Weiner & J. Schneider (Eds.), *Cloth and human experience* (pp. 303-354). Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Cort, Louise, A. (1989) The changing fortunes of three archaic Japanese textiles. In A. Weiner & J. Schneider (Eds.), *Cloth and human experience* (pp. 377-416). Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Čale-Feldman, L. , Prica, I., & Senjković, Reana. (1992). Poetika otpora [Poetics of resistance]. *Narodna umjetnost, 29*, 45-106.

Čale-Feldman, L. , Prica, I., & Senjković, Reana (Eds.). (1993). *Fear, death and resistance/ An Ethnography of war: Croatia 1991-1992.* Zagreb: Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research.

Čapo, Jasna. (1988). Etnologija između demografije i socijalne historije [Ethnology between demography and social history]. *Etnološka tribina, 11*, 5-16.

Čapo-Žmegač, Jasna. (1991). Croatian ethnology, the science of peoples or the science of culture?. *Studia ethnologica, 3*, 7-25.

Čapo-Žmegač, Jasna. (1993). Etnologija i/ili (socio)kulturna anthropologija [Ethnology and/or (socio)cultural anthropology]. *Studia ethnologica, 5*, 11-25.

Čistov, Kirill, V. (1972). Specifikum folkloru vo svetle teorie informacie [The specificity of folklore in the light of communication theory]. *Slovensky Narodopis, XX* (3), 345-368.

Čolović, Ivan. (1990). Folklor i politika [Folklore and politics]. *Etnološka tribina, 13*, 63-72.

Dimić, Milan, V. (1993). Polysystem theory. In I. R. Makaryk (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of contemporary literary theory* (pp. 151-155). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1990). Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today, 11* (1), 1-253.

Gjetvaj, Nada. (1989). Etnografski Muzej u Zagrebu: U povodu 70. obljetnice [The Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb: On the occasion of the 70th anniversarry]. *Etnološka istraživanja, 5*, 1-144.

Graburn, Nelson H. H. (1976). *Ethnic and tourist arts: Cultural expressions from the fourth world.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Gross, Mirjana. (in press). Suvremena historiografija - korijeni, postignuća, traganja [Contemporary historiography - roots, achievements, explorations].

Gušić, Marijana. (1955). *Commentary on the exhibited material.* Zagreb: Etnografski Muzej.

Gušić, Marijana. (1963). *Folklor naroda Jugoslavije* [Folklore of Yugoslav people]. Zagreb: Grafički Zavod Hrvatske.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1983). Introduction: Inventing traditions. In E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (Eds), *The invention of tradition* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1990). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hofer, Tamas. (1984). The perception of tradition in European ethnology. *Journal of Folklore Research, 21* (22-3), 133-147.

Hultkrantz, Ake. (1960). General ethnological concepts. In S. Erixon & A. Hultkrantz (Eds), *International dictionary of regional European ethnology* (Vol. 1). Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.

Jakobson, Roman & Bogatyrev, Petr. (1971) Folklor kao naročiti oblik stvaralaštva [Folklore as a special form of creation]. In M. Bošković-Stulli (Ed.), *Usmena književnost: Izbor studija i ogleda* (pp. 17-30). Zagreb: Školska Knjiga. (Original paper published in 1929)

Karanović, Zoja & Katić, Vesna. (1989). The Kraljicas in Vojvodina: Ritual practice and folklorism. In D. Rihtman-Auguštin & M. Povrzanović (Eds.), *Folklore and historical process* (pp. 171-186). Zagreb: Institute of Folklore Research.

Lofgren, Orvar. (1991). The nationalization of culture: Constructing Swedishness. *Studia ethnologica, 3*, 101-116.

Lozica, Ivan. (1986). Poklade u Zborniku za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena i suvremeni karneval u Hrvatskoj [The carnival in Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena and the contemporary carnival in Croatia]. *Narodna umjetnost, 23*, 31-57.

Lozica Ivan. (1987). Običaji i etnologija u vidokrugu filozofije [Customs and ethnology in the sphere of philosophy]. *Narodna umjetnost, 24*, 23-39.

Maruševski, Olga. (1978). Da nam naše krasne prionu uz naš list...[That our beauties would adhere to our leaf...]. In S. Draganić (Ed.), *Umjetničke znamenitosti Zagreba II* (pp. 73-96). Zagreb: Kajkavsko Spravišče.

Moslavac, Slaviça. (1995). *Stjepan Šajnović i Moslavačka narodna nošnja* [Stjepan Šajnović and folk costume of Moslavina]. Osekovo: Muzej Moslavine Kutina. (Exhibition catalog)

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1981). Tradicijsko odijevanje na Zlarinu [Traditional clothing on Zlarin]. *Narodna umjetnost, 18*, 159-220.

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1991). Kućno tekstilno umijeće u Slunjskim rastokama [Domestic textile craft in Slunjske rastoke]. *Narodna umjetnost, 28*, 269-293.

Niessen, Sandra. (1990). Toba batak textile inventions. *Proceedings of the Textile Society of America Biennual Symposium* (pp. 223-232). Washington, D. C.

Phillips, Ruth, B. (1989). Native American art and the New Art History. *Museum Anthropology, 13* (4), 2-13.

Phillips, Ruth, B. (1990). Moccasins into slipers: Traditions and transformations in nineteenth century Woodland Indian textiles. *Proceedings of the Textile Society of America Biennual Symposium* (pp. 262-273). Washington, D. C.

Povrzanović, Maja. (1988). Image and word on clothing: Messages to the ethnologist. In Z. Rajković (Ed.), *Contributions to the study of contemporary folklore in Croatia* (pp. 37-48). Zagreb: Zavod za Istraživanje Folklora.

Povrzanović, Maja. (1992). Etnologija rata - pisanje bez suza? [Ethnology of war - writing without tears?]. *Etnološka tribina, 15*, 61-80.

Povrzanović, Maja. (1995). Crossing the borders: Croatian war ethnographies. *Narodna umjetnost, 32* (1), 91-106.

Prica, Ines. (1995). "To be here - to publish there": On the position of a small European ethnology. *Narodna umjetnost, 32* (1), 7-24.

Prošić-Dvornić, Mirjana. (1991). Sa nama nema neizvesnosti: Politički predizborni plakat u Srbiji 1990. [We do not keep you in suspense: Political preelection poster in Serbia,1990]. *Narodna umjetnost, 28*, 349-376.

Prosperov-Novak, Slobodan & Šulc, Branka (Eds.). (1992). *Muzeji i galerije Hrvatske* [Museums and galleries in Croatia]. Zagreb: Ministry of Education and Culture.

Rajković, Zorica. (1988). *Contributions to the study of contemporary folklore in Croatia*. Zagreb: Zavod za Istraživanje Folklora.

Ribarić, Jelka. (1975). *Narodne nošnje Hrvatske* [Folk costumes of Croatia]. Zagreb: Spektar.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1984a). *Struktura tradicijskog mišljenja* [Structure of traditional thinking]. Zagreb: Školska Knjiga.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1984b). Trideset i pet godina rada Zavoda za Istraživanje Folklora [Thirty five years of activities of the Institut of Folklore Research]. *Narodna umjetnost, 21*, 11-35.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1987). Teorija o dvije kulture (Od Radića do Gramscija, Ciresea i Burkea) [The theory of the two-tiered model of culture (From Radić to Gramsci, Cirese and Burke)]. *Narodna umjetnost, 24*, 177-198.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1988a). *Etnologija naše svakodnevnice* [The ethnology of our everyday life]. Zagreb: Školska Knjiga.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1988b). Folklore: Models and symbols. In Z. Rajković (Ed.), *Contributions to the study of contemporary folklore in Croatia* (pp. 9-22). Zagreb: Institut of Folklore Research.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1990). O dekristijanizaciji narodne kulture [On the dechristianization of folk culture]. *Etnološka tribina, 13*, 9-16.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1991). Istinski ili lažni identitet: Ponovno o odnosu folklora i folklorizma [True or false identity: More on the inerrelationship between folklore and folklorism]. In D. Rihtman-Auguštin (Ed.), *Simboli identiteta: Studije, eseji, grada* (pp. 78-89). Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1992a). Etnologija socijalizma i poslije [The ethnology of socialism and afterwards]. *Etnološka tribina, 15*, 81-91.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1992b). O konstrukciji tradicije u naše dane: Rituali, simboli i konotacije vremena [On the construction of tradition in this day and age: Rituals, symbols, and conotations of time]. *Narodna umjetnost, 29*, 25-44.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1993). We were proud to live with you, and now immensely sad to have lost you....*Narodna umjetnost, 30*, 279-302.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja, & Povrzanović, Maja (Eds.). (1989). *Folklore and historical process.* Zagreb: Institute of Folklore Research.

Salopek, Vladimir (Ed.). (1988 -). Biblioteka "Narodne nošnje Jugoslavije" [Library of "Yugoslav Folk Costumes"]. Zagreb: Kulturno Prosvjetni Sabor Hrvatske. (Ongoing project)

Schevill, Margot, B., Berlo, Catherine J., & Dwyer, Edward, B. (Eds.). (1991). *Textile traditions of Mesoamerica and the Andes: An anthology*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Schneider, Jane. (1987). The anthropology of cloth. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 16*, 409-448.

Schneider, Marijana. (1985). Nošnja Iliraca [Illyrian costume]. In *Hrvatski narodni preporod, 1790-1848: Hrvatska u vrijeme Ilirskog pokreta* (pp. 371-379). Zagreb: Muzej za Umjetnost i Obrt.

Scklevicky, Lydia. (1991). Profesija etnolog: Analiza pokazatelja statusa profesije [Profession Ethnologist: The analysis of elements of profesion]. In D. Rihtman-Auguštin (Ed.), *Simboli identiteta: Studije, eseji, grada* (pp. 45-67). Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Senjković, Reana, (1994). Oko baroka [On the baroque]. *Etnološka tribina, 17*, 123-138.

Šprem-Lovrić, Branka. (1995). *Odjeća i nakit hrvatskih žena do 30-tih godina dvadesetog stoljeća; Paralela: Selo-grad* [Clothing and jewlery of Croatian women until the 1930s; Parallel: Village-city]. Kumrovec: Muzej "Staro Selo". (Exhibition catalog)

Sremac, Stjepan. (1978). Smotre folklora nekad i danas [Folk festivals in the past and present]. *Narodna umjetnost, 15*, 97-116.

Supek, Olga. (1983). Osnovne značajke etnologije u Hrvatskoj od 1945 do danas [Basic characteristics of Croatian ethnology from 1945 onwards]. In *Proceedings kongresa jugoslavenskih etnologa i folklorista I*, (pp. 51-65).

Supek, Olga. (1988a). Ethnology in Croatia. *Etnološki pregled, 23-24*, 17-35.

Supek, Olga. (1988b). Kulturna antropologija i socialna historiografija [Cultural anthropology and social historiography]. *Etnološka tribina, 11*, 17-24.

Supek, Olga. (in press). Women's entrepreneurship and the dissolution of Zadruga in 19th century Slavonia. *Studia Ethnologica Croatica*.

Toldi, Zvonimir. (1978). *Svilogijostvo* [Silk production]. Slavonski Brod: Muzej Brodskog Posavlja. (Exhibition catalog)

Vince-Pallua, Jelka. (1994). Razmišljanja i dileme na marginama etnoloških karata - kriza etnologije? [Reflections and dilemmas on the margins of ethnological maps - crisis of ethnology?]. *Studia Ethnologica Croatica, 6*, 9-20.

Weiner, Annette B. & Schneider, Jane. (Eds.). (1989). *Cloth and human experience* . Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Wolf, Eric. (1982). *Europe and the people without history.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Zečević, Divna. (1988). *Hrvatske pučke pjesmarice 19. stoljeća (svjetovne i nabožne)* [Croatian popular songbooks of the 19th century (secular and religious)]. Osijek: Izdavački Centar Revija.

Zečević, Divna. (1989). Kada završava 19. stoljeće? Pučke pjesmarice svjetovnog i nabožnog karaktera u odnosu na povijest hrvatske književnosti [When does the 19th century ends? Secular and religious popular songs in relation to Croatian literary history]. In D. Rihtman-Auguštin & M. Povrzanović (Eds.), *Folklore and historical process* (pp. 95-104). Zagreb: Institute of Folklore Research.

Zečević, Divna. (1991). *Prošlost u sadašnjosti* [Past in the present]. Osijek: Izdavački Centar Revija.

Zečević, Divna. (1993). *Strah božji: Hrvatske pučke propovjedi 18. stoljeća* [Fear of God: Croatian popular sermons in the 18th century]. Osijek: Izdavački Centar Revija.

CHAPTER III
THE POLYSYSTEM THEORY AND ITS APPLICATION IN TEXTILE STUDIES

The Model of the Polysystem and its General Characteristics

The Polysystem Theory has been developed by semioticians of language and literature to answer questions about how semiotic systems change and why they assume a particular form within the broader socio-cultural context in a specified place and time. Thus far, Polysystem Theory has been applied almost exclusively in the study of literature. However, it is also applicable to the study of other cultural activities that function as semiotic systems, or larger macrosystems such as culture (Even-Zohar, 1990, p. 2). This paper suggests that Polysystem Theory can be a useful heuristic tool in the historical and comparative study of textiles. I shall demonstrate this by first describing the basic framework of the theory, followed by an example of its application.

The development of Polysystem Theory by Itamar Even-Zohar and collaborators at the Tel Aviv University in Israel began in the 1960s, and has since become part of the international debate in the humanities (Dimić, 1993). The theory itself, and the research practice inspired by it, are largely compatible with Bourdieu's sociological studies of the *field* of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1993). Polysystem Theory, however, evolved from semiotically

---

An earlier version of this paper entitled "Systemic Approach to Heritage Interpretation" was presented at the IVth Global Congress on Heritage Interpretation, Barcelona, Spain, 1995, and will be published in *The Journal of the European Network of Sciences and Technologies Applied to Cultural Heritage.*

oriented studies of literature and culture, notably those of Russian formalism and the Prague School of structuralism (Dimić, 1988). It should be distinguished, however, from the structuralism/functionalism of Geneva and Paris, which examines language or culture as a closed system, and is therefore characterized by "statics and synchronism, homogeneous structure and an a-historical approach" (Even-Zohar, 1990, p. 11). The Polysystem Theory, on the contrary, defines all cultures (Western and non-Western, elite and non-elite) as dynamic, functional, stratified, open systems that are heterogeneous, only partially autonomous, and which are subject to change over time. It is specifically designed to search for general "laws" that explain the functioning of cultural activities, and that account for the possibility of historical change and its governing mechanism.

The model of the polysystem is based on Jakobson's schema of the total semiotic situation in *verbal communication* between two individuals, taking into account their shared code and context at a particular point in time. Even-Zohar's adapted schema is designed, however, for the total semiotic situation in *cultural activities* such as literature, film, clothing, architecture, arts, folk arts, or larger macro-systems such as culture. The schema thus deals with groups of producers, consumers, and groups or agents comprising the "institution" and "market" of the system, over a selected period of time (Jakobson's terms in brackets):

INSTITUTION [context]

REPERTOIRE [code]

PRODUCER [addresser] [addressee] CONSUMER

MARKET [contact/channel]

PRODUCT [message]

It is the interdependencies among these factors which allow the system to function, and which determine the system's dynamics in a designated space and time. To quote Even-Zohar (1990):

> Thus a CONSUMER may "consume" a PRODUCT produced by a PRODUCER, but in order for the "product"... to be generated, a common REPERTOIRE must exist, whose usability is determined by some INSTITUTION. A MARKET must exist where such a good can be transmitted. (p. 34)

It is instructive to highlight the main aspects of the definitions of these terms, as given by Even-Zohar (1990, pp. 31-44):

PRODUCERS and CONSUMERS:

- may move on a variety of levels as participants in the cultural activity in question, i. e. they may also comprise part of either institution or market

INSTITUTION:

- the aggregate of factors involved with the maintenance of cultural activity
- governs the norms prevailing in the cultural activity in question, sanctioning some and rejecting others
- includes publishing houses, mass media, educational institutions, museums, and others
- naturally, the institution is not uniform; inside the institution there are struggles over domination

REPERTOIRE:

- designates all *rules* and *materials* which govern both the *making* and *use* of any given product

MARKET:

- the aggregate of factors involved with the selling and buying of products and with the promotion of types of consumption

PRODUCT

- any performed set of signs, including behavior

These then are the factors that are interrelated, and that comprise the "space and boundaries" of cultural activities (Dimić, 1988). The theory has developed a set of interrelated hypothesis on how these factors influence each other. As well, a number of heuristic constructs have been developed that help explain the functioning of the (poly)system, such as 'model', 'canonized' and 'non-canonized' models and products, 'primary' and 'secondary' systems, 'periphery' and 'center', 'intra-relations' and 'inter-relations', 'stability' and 'instability' of the system. For more detailed definitions of the aforementioned terms as well as elaboration about their interrelationships, the reader is referred to Even-Zohar's (1990) *Polysystem Studies* in which Polysystem Theory is described in its latest state of development.

A few general characteristics of the theory and conditions for the fruitfulness of its application ought to be mentioned. Firstly, it should be noted that Polysystem Theory should not be mistaken for some kind of totalizing theory. Instead it is a theory that has adopted a scientific approach, made a declaration of intentions, set up a methodological program and a goal, but the "laws" it seeks to uncover are not some eternal truths, but rather a set of temporary hypotheses that are open to verification and emendations whenever change becomes necessary (Even-Zohar, 1990, p. 4).

Secondly, since the theory incorporates both synchronic and diachronic dynamics of the functioning of the (poly)system, the analysis is necessarily complex and deals with many sources of data. As a result, the theory largely focuses on various observable shifts and points of change within the (poly)system, rather than all inclusive explanations. However, as Even-Zohar (1990) states, this is not to be seen as a disadvantage:

> Admittedly, since handling an open system is more difficult than handling a closed one, the level of exhaustive analysis may be more limited. Perhaps more room will be given to "disorders", and the notion of "the systemic" will no more be erroneously equated with "the systematic"....From the point of view of dynamic systems theory [these are not disadvantages, as they can] account for the functioning of semiotic systems in a specific territory in *time*...i.e. [they account] for the possibility of change and its governing mechanism. (p. 12)

Even-Zohar (1990) cautions, however, that no matter which selected aspect of the functioning of the semiotic system is chosen for study, the application of the Polysystem Theory will be appropriate only if the selected aspect is analyzed and interpreted within the functioning of the whole semiotic system as postulated by the theory:

> ... accepting the framework of Polysystem Theory means accepting a whole theory, that is a network of interdependent hypotheses, not just disparate suggestions or "ideas"....If Polysystem theory is used...within a conceptual framework which identifies [cultural activity] exclusively with its [material] products and does not see the correlation between repertoire and the system, or between production, products, and consumption; or within a framework which assigns notion of "relations"

> to "connections" only (ignoring *dis*connections as a current order) - then Polysystem theory is turned into a partial, feeble, and unhelpful kind of theory. (p. 4-5)

In other words, taking only some concepts developed by the Polysystem theory and applying them outside of the totality of the postulated or hypothesized elements and their interrelations, renders meaningless both the theory and its application. If, for example the canonization of a research model in academic research is identified yet not interpreted within the postulates of the whole theory, if it is instead denounced in a political struggle within the academic discipline in order to assert new areas of research or new research models, then it has little to do with the proper and intended application of this theory. The Polysystem Theory recognizes the process of canonization to be an essential characteristic of the semiotic system, and it considers the study of canonization of both models and products, namely the study of cultural norms and their hierarchy, to lie at the very core of this functional stratification theory (p. 13). In fact, the semiotic system is considered to be properly established only after the canonization of models and products of the cultural activity takes place, and the process of maintaining or usurping the canonized order ensues. In other words, in an appropriate application of Polysystem Theory, past canonized research models in academic research are not denounced, but are studied as an essential part of the dynamics of the semiotic system(s) in question. What Bourdieu (1990) said of sociologists in relation to the social world, is true for the practitioners of all other academic disciplines in relation to the semiotic system(s) or *field(s)* in which they participate:

> Thus, the sociologists words contribute to creating the social world. The social world is more and more inhibited [sic] by reified sociology. The

> sociologists of the future (but it's already true of us) will discover in the reality they study the sedimented products of their predecessors. (p. 54)

I further suggest that this is precisely one of the important new areas of research that Polysystem Theory opens up in textile studies. For example, many socio-cultural and historical studies of textiles are "isomorphic" with research proposed by Polysystem Theory, as they study the dynamics of production, transmission/exchange, and consumption of textiles. However, the importance and the dynamics of struggles within the 'institution' (an aggregate of schools, universities, museums, political and cultural organizations, and media in literate societies) has not been sufficiently examined in relation to production, trade, and consumption of textile products. Namely, it is the 'institution' that largely establishes the hierarchy and eventual canonization of certain models and products, and is later instrumental in either maintaining or subverting such established order in a specified place and time. This is one of the important areas of research that Polysystem Theory opens up, as well as offering already refined constructs or tools for such analyses. To quote Milan Dimić (1993):

> The particularity of the Polysystem Theory is that it uses the study of the social conditioning and manipulation of [products] to describe and explain the evolution and functioning of [cultural activity], as well as its regularities ("laws"), instead of taking [cultural activity] only as one of the elements of society. (p. 155)

Naturally, in such an approach, the products themselves, in this case textile products, are considered to be neither aesthetic creations of individual makers, nor expressions of an integrated culture's world view, but rather "products, with relative merits and functions which depend on many changing factors of social practice" (Dimić, 1993, p. 151).

An Example of the Application of the Polysystem Theory in Textile Studies

As mentioned earlier, the Polysystem Theory has thus far been applied almost exclusively in the study of literature, but it is applicable to the study of other semiotic systems (Even-Zohar, 1990, p.2). In fact, during the 1930s, a member of the Prague School of Structuralism, Petr Bogatyrev, initiated the application of such an approach to the study of folklore. Bogatyrev's work was a precursor to Even-Zohar's theory of dynamic (poly)systems. Unfortunately, this was obscured in the textile literature of the English speaking world by the introduction to the English translation of his book, *The Functions of Folk Costume in Moravian Slovakia* , which places Bogatyrev's work as a precursor to the French structuralism/functionalism, namely the structural anthropology of Levi-Strauss which utilizes Saussure's theory of static systems (Ogibenin, 1971). In the short preface to the translation of his book Bogatyrev distances himself from this interpretation, but does not explain how his approach differs from that of French structuralism.

What Bogatyrev (1937/1971) proposed as a fruitful direction in folk textile research, was to study changes in the *form* of popular folk costume in relation to changes in the *function* of folk costume. He expressed his intentions more explicitly, perhaps, when speaking of folk songs: "One of the urgent tasks...is the study of the musical form of the song in conjunction with the modification of song function. The functions of folk song do not remain fixed any more than do the functions of other social activities." (Bogatyrev, 1936/1976, p. 30). It is obvious in reading his work on folk costumes that his intentions were the same for the study of folk costumes and textiles (Bogatyrev,

1937/1971). Much later, following the art historian Meyer Shapiro, Jane Schneider (1987) proposed more generally that changes in the form and style of clothing and textiles happen in conjunction with changes in their political or economic functions, and often in tandem with transregional shifts in power. The Polysystem Theory in its latest state of development offers a sophisticated tool to pursue this line of thought and research with increased precision and, therefore, better potential for fruitful comparative analysis on a global scale.

In the aforementioned publication, *The Functions of Folk Costumes in Moravian Slovakia*, Bogatyrev (1937/1971) examined various forms and functions of village costumes. The specific question he posed, as a suggestion for future research, was whether the nationalistic function of folk costume "caused an expansion or [a] decline of folk costume [use in rural regions]" (p. 55). I shall utilize the Polysystem Theory to address this question in the case of folk costume in Croatia.

The polysystem approach requires that the dynamics of change in Croatian national costume be initially examined separately from the dynamics of change in rural costume. National costume was a product of the national or folk art polysystem in Croatia, which emerged in the first half of the 19th century within the Croatian National Revival or Illyrian Movement, as part of the Romantic Movement and "awakening" of nations throughout Europe (Bošković-Stulli, 1971; Burke, 1978; Hobsbawm, 1990). At the time, under the influence of the ideas of Herder and German Romanticism, the folk culture of rural populations, in contrast to the elite culture associated with towns and foreign rulers, became a symbol of the emerging national identity. National costume was essentially the costume of the urban elite which incorporated certain elements of the rural costume, notably a coat, "surka", in Croatia (Balog,

1987; Maruševski, 1978; Schneider, 1985). From the end of the 19th century through to the Second World War, this model of urban national costume broadened. It now included new items of urban clothing made in home industries in many rural regions of Croatia, which utilized a broader selection of modified rural textile techniques and stylized designs. Such "primitive" or "folk" style items of clothing and domestic textiles were produced in many home industries in Europe, European colonies, and former colonies during that period. These products were marketed internationally, the consumers being the rapidly growing urban population worldwide.

The whole polysystem of Croatian national or folk arts expanded during that time, especially in the area of clothing and textiles. Rural women, (re)trained in schools, as well as poor women among urban population became the main producers; growing urban populations in Croatia, Europe and the Americas became the consumers; Croatian and international merchants became involved in the marketing of products in shops and on urban trade fairs; and various international and Croatian institutions, such as schools, museums, and media were involved in governing the norms and evaluation of the designs of such products (Chapter VI). Concurrently, a growing number of private collectors and museums were collecting peasant and rural costumes, and in 1886 the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb, Croatia, initiated a systematic study of rural life and culture, including costumes and textiles.

Throughout the 19th and early 20th century there was a certain amount of ambivalence among Croatian elites as to what represented the "true" national costume – the rural costume or the urban national costume (Bošković-Stulli, 1971). This ambivalence was to be resolved during the late 1920s and 1930s, when ethnologists associated with the newly established institutions, the

Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb and Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb, began to dominate the folk art polysystem in Croatia. The canonization of the diffusionist research model within the discipline of ethnology at that time, brought about the canonization of models of national costume: 1) selected older rural (largely peasant) costumes and textiles were canonized as "autochthonous" national textile arts; 2) urban national costume and textile items were classified as "applied" popular arts; and 3) rural costumes and textiles that had changed and incorporated new materials, designs, or patterns were classified as "non-authentic" popular textiles (Chapter VI)

As the century progressed, rural costumes in Croatia changed within their own local costume polysystems (Chapter IV). It can be stated in general terms, that the urban national costume did not directly influence the rural costume, except on the level of textile techniques and certain elements of design which were (re)introduced in a modified form through home industries and school instruction (Bonifačić, 1994; Brenko, 1994). However, from the late 1920s onwards, the interaction between the canonized "authentic" national costume (i. e. older peasant costume styles, at times "purified" by ethnologists) and rural costume became more direct and significant. This was particularly true for those rural regions of Croatia and parts of Bosnia where the Croatian Peasant Party, the main opposition party in the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, was active (Banac, 1984). During the 1920s the Party successfully mobilized rural populations and their votes through an active program carried out by their cultural/educational section, Peasant Unity, which promoted modernization of villages through literacy courses, libraries, lectures, and theater performances. At the same time, they encouraged artistic creations (literature, theater, music, textile crafts) that were based on rural traditions (Leček, 1995).

However, after the assassination of the leader of the Croatian peasant movement, Stjepan Radić, and the introduction of dictatorship rule by the central government, the ideology of Peasant Unity shifted from an openess to the future towards a return to a past, namely towards older "authentic" Croatian national traditions, including costumes and textiles.[1] For example, only those rural groups which performed in "authentic" older style costumes were allowed to participate in numerous organized folk festivals (Sremac, 1978). As well, rural chapters of the Peasant Unity placed significant pressure on women to return to making handmade cloth and older styles of costumes for use in village life and local rituals. The exact impact of these activities on rural costumes requires further research, guided by the above analysis regarding: 1) the relevant period of time and locality where the Peasant Unity was active; and 2) the canonized model of "authentic" national costume for the region that interacted with rural costume repertoire, at the time. These activities were interrupted by the war and the subsequent formation of a socialist Yugoslavia, a subject which is beyond the scope of this paper.

The above discussion is certainly not new to European ethnologists, folklorists, and museologists. During the 1960s, German ethnologists Moser and Bausinger introduced the concepts of "folklore" and "folklorism"[2], and discussed their differing functions and interactions (Bošković-Stuli, 1971). What Polysystem Theory offers to this topic, however, are more sophisticated and precise tools with which to analyze historical changes in the "space and boundaries" of village costume systems and the national costume system, as well as the ability to isolate the manner of their interaction. For the material presented in this paper, such an analysis reveals more specific modes and channels of interactions among various international and Croatian urban and rural social

groups, and therefore delineates their roles on the levels of production, mediation, exchange, and consumption in the historical process of constructing and reconstructing Croatian national costume, in terms of both its form and function. The clarity of analysis is further aided by a number of heuristic constructs developed by the theory and which are referred to in this paper, such as "model", "repertoire" and "canonization".

Application of Polysystem Theory offers new themes for research about Croatian folk textiles. Equally important, it both requires and fosters cooperation among various disciplines, research institutions, and museums – be they ethnographic museums or those that focus on popular or elite culture. In adopting this research model as one of their working paradigms, Croatian ethnologists would be able to explore the imprint of the larger world on the textile heritage of their territory, and, vice versa, articulate the unique place of their textile heritage within a global textile and cultural history.

Notes

1. This was only one among many 20th century political movements which utilized older, handmade textiles as one of the means of mobilizing broad segments of illiterate populations, especially after the introduction of universal suffrage. Perhaps the best known example was Ghandi's use of *khadi* as a means of resistance to the British rule (Bean, 1989).

2. In 1962, Moser broadly defined 'folklorism' as a mediated transfer and 'second hand' presentation of popular folklore. Somewhat later, in 1968, Bausinger further modified that definition by stressing that 'folklorism' is a phenomenon in which "selected aspects of folk culture are taken outside its original context to assume new functions and purposes", thus defining 'folklorism' in terms of its functions (Bošković-Stulli, 1971, p.172).

References

Balog, Zdenko. (1987). Modne slike u Zagrebačkoj "Luni": Počeci modne žurnalistike u Hrvatskoj [Fashion plates in the Zagreb magazine "Luna": The beginnings of fashion journalism in Croatia]. *Život umjetnosti, 41-42,* 15-24.

Banac, Ivo. (1984). *The national question in Yugoslavia: Origins, history, politics.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bean, Susan, S. (1989). Ghandhi and khadi, the fabric of Indian independence. In A. B. Weiner & J. Schneider (Eds.), *Cloth and human experience* (pp. 355-376). Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Bogatyrev, Petr. (1971). *The functions of folk costumes in Moravian Slovakia.* (R. G. Crum, Trans.). The Hague: Mouton. (Original work published in 1937)

Bogatyrev, Petr. (1976). Folk song from a functional point of view (Y.Lockwood, Trans.). In L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik (Eds.), *Semiotics of art: Prague School contributions* (pp.20-32). Cambridge: The Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (Original paper published in 1936)

Bonifačić, Vjera. (1994) Lace production on the island of Pag, Croatia, from 1900 to the present. *Etnološka tribina, 17,* 139-152.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1971). O folklorizmu [About folklorism]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 45,* 165-186.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature.* Columbia University Press.

Brenko, Aida, & Jelavić, Željka. (1994). *Zagrebačke uspomene: Etnografske slike grada* [Zagreb memories: Ethnographic pictures of the city]. Zagreb: Ethnografski Muzej. (Exhibition Catalog)

Burke, Peter. (1978). *Popular culture in early modern Europe.* New York: Harper Row Publishers.

Dimić, Milan V. (1988). Space and boundaries of literature according to Russian Formalism, the Prague School, and the Polysytem Theory. *Proceedings of the XIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association* (pp. 30-35). Munich.

Dimić, Milan, V. (1993). Polysystem theory. In I. R. Makaryk (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of contemporary literary theory* (pp. 151-155). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1990). Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today, 11-1,* 1-253.

Hobsbawm, Eric, J. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leček, Suzana. (1995). Između izvornog i novog - "Seljačka Sloga" do 1929 godine [Between autochthonous and new - "Peasant Concord" until 1929]. *Etnološka tribina, 18,* 103-123.

Maruševski, Olga. (1978). Da nam naše krasne prionu uz naš list...[That our beauties would adhere to our leaf...]. In S. Draganić (Ed.), *Umjetničke znamenitosti Zagreba II* (pp. 73-96). Zagreb: Kajkavsko Spravišče.

Ogibenin, Boris, L. (1971). Petr Bogatyrev and structural ethnography. In P. Bogatyrev, *The functions of folk costumes in Moravian Slovakia.* (pp. 9-32). The Hague: Mouton.

Schneider, Jane. (1987). The anthropology of cloth. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 16,* 409-448.

Schneider, Marijana. (1985). Nošnja Iliraca [Illyrian costume]. In *Hrvatski narodni preporod,1790-1848: Hrvatska u vrijeme Ilirskog pokreta* (pp. 371-379). Zagreb: Muzej za Umjetnost i Obrt. (Exhibition Catalog)

Sremac, Stjepan. (1978). Smotre folklora nekad i danas [Folk festivals in the past and present]. *Narodna umjetnost, 15,* 97-116.

CHAPTER IV
ANTUN RADIĆ AND ETHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH OF CLOTHING AND TEXTILES IN CROATIA: 1896 to 1919

Introduction

The beginnings of ethnological research in Croatia were marked by the work of Antun Radić and his questionnaire for collecting ethnographic data about folk culture of South Slavs. From the 1980s onwards, in the wave of publications concerned with theoretical/methodological issues, Croatian ethnologists have often discussed Radić's initial design for Croatian ethnology from various perspectives (see, for example, Belaj, 1989; Čapo, 1991; Čapo-Žmegač, 1994, 1995; Muraj, 1989; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1987; Supek, 1988). Among them, several publications commented on Radić's conception of culture and folk culture. Rihtman-Auguštin (1987) wrote about Radić's two-tiered model of culture, and about the need to replace the conception of folk culture and elite culture as two separate, closed systems with contemporary models of all cultures as open systems. Muraj (1989) evaluated Radić as anticipating the contemporary concerns of ethnology with people rather than cultural objects, as sensing that folk culture was a dynamic phenomenon, and as having created an open design for ethnological research in which methodologies can be shaped in response to specifically posed research questions. Following Kremenšek (1984),

---

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the conference, "Croatian Ethnology in European Context", held in September of 1995 at the Department of Ethnology, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia. The paper will be published in the Croatian journal *Studia Ethnologica Croatica.*

however, Muraj echoed Rihtman-Auguštin in suggesting that Radić's weakest point as an ethnologist was his view of the subject matter of ethnology. "By limiting the subject matter of ethnological research to peasant culture", Muraj writes, "Radić lost the possibility of grasping the unity of culture, of the functioning of all its mechanisms and their intertwining. In this way he severed connections between "folk" life and the totality of the evolving socio-historical process." (Muraj, 1989, p. 15)

My own close examination of the work of Radić, with a specific focus on the area dealing with clothing and textiles, prompted me to offer a different reading of Radić's conception of folk culture as subject matter for ethnological research. In this chapter I suggest that Radić stressed the difference between folk culture and elite culture only in order to clearly delineate the new area of study. His keen understanding of the scientific method, and the interdisciplinary framework he proposed for Croatian ethnology, both suggest that he did not intend to separate the dynamics of folk culture from those of elite culture. Moreover, in the areas of his questionnaire dealing with clothing and textiles, Radić specifically designed questions that inquired into the ways in which material manifestations of folk culture changed through interactions with the larger socio-cultural processes taking place at the turn of the century. Finally, I shall comment on the relevance of Radić's questions, as well as of the data provided by authors who used his questionnaire, for contemporary research of clothing and textile dynamics in rural areas of Croatia during the late 19th and early 20th century.

Radić's Initial Design and Program of Work for Croatian Ethnology

In the second issue of the first ethnological journal in Croatia, the *Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs*, Antun Radić, the main editor of the journal, published his well known work, "Foundations for Collecting and Interpreting Materials about Folk Life" [Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu] (Radić, 1897). The main portion of this publication consisted of a comprehensive questionnaire for collecting ethnographic data about folk life. In the introductory and closing remarks to the questionnaire, Radić broadly sketched out the initial design and program of work for Croatian ethnology.

In the opening paragraph, Radić clearly delineated what was to be the subject matter and general aims of ethnological study in Croatia: "1) to collect everything possible about folk life of South Slavs; and 2) to scientifically interpret the collected materials" (p. 1). Radić then provided an explanation of the key words in his opening statement: *folk, folk life,* and *scientific method.* He stated that the term *folk* did not signify the whole of a nation, such as Croatian, Serbian, Slovene, or Bulgarian, but only the larger part of each nation which was characterized by *folk culture*, as opposed to the *elite culture* of the same nation. He then defined *culture* as "a way of life" (p. 1). Radić viewed *folk culture*, namely folk life, customs, feelings, knowledge, and beliefs, as different from *elite culture*, the latter being based on a Graeco-Roman-Christian legacy. However, these were not the only differences that separated folk culture from elite culture. According to Radić, the traditional hierarchy between the two

cultures, namely, the assumed superiority of elite culture over folk culture, further deepened the gulf between them.

Radić did not offer any references or sources for his definitions of *folk* and *folk culture*. However, they can be readily traced to the late 18th and early 19th century intellectual developments of Romanticism in German speaking countries. It was the German philosopher, J. G. Herder, who initially sparked the interest of European intellectuals in the non-elite social groups – the 'people' or the 'folk'. It was also Herder who first contrasted 'folk culture' (Kultur des Volkes) with 'learned culture' (Kultur der Gelehrnten). He suggested that folk "manners, customs, observances, superstitions, ballads, proverbs, etc. were all part of a whole [folk culture]" (Burke, 1978, p. 8). As the 19th century progressed, German Romanticism prevailed over the previously dominant ideas of the French Enlightenment in the whole of Europe. By the 1850s, these ideas were already present in the work of the French historian Michelet, whose work later inspired Radić to a great extent (Radić, 1898). It is instructive at this point to quote Fernand Braudel (1969/1980) who wrote on the history of the concepts of *civilization* and *culture* in Europe:

> Culture and civilization were born in France at just about the same time. As far as we know, civilization first appeared in a printed work in 1776....From its inception, it referred to a worldly ideal of intellectual, technological, moral, and social progress. Civilization is "enlightenment"....Thus it can hardly be imagined without a well-bred, well-mannered, and "polite" society to sustain it. Opposed to it stands *barbarity*: it is over this that the former declares a difficult and necessary victory. Between the one and the other there is, in any case, a great gulf fixed.

> Toward 1850, *civilization* (and *culture*) moved from the singular to the plural....Civilizations and cultures in the plural imply the renunciation of a civilization defined as an ideal, or rather as the ideal....The triumphant plural of the nineteenth century is undeniably a sign of new ideas, new ways of thinking – in short, new times.
>
> This triumph, which became more or less clearly defined toward 1850, is visible not only in France but across the whole of Europe. We must not forget, in fact, that the crucial terms like this, and a good many other things, too, are constantly on the move from one language to another, from one author to another. The word is tossed back and forth like a ball, but when it comes back the ball is never quite the same as when it left. Thus, on its way back from Germany – the admirable and much admired Germany of the first half of the nineteenth century – *culture* arrived in France with a whole new meaning and prestige. Immediately, this modest secondary term became, or attempted to become, the dominant word in Western thought. (pp. 180-181)

German Romanticism, then, brought about a whole new view of man and his institutions among European intellectuals, a new notion of history; it viewed all social and cultural phenomena, all categories, truths, and values, as relative and historically determined. Towards the end of the 19th century, this view led to the establishment of the new disciplines of anthropology, folklore studies, and ethnology in Europe; scholarly disciplines whose mandate was to study European non-elite cultures and non-European cultures.

I tend to consider that the stress Radić placed on the division between folk culture and elite culture was meant to assert this new definition of culture, or cultures in the plural. Radić was also stressing the need to study and evaluate

these cultures in their own right, and within the parameters of their own historical circumstances. He defined the particular folk culture to be studied as the rural (at the time predominantly peasant) culture of South Slavs. The approach Radić took to initiate such a study by using a questionnaire to document the totality of folk culture, with regards to its material, social and spiritual aspects, was again the product of the time. Similar questionnaires were used in other European countries (Yoder, 1990), although Radić was praised for having created a particularly good one. Most of the ideas and procedures I have described thus far in regards to Radić's design for Croatian ethnology were already well established, and not original ones. In Fernand Braudel's words, they were tossed to Radić like a ball, and I shall now examine how this ball changed when it left his hands.

Where Radić did distinguish himself as an independent thinker, was in his keen understanding of the scientific method for studying cultural phenomena, and in his (not unrelated) grasp of the appropriate theoretical/methodological approaches for studying European rural cultures. He explicitly stated that the initial stage of collecting data using his questionnaire was not yet a science, and was only a necessary step that would allow scientific interpretation at a later stage. He proposed this stage of scientific interpretation of data as the aim of Croatian ethnology, more specifically to interpret the spiritual life of people in relation to the material circumstances in which they live, and to further "compare life, customs, and beliefs of all peoples, and to find general laws according to which people live and think...(as well as) find causes of such laws" (1897, p. 10).

Radić distinguished between scientific endeavor and engagement in society, and stated that ethnology as a science should not serve either religious (1897, p. 9) or political ideologies (1896, p. 362). In a review article in the same

issue of the journal, Radić (1896) repeated in more detail that scientific research should not have a direct pragmatic purpose, either philanthropic, political, or economic, but must be detached and satisfied with the answers to the questions as to *how* and *why* (pp. 319-320). Only in the long run did Radić hope that results of scientific research would bring about leveling of cultures (1897, p 10).

When it comes to theories and methodologies for studying and interpreting folk culture, Radić understood that ethnology was not simply another specialized discipline, focusing on let us say music instead of literature. It was a discipline, he proposed, which needed to employ theories and methodologies from other existing disciplines in order to study all of the aspects of folk culture. Not surprisingly, with his firm conviction that cultures are equal and function according to the same laws, Radić rejected the evolutionist theories that preoccupied some of his contemporaries, as Muraj (1989) and Belaj (1989) have already noted. Instead, in a remarkable statement for his time, he proposed that theories and methodologies for studying folk culture should not differ in principle from those used for studying elite culture (Radić, 1897, p. 86). Perhaps we can better appreciate such a statement today, almost 100 years later, not only with regards to evolutionist theories which were abandoned long ago, but also with regards to other theories, such as French structuralism, that were later designed to study the so called "traditional" or "cold" societies and cultures as closed systems. Today, there is a general trend among disciplines to study all cultures as historical, dynamic, and open systems which, coupled with related interdisciplinary dialogue and exchange of research models, theories, and methodologies, makes for the kind of research which I think Radić, as ethnologist, would have welcomed.

This brings us to the next topic in which sections of Radić's questionnaire that deal with clothing and textiles will be examined. They will show that Radić indeed conceived of folk or peasant culture as an open system in interaction with elite culture and larger socio-historical processes, and that Radić considered such processes to be a valid subject of ethnological research.

The Analysis of Radić's Questionnaire in the Domain of Clothing and Textiles

Clothing and textiles as material culture are becoming increasingly recognized as a unique and potent index of human culture and history (Schevill, 1991, Schneider, 1987; Weiner & Schneider, 1989). In Eastern Europe, in the late 19th and early 20th century, for example, as Bogatyrev (1937/1971) has described for Moravian Slovakia, clothing served many functions in the social organization of rural life. What is unique to clothing as material culture is that it is constantly displayed socially, and that it is capable and suitable for signifying both individual and group norms and identities. As well, even though clothing is reasonably durable, it has a much faster turnover in terms of production and consumption, and consequently a much more dynamic vocabulary, than, let us say, architecture does. In other words, it is easier to change clothing to signal changes in terms of individual or group status, wealth, age, or various identities, than to convey these messages through changes in family dwelling. As a result, it is also easier to observe changes in the collective manner of dressing on a generational scale of time, than it is in architecture, where homes often serve more than one generation. It has been noticed all along that aspects of clothing styles in terms of material characteristics (such as fibers, yarns, technologies and

techniques of production, decorative techniques, ornamentation, tailoring patterns, colors), as well as in terms of their functions, have changed frequently in rural areas of Croatia during the 19th and 20th centuries . In fact, these changes were often decried by those in more powerful social positions (which incidentally at later times included ethnologists) on either moral, economic, ideological, or aesthetic grounds. Nevertheless, changes in clothing and textiles and their functions continued to take place, and they are some of the most visible indicators of the transformations of rural communities in Croatia throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.

When reading the different sections of Radić's questionnaire, I found that he inquired in a very straightforward, deliberate, and extensive manner not only about how textiles and clothing were made and used in rural areas, but also about changes in both style and function of clothing and textiles that were taking place at the time. For example, on the level of production, he inquired not only about production of handmade yarns, textiles, and clothing in individual homes, but also about craftsmen who made clothing and textiles commercially, about their training, and even whether either craftsmen or buyers determined how clothing was to be made (Radić, 1897, p. 23).

On the level of exchange of textiles, he inquired about shops that sold factory yarns, cloth or ready made clothing (by asking for the specific location and names of shops and merchants), and about merchants who sold textiles and ready made clothing at local and regional fairs. As well, he inquired about textile trading by local craftsmen, and even about textiles made for sale by women in the community (p. 23). For example, in the appendix[1] to the section on clothing and footwear he asks:

2) *Is home made clothing sold?* Do women sell it to each other, or do people from outside buy it? How much would each piece cost, if it was sold?

...

5) *Purchased clothing.* Where do people buy clothing that is not made at home? Where have craftsmen who make folk clothing learned their craft? Can anything be said about the following: do craftsmen make what people like, or do women or people accept what the craftsmen make and how they make it? (p. 23)

The local exchange of textiles as gifts at occasions of birth, marriage, and death was covered in different sections of the questionnaire. Again, Radić asked ethnographers to record things as they were, rather than only as they ought to have been, or "traditionally" had been.

On the level of consumption of clothing, Radić considered it important to record differences in clothing according to gender, age, social status, profession or occupation, special occasion in individual's life cycle, special occasion in the yearly cycle of community life, private or public space, and by region. Again, Radić did not give instructions to record only how "traditional" folk clothing and textiles were used. Instead, he also wanted to record how new types of clothing and textiles were used at the time to signify, for example, differentiation in social identities and social status within the community, or serve other practical and social functions. This emphasis is evident even from the fact that the general section of the questionnaire devoted to consumption of textiles is simply entitled "Clothing and Footwear" rather than "Folk Clothing and Footwear" (pp. 22-23). It is made even more explicit by additional questions he placed in the appendix to this section:

3) *Older style clothing.* Does anyone remember if clothing was different in the past? Does anyone have such clothing? Why do people think clothing changed? (Is new clothing more beautiful, more practical, or cheaper?)

4) *Why is folk clothing disappearing?* Is folk clothing disappearing in that region? Is it because of poverty, savings, vicinity of towns, (why people like - if they like - town dress: because they think it more beautiful or because it is cheaper?), influence of the local elite (male teacher, female teacher, priest), laws about soaking of flax and hemp fibers? (p. 23)

Importantly, Radić did not inquire only about clothing and textiles of peasants who owned land in the given village or region. In the section entitled Life According to Profession and Wealth (pp. 38-40), he inquired about differences in clothing styles both by profession and by wealth (shepherds, local craftsmen, merchants, healers, musicians, the poor without land or profession, servants, beggars, gypsies, elite, and emigrants), that is, all the people who lived or participated in the life of the specified rural community or region.

The consistency and the manner of questioning about changes in cloth production, exchange, and consumption, indicate that Radić considered such information important and indicative of the realities of rural life, rather than a negative phenomenon that was destroying the "true" traditional folk culture. The answers that different authors provided to such questions varied, of course, both in terms of quantity and quality. The monograph on Otok, by Josip Lovretić (1990), stands out as particularly rich in materials on clothing and textiles and their changes. It was also the first monograph that was published in installments between 1897 and 1918 in the newly founded journal, the *Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs.* The surviving correspondence

between Lovretić and Radić shows that Lovretić collected most of the data on Otok prior to the publication of Radić's questionnaire, and later only arranged them to correspond to the questionnaire for the publication. Svirac (1984) suggested that Radić formulated some of his questions on the basis of materials that Lovretić already prepared for his monograph. This is particularly likely in the area of clothing and textiles where Radić's questions and Lovretić's answers indeed correspond rather closely. Josip Lovretić was insightful in engaging his mother and other women as informants in the domain of textiles. As well, as a priest, he had ample insight into how clothing functioned in rural life, and considerable power to set the rules on dress codes for various church ceremonies. Later correspondence by Lovretić suggests, however, that while he was well aware of changes in clothing styles, he disapproved of them and actively tried to enforce what he considered to be "traditional" handmade folk costumes for use at least in church ceremonies (Svirac, 1984, p. 121). Radić, on the contrary, asked questions about the changes in rural textiles, as well as the mechanisms of those changes, in a much more detached and deliberate way. I tend to think that Radić considered changes in the production, exchange and consumption patterns of clothing and textiles to be indicators of change in local life of communities and useful for future comparisons among different regions, namely as important data indicative of the mechanisms of transformation of "folk" or rural culture at the turn of the century. The answers that selected authors provided to such questions will be analyzed in the next section.

Nine Monographs Based on Radić's Questionnaire: Textile Dynamics in Croatia at the Turn of the 20th Century

As Muraj (1989) noted in her work on rural architecture, among the monographs that were published between 1896 and 1919 in the *Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs*, nine can be singled out as being more complete applications of Radić's questionnaire for the territory of Croatia. These are: "Otok" by Josip Lovretić (1990, original publication 1897-1918); "Trebarjevo" by Kata Jajnčerova (1898); "Vrbnik" on the island of Krk by Ivan Žic (1901); "Bukovica" by Vladimir Ardalić (1899); "Polica" by Frane Ivanišević (1903); "Prigorje" by Vatroslav Rožić (1907); "Samobor" by Milan Lang (1911, 1912); "Lobor" by Josip Kotarski (1915, 1916); and "Varoš" by Luka Lukić (1919).

Muraj (1989) also reports that even though the monographs were published between 1897 and 1919, the actual ethnographic data were collected either shortly before or after the questionnaire was published, so that the materials are comparable in terms of being related to the time period of the late 19th and the first few years of the 20th century (p. 19). At the same time, the nine monographs cover various regions of Croatia, from north-eastern Slavonia (Otok, Varoš) and Posavina (Trebarjevo) to the central north-western region (Lobor, Samobor, and Prigorje), down to the island of Krk (Vrbnik) and more southern parts of the coastal and inland Dalmatia (Polica, Bukovica). The monographs also differ by the type of community they describe: Otok, Trebarjevo, and Varoš describe only one village; Lobor, Bukovica, Polica, and Prigorje describe a group of villages usually overlapping with borders of a parish; and finally Vrbnik and Samobor describe rural towns.

Radić required that only local people who were either born or lived for a long time in the community or region collect data about local life. Since they obviously needed to be literate, all of the authors except Kata Jajnčerova, the sister of Antun Radić, were men. None of them had any training as ethnologist, and their professions differed: Jajnčerova and Ardalić were peasants; Žic, Lukić, and Lang were teachers; Rožić was a professor; and Lovretić, Ivanišević, and Kotarski were priests. Their profession quite obviously influenced the manner in which they responded to Radić's questionnaire. In the sections dealing with textiles, for example, Jajnčerova, a literate but unschooled woman, gave a fascinating subjective account of an insider very much aware of interpersonal conflicts and pressures regarding clothing in a very closed community and family life, but did not offer more general or objective observations. The male teachers responded in the opposite way: they answered in a clear and objective manner about the material, technical, and visual characteristics of textile objects, and recorded general observations about textile trade, but commented much less on how textiles functioned in local life. The priests were by far the most informed and perceptive about importance of textiles in the social organization of local life, but had the point of view of an insider in a more powerful social position within the community. As I mentioned earlier, this comes as no surprise since priests had the power to set dress codes for many vital social rituals and ceremonies, and could try to impose standards of appropriate clothing for women on moral, economic, or even aesthetic grounds. Thus the monograph on Otok by Josip Lovretić, and on Polica by Frano Ivanišević stand out as the most valuable in that particular aspect. Kotarski, although a priest, had a style of writing that was sparse and therefore less informative. It must also be mentioned that both Lovretić and Ivanišević were the two authors who made the most

consistent use of other informants in their communities, including their mothers and other women whom they consulted regarding information on textiles.

Since clothing and textile vocabulary was quite complex and changing at the turn of the century, it remains to be determined through further research how accurately these nine authors portrayed various aspects of production, exchange, and consumption of textiles in their specified regions. It appears that even though Radić formulated his questions in such a way that he wanted them to record all types of clothing and textiles used in their communities at the time, some authors nevertheless devoted more attention to the handmade textiles. However, this analysis is not concerned with the absolute measure of factual reliability of their reports. Instead, the intention of this analysis is to point out some aspects of textile dynamics in Croatia at the turn of this century that are clearly apparent from all of the nine monographs, and highlight other aspects that are mentioned for some regions and are likely worthy of further comparative investigation.

The monographs will be first analyzed for the data indicative of continuity and change in various aspects of production and exchange of textiles at the turn of the century. For example, what kind of fibers, yarns, types of cloth, decorative techniques were still used, and what kinds of tailoring and sewing of clothing and domestic textiles were still done in individual households? Secondly, what kinds of fibers, yarns, woven cloth, and ready made clothing were purchased from village or town stores, at local fairs, or from other tradesmen, and which services were used or commissioned from local or town craftsmen? Following that, the monographs will be examined for evidence of how changes in production and exchange of textiles manifested themselves on the level of consumption of textiles within the described communities.

In his monograph on the Slavonian village Otok, Lovretić (1897-1918/1990) writes that due to the lack of available wool, as well as the time consuming process of dyeing wool at home, women turned to buying woolen yarn or having their own wool dyed by professional dyers in bright aniline colours (p. 103). State regulations regarding soaking of hemp and flax, and the lack of needed time, Lovretić writes, forced women to switch to using industrial cotton yarn to weave certain parts of women's and men's clothing and domestic textiles (p. 104). It is also obvious from the descriptions of clothing that women in Otok and the surrounding villages bought industrially woven silk, cotton, flax, and woolen cloth to make different parts or types of clothing, as well as golden, white, or coloured yarns for decorating their clothing with various types of embroidery (pp. 69-90). Lovretić reports that female school teachers did not teach new embroidery techniques since "every peasant girl knows ten times better how to embroider than any village teacher" but he adds that they teach children how to "knit socks, macramé, crocheting, and all kinds of similar work....that is of no use to children" (107). Lukić (1919) describes a very similar picture in Vароš, another village in Slavonia, where women were still making some fibers, yarns, and woven cloth on their own, but were increasingly replacing them with purchased handwoven cloth or industrially made materials. Consequently, young girls devoted most of their time to decorate clothing and domestic textiles with post-loom types of decorations such as embroideries and crocheting. Both Lovretić and Lukić report that girls and older women in Otok and Vароš knew how to sew needed clothing, but local and town seamstresses were also used, especially for more fashionable types of outfits. Some parts of male clothing were made by women at home, but others such as hats, scarves,

and decorated sheepskin vests and coats, were purchased from local or town craftsmen (Lukić, 1919, pp. 84-87).

As I mentioned earlier, Jajnčerova's account of Trebarjevo in Posavina is quite different in focus, and she does not explicitly talk about production or exchange of textiles. However, her description of clothing suggests that at the turn of the century women still made most of the needed flax and hemp fibers and yarns, wove plain and loom decorated cloth, and sewed clothing and domestic textiles in individual households. Jajnčerova (1898) mentions, however, that younger men did not want to wear trousers made out of handwoven white linen cloth, but wanted to buy pants made out of industrially made cloth; in contrast to this, she writes that "...old men - they do not want to leave their costume, they wear white, and only white" (p. 127). In her written account, Jajnčerova suggests that women used only handmade linen cloth (plain for everyday use and decorated for festive occasions) for their clothing. However, some of the accompanying photographs show women wearing short tailored blouses and coats made from industrially made cloth (pp. 127, 129, 130). Obviously, even though new industrial materials and styles of tailoring were also beginning to be used in women's clothing in Trebarjevo, Jajnčerova focused more on handmade clothing which she considered to be the "true" folk clothing for women.

In the north-western part of Croatia, Kotarski and Rožić offer a different picture for their respective regions of Lobor and Prigorje. Their monographs suggest that, in these regions, both men's and women's clothing was simpler in decorative elaboration, as well as in terms of variety of different outfits used for different occasions. Both Kotarski and Rožić report that men were largely wearing town-style clothing made from industrial cloth that was either sewn by

tailors, or purchased second hand in nearby towns (Kotarski, 1915, p. 84; Rožić, 1907, 109-112). In contrast to Slavonia and Posavina where women wore markedly different outfits depending on their age, Kotarski and Rožić report that in their parishes women of all ages wore the same outfits except for the way they covered their heads, marking in this minimal manner their status as a young girl, a marriageable girl, a young married woman, or an old woman past the childbearing age. For festive clothing, women wore simple white outfits made from either homegrown flax, homegrown hemp, or purchased white cotton cloth which they decorated with white embroidery, while their daily clothing was even simpler (Kotarski, 1915, p.83; Rožić, 1907, pp. 112-115). This is how Rožić describes women from Prigorje in festive clothing:

> It is lovely to see women returning from church service on Sunday, all in snow white outfits, except for a scarf on their head and a belt around their waist, all the rest is white like they were fairies. (p. 117)

It is possible that to Rožić women's outfits appeared "the same" because they were white, but that they differed in more subtle ways among women of differing age. Nevertheless, on the whole, differences were less noticeable and women's clothing repertoire was simpler as compared to other regions.

The monograph by Milan Lang on Samobor offers interesting information about textile dynamics within a rural town, along with its interaction with the surrounding villages. Samobor was a small rural town in 1900 with a population of 2,783. It was an old trading center dating back to the 1200s with a long tradition of textile craft production in small, family type workshops. When describing clothing and textiles used in the town itself, Lang refers mostly to the non-elite part of population. He distinguishes between white clothing [rublje] and outer clothing [oprava]. White clothing was made

out of flax, cotton, or more rarely hemp cloth which women in Samobor had previously made on their own, but which at the turn of the century was exclusively purchased in stores or from professional weavers. Clothing made from white cloth "is all cut and sewn at home; if that is not possible then it is given to a seamstress, or a seamstress comes to individual homes to sew what is needed" (Lang, 1911, p. 161). About decorative techniques used to decorate white clothing Lang (1912) writes:

> ...the most widespread is embroidery. It is still done today, but not as much as in the past. With extraordinary diligence and great skill some women and young girls used to adorn their underskirts, finer scarves, [regular] scarves, and others....Especially finer scarves used to be beautifully embroidered with cutwork....They say that [some embroidery skills] were difficult to acquire, and not many women could master them. Women largely learned from each other, while tending animals in the fields, or at home. Some women still like to adorn their clothing, as well as other textiles that are used in home, but now it is mostly done with modern type of ornamentation. (p. 48).

The remaining outer clothing was made out of industrially woven woolen or cotton cloth or from fur. Lang (1911) writes:

> [Outer clothing] is cut and sewn by tailors, women seamstresses or furriers. Not long ago there were no seamstresses, instead tailors made women's and men's coats. Today there are all kinds of better or poorer quality seamstresses who sew women's clothing. Better seamstresses sew for ladies, and poorer ones sew for simpler folk. Still, girls and women sew some of their own simpler clothing. If some of them do not know how to

cut, they give it to a seamstress or a neighbor to cut, and then sew it by themselves. Sewing is mostly done by hand, but also by machine. (p.162)

Lang (1912) devotes another whole section to various craftsmen with a long tradition in Samobor, describing the work processes involved in each trade, tools, manner of apprenticeship, types of products, and marketing of products (pp. 48-99). He writes that the numbers of some traditional professional textile craftsmen were in decline; for example, only two out of eight furriers were still in business; two out of twelve hat makers; eleven out of previously many more professional weavers (weavers did not market their products but wove only on commission); one out of three textile accessories makers (of ribbons, various decorative cords and braids, tassels, decorative buttons made out of cords); tailors, by contrast, were on the increase making a total of ten, six of whom served the town's elite, while other tailors made clothing for poorer town customers or made cheap ready-made clothing that was sold in stores. Some tailors specialized in making men's and women's vests for peasants in surrounding villages, while an increasing number of women seamstresses made women's clothing.

The situation along the Adriatic coast and among the islands was again markedly different. It should be mentioned here that in the continental parts of Croatia at the turn of the century many rural households still had weaving looms, and women had weaving skills even if they no longer wove all of the needed cloth. Along the coast, however, purchasing woven cloth for the needs of individual households had been practiced much longer. By the turn of the century, relatively few professional weavers still had looms and they made woolen cloth on commission for others in the community. Otherwise, individual households no longer had looms. Increasingly, industrially made cloth was

purchased in stores. In the rural town of Vrbnik on the island of Krk, Žic (1901) describes how women even now made some of their own woolen yarn, but purchased all other industrially made textile yarns and woven cloth for making clothing and domestic textiles. Žic does not mention who tailored men's or women's clothing.

For the more inland and isolated region in north Dalmatia, Bukovica, Ardalić offers little information about textile production, but the photographs accompanying his article suggest that in this region women at home still produced most of the textile fibers, yarns, and cloth, as well as decorating and sewing clothing in the traditional manner.

Ivanišević (1903) writes that further south along the coast, in Polica, some wool was yet processed, handspun, and woven at home, but increasingly industrially woven cloth was purchased in stores in the nearby towns of Split and Sinj (p. 336). Much of the sewing and decoration of clothing were done in individual households. When it comes to decorations of women's clothing, Ivanišević writes that female teachers in elementary schools "started to introduce new types of embroidery and jewelry, so that some local women want to dress like the elite" (p. 336). On the whole, he writes, "almost all of the women cut, sew and decorate their clothing, which they learn from each other at home, or while tending sheep, and lately in elementary schools" (p. 336). In some villages nearer the coast, Ivanišević writes that women adopted "....new fashion that came from the town of Split....On holidays they dress up only in new fashion, and for everyday clothing they mix old and new type of clothing" (Ivanišević, 1903, p. 326). When it comes to the tailoring of men's clothing, specialized production of professionally crafted men's vests and jackets adorned with metal decorations and decoratively applied silk cords was declining due to

the high cost of such items and changing fashions. Instead, Ivanišević writes that "both everyday and festive clothing is made by tailors in towns, although there are local tailors who also know how to cut and sew [men's clothing]" (p. 333). In some villages, "...as in Jesenice, tailors from outside come to the village and sew in villagers homes" (p.336).

It is clearly apparent from the nine monographs that in most of the rural regions in Croatia the industrially made fibers, yarns, and industrially woven cloth were increasingly replacing home grown and hand processed fibers, hand spun and hand dyed yarns, and handwoven cloth. Not unrelatedly, women increasingly decorated festive clothing and domestic textiles with post-loom types of decorations, especially embroidery, and gradually adopted more tailored styles of dress. As Lovretić and Ivanišević noted, these changes were reinforced through schools in rural areas, where girls were taught new types of decorative textile techniques and tailoring. Professional tailoring services were increasingly used, while, at the same time, more traditional types of textile craftsmanship were in decline.

These changes in patterns of textile production and exchange were obviously related to larger social and economic transformations that were taking place in Croatia and Dalmatia at the time. At the turn of the century, Croatia and Dalmatia were poor and underdeveloped provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Most of the rural regions were only beginning to transform from what Fernand Braudel (1977) called the "material life" of self-sufficiency and elementary forms of local market exchange, to "economic life" of international market exchange. This transformation began earlier in the 19th century in those regions of Croatia which became open to forest and mineral exploitation, and through export of grain surpluses in Slavonia and shipbuilding and wine trade

along the Dalmatian coast (Foretić, 1969; Matković, 1964). This process gradually spread to other regions after the dissolution of the feudal order in 1854, which further resulted in the gradual breakup of extended family households, partitioning of land, and changes in family economy and family division of labour (Despalatović, 1981).

In some regions these changes freed women to turn to home entrepreneurship, often in the form of some kind of textile production. Authors of monographs occasionally mentioned local seamstresses, but failed to mention that women in rural areas also engaged in textile craftsmanship and trade for town consumption. As I mentioned earlier, in his questionnaire, Radić explicitly asked his respondents to record such trade (Radić, 1897, p. 23). While it is true that women's trade was perhaps less visible since women worked at home, it is also likely that authors of monographs did not mention this labour because of the prevailing attitude of undervaluing women's entrepreneurial work. However, this phenomenon was not insignificant at the time, and certainly deserves further research. For example, Supek (in press) recently suggested that this work was varied and significant in Slavonia:

> By the second half of the 19th c. many women were not just processing silk, weaving, embroidering, crocheting and sewing for their less skilled village neighbors. Rather, a full scale cottage industry was set up in many places. Some women specialized in working at home, while others specialized in marketing the products for profit in booming urban centers where folk art became a respected and fashionable commodity.

As well, patterns of textile consumption were changing in rural Croatia at the turn of the century. For some regions, most notably Slavonia, the social and economic transformation resulted in a certain measure of prosperity and

subsequent increase in conspicuous consumption of textiles, as can be discerned from monographs on Otok and Varoš in Slavonia by Lovretić and Lukić. The conspicuous consumption of textiles was especially pronounced among girls of marriageable age, and Supek (in press) suggests that mothers invested most of their earnings from their entrepreneurial activities into preparations for their young daughters' dresses and textiles in dowry, in order to improve their marriage prospects. At the turn of the century, it was a community regulated custom in many parts of Slavonia for young girls to display costly and elaborately decorated clothing during the years before marriage.

However, local priests often tried to influence what the girls could wear to church, discouraging expensive outfits and town style clothing on economic and moral grounds. Lovretić (1897-1918/1990), writes, for example:

> I once asked women from Komletinci why they buy town-style skirts, *rekle*, because I was sorry that women from Otok were beginning to imitate them. They tell me: our priest forbade us to embroider skirts with gold, and that is the best outfit, so then we decided to wear new styles. (p.108)

Lovretić (1897-1918/1990) further mentions changes in clothing that the next priest who came to the same village of Komletinci introduced: he promised young girls they could come to church without covering their head, if they made and wore outfits decorated with folk type embroideries:

> But the new priest, Stručić, helped the folk costume in Komletinci as nobody has done so far. He collected over sixty samples of folk embroideries from...[other villages] that Komletinci did not even previously have...and he ordered that the first time girls dress up they...must have the top embroidered with such red and blue

ornaments....Now that folk costume is in decline, it is simply miraculous what a single word by that priest could achieve in no time at all, in two years. (p. 108)

The new priest might have perceived the local versions of town style fashions as symbols of town values, and therefore discouraged them on moral grounds. It is also likely, however, that he perceived local clothing styles as "vulgar" imitations of the elite arts, which were aesthetically inferior to the older peasant folk arts. Obviously, Lovretić considered it desirable to "preserve" older styles of clothing and textiles in active use.

Such attitude was common among the Croatian elite at that time. Aside from collecting rural textiles to preserve them as Croatian folk arts in museums, the Croatian elite also promoted its application in urban and rural life, even though they did not always agree of what constituted the "true" Croatian folk arts (Chapter VI). Women within rural communities did not share such aesthetic preoccupations. Therefore, while at times they complied with some of the priests' rules or suggestions about the way they should dress, they also resisted them in different ways. Priests, too, were at times aware that styles of girls' clothing were not only expressions of personal vanity, but also related to their marriage prospects and marriage strategies. Thus Lovretić (1897-1918/1990) writes about girls who hoped to marry craftsmen in their village or in nearby towns:

> That folk clothing is in decline is often the fault of women married to professional craftsmen in the village. Then, there are those ladies that used to be peasants. Some of them want to behave like the elite, and they are ashamed to even mention they were once peasants....If they have among their relatives a girl who does not want to marry a peasant, she prepares clothing that she will need later on, and makes only as much of

> folk clothing as she has to wear in order to hide her intentions in public. This is why the wealthiest girls in the village are likely to be the worst dressed....A peasant girl is happy to listen to such women knowing that she, too, was once a peasant girl...and this is the beginning of decline in use of folk costume. (pp. 106-107)

Girls who hoped to marry men from other villages had different strategies, and at times even reverted to older style clothing, as Lovretić writes:

> People from Komletinci and Nimci are intermarrying, and this is why clothing in Komletinci is getting more colourful. From there it comes to Otok, but Otok prefers to marry into Privlaka, and people from Privlaka are proud of their clothing and look down upon new fashions. A woman from Otok is happy if a man from Privlaka would ask her, so like it or not, she tries to please them, and this is how folk costume is being preserved to a certain extent. (p. 109).

In many other rural regions in Croatia the change to market economy did not bring prosperity, but instead resulted in even greater poverty and a large decrease in consumption of clothing and textiles for the majority of population. For example, when describing his parish of Lobor, Kotarski (1916) writes: "...wherever you turn, you find poor people everywhere, and if a stranger came to our village, he would say: almost everyone is poor!" (p. 73). Kotarski also states that, in Lobor, the majority of men could only afford to buy cheap second hand clothing from the nearby towns; if women had clothing made out of cheap industrial cloth, it was also a sign of poverty (p. 73).

In many regions the change to market economy also resulted in emigration of men and young people from villages to towns and cities. For example, poorer men who went to towns seeking seasonal employment or

young girls who went to serve as servants, often brought town styles of clothing back to the village. On the other hand, for village or rural town shopkeepers and their wives, new styles of clothing became a symbol of social status. For the case of Polica in Dalmatia, Ivanišević (1903) writes:

> Since young men go to the monarch's army, since people go out to the world and are mixing among other communities, they always bring to their village some new ways or adornment, and then others, men and women alike, wants to wear the same. Before our people stayed home, they rarely went to cities or other towns...but today everyone is mixing (p. 336).

On the whole, changes in consumption of textiles reflected changes in local conditions, as well as strategies of people in a local community to adjust to these new conditions. The quantity and quality of textiles young girls could prepare as part of their dowry signified changing fortunes among rural families. On the other side, qualitative differences in men's and women's clothing in terms of materials used, decorations, and styles of tailoring, as well as new social rules about their appropriate use, signified the emergence of new occupations and professions, or, in other words, new patterns of social stratification among members of rural towns or villages.

Conclusion

Radić's questionnaire and the data that were collected on its basis in nine monographs between 1896 and 1919, offer much insight and information about changes in clothing and textile styles and functions during that period; certainly more so than they do about changes in other manifestations of folk culture, such

as dance, music, or literature. Paradoxically, in the past few decades, Croatian folklorists and ethnologists who focused on literature, dance and music began to explore changes in the types and styles of dance, music, and literature, in relation to changes in their social functions during the 19th and 20th century. On the other hand, in the research of folk textiles, the diffusionist research model gradually began to prevail from the 1930's onwards, and it remained the dominant model in Croatian ethnological study of textiles to this day. This model asked a completely different set of questions – diffusionists inquired about origins and transmission of cultural forms that were evident in older, largely handmade, textiles. However, as Wolf (1982) noted, diffusionists "omitted any interest in the ecological, economic, social, political, and ideological matrix within which the cultural forms were being transmitted in time and space" (p.15). Of course, many Croatian publications, too numerous to cite here, continued to document certain historical aspects of production, exchange, and consumption of clothing and textiles, including their change. But the inquiry into the processes and mechanisms of the aforementioned change has not yet begun as a larger program and collective effort in Croatian ethnological research of clothing and textiles.

The early design of ethnological research initiated by Antun Radić, and the data collected in early monographs based on his questionnaire, prepared a solid basis and a valuable source of information for inquiries into cloth dynamics in rural Croatia during the late 19th and early 20th century. For example, these monographs identified several macro–phenomena that need to be taken into account for the whole territory of Croatia, these being various forms of textile trade, and the introduction of schools in rural areas, through which new textile materials, technologies, techniques, decorative designs, and types of tailoring

were introduced to local communities. On the local scale, the aforementioned authors described directly or indirectly how local politics manifested itself through changes in clothing and textiles. For example, their work indicates that further explorations of cloth dynamics on the scale of the community will need to take into account: 1) women's marriage strategies; 2) the role of the church (and where relevant other institutions or associations) in the social organization of community life; and 3) changes in village economics, which resulted in either conspicuous consumption of textiles or lack of adequate clothing, as well as differentiation in types of dress among families of differing wealth or occupation. Once Croatian ethnologists begin to systematically explore cloth dynamics within the socio-historical context[2], the collected ethnographic data from the turn of this century based on Radić's questionnaire will be revived and used in a new perspective. These data will become both a valuable source of information, as well as a guide for further explorations of relevant macro processes for the territory of Croatia, micro studies of selected communities or regions, and their interactions.

Notes

1. It is safe to assume that Radić formulated these questions by himself, since he placed them in the appendix to the section on clothing and textiles.

2. The contemporary theoretical models specifically designed to study cultural dynamics within the socio-historical context are Even-Zohar's Polysystem Theory (Even-Zohar, 1990) and Bourdieu's sociological model of the *field* of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1980/1990a, 1990b).

References

Ardalić, Vladimir. (1900). Bukovica: Narodni život i običaji [Bukovica: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 5*, 1-50.

Belaj, Vitomir. (1989). Plaidoyer za etnologiju kao historijsku znanost o etničkim skupinama [A case for ethnology as a historical science of ethnic groups]. *Studia ethnologica, 1*, 9-17.

Bogatyrev, Petr. (1971). *The functions of folk costumes in Moravian Slovakia.* (R. G. Crum, Trans.). The Hague: Mouton. (Original work published in 1937)

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990a). *The logic of practice.* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press. (Original work published 1980)

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990b). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Braudel, Fernand. (1977). *Afterthoughts on material civilization and capitalism.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Braudel, Fernand. (1980). *On history* (S. Matthews, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1969)

Burke, Peter. (1978). *Popular culture in early modern Europe.* New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Čapo, Jasna. (1991). Croatian ethnology, the science of peoples or the science of culture?. *Studia ethnologica, 3*, 7-25.

Čapo-Žmegač, Jasna. (1994). Plaidoyer za istraživanje (nacionalnog) identiteta u Hrvatskoj etnologiji [A case for studying (national) identity in Croatian ethnology]. *Etnološka tribina, 17*, 7-23.

Čapo-Žmegac, Jasna. (1995). Two scientific paradigms in Croatian ethnology: Antun Radić and Milovan Gavazzi. *Narodna umjetnost, 32*, 25-38.

Despalatović, Elinor, M. (1981). Preface. In J. M. Halpern & E. M. Despalatović (Eds.), *How the people live: Life in the passive regions (Peasant life in Southwestern Croatia, Bosnia, and Hercegovina; Yugoslavia in 1935)* (pp. 1-22). (Research Report No. 21). Amherst: University of Massachutes, Department of Anthropology.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1990). Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today, 11-1*, 1-253.

Foretić, D. (1969). O ekonomskim prilikama u Dalmaciji u drugoj polovici XIX stoljeća do prvog svjetskog rata [On economic conditions in Dalmatia in the second half of the 19th century until World War One]. In: J. Ravlić (ed.), *Hrvatski narodni preporod u Dalmaciji i Istri* (pp. 9-45). Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.

Ivanišević, Frano. (1903). Polica: Narodni život i običaji [Polica: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 8,* 183-336.

Jajnčerova, Kata. (1898). Trebarjevo: Narodni život i običaji [Trebarjevo: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 3,* 55-139.

Kotarski, Josip. (1915). Lobor: Narodni život i običaji [Lobor: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 20,* 53-88, 226-253..

Kotarski, Josip. (1916). Lobor: Narodni život i običaji [Lobor: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 21,* 46-80.

Kremenšek, Slavko. (1984). Matija Murko in Antun Radić [Matija Murko and Antun Radić].*Etnološka tribina, 6-7,* 37-42.

Lang, Milan. (1911). Samobor: Narodni život i običaji [Samobor: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 16,* 1-128.

Lang, Milan. (1912). Samobor:Narodni život i običaji [Samobor: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 17,* 1-150.

Lovretić, Josip. (1990). Otok [Otok]. Vinkovci: Privlačica. (Original work published 1897 to1918)

Lukić, Luka. (1919). Varoš: Narodni život i običaji [Varoš: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 24,* 32-238.

Matković, Drago. (1964). Economic development. In F. H. Eterovich & C. Spalatin (Eds.), *Croatia: Land, culture, people* (pp. 167-190). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1989). *Živim znači stanujem: Etnološka studija o kulturi stanovanja u Žumberačkim Sočicama* [I live therefore I inhabit: Ethnological study about the culture of habitation in Sočice, Žumberak]. Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Radić, Antun. (1896). Referati. Bibliografija [Reports. Bibliography]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 1,* 315-363.

Radić, Antun. (1897). Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu [Foundations for collecting and interpreting materials about folk life]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 2*, 1-88.

Radić, Antun. (1898). Narod: J. Michelet, 'Le Peuple' (1798-1898) [People: J. Michelet, 'Le Peuple' (1798-1898)]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 3,* 103-124.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1987). Teorija o dvije kulture (Od Radića do Gramscija, Ciresea i Burkea) [The theory of the two-tiered model of culture (From Radić to Gramsci, Cirese and Burke)]. *Narodna umjetnost, 24*, 177-198.

Rožić, Vatroslav. (1907). Prigorje: Narodni život i običaji [Prigorje: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 12*, 49-134, 161-.297.

Schevill, Margot B., Berlo, Janet C., & Dwyer, Edward B. (Eds.). (1991). *Textile traditions of Mesoamerica and the Andes: An anthology*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Schneider, Jane. (1987). The anthropology of cloth. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 16*, 409-448.

Supek, Olga. (1988). Ethnology in Croatia. *Etnološki pregled, 23-24*, 17-35.

Supek, Olga. (in press). Women's entrepreneurship and the dissolution of *zadruga* in 19th century Slavonia. *Studia Ethnologica Croatica.*

Svirac, Manda. (1984). Novija istraživanja o Josipu Lovretiću kao etnografu [New research on Josip Lovretić as an ethnographer]. *Etnološka tribina, 6-7*, 127-135.

Weiner, Anette & Schneider, Jane (Eds.). (1989) *Cloth and human experience.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Wolf, Eric. (1982). *Europe and the people without history.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Yoder, Don. (1990). *Discovering American Folklife: Studies in ethnic, religious, and regional culture.* Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.

Žic, Ivan. (1901). Vrbnik na otoku Krku: Narodni život i običaji [Vrbnik on the island of Krk: Folk life and customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 6,* 1-52,161-186.

CHAPTER V
ETHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN CROATIA: 1919 to 1940

Introduction

Between 1919 and 1940 ethnological research in Croatia entered its second phase, which can be characterized as being more diverse than the first phase described in Chapter IV. This was largely due to new institutional activities, which were made possible by the establishment of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb in 1919, and the creation of the Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb in 1924. The Ethnographic Museum created conditions for conducting different types of research in order to support the Museum's collection and exhibition programming, as well as additional publishing activities. The Department of Ethnology, on the other hand, focused on developing teaching and research programming that would serve the formal education of Croatian ethnologists. In the process of shaping the new museum and educational programming, various authors associated with these two institutions introduced new research models or approaches to the study of rural culture. The questionnaire prepared by Radić as a tool of collecting ethnographic data was no longer used in producing comprehensive monographs of selected communities or regions in rural Croatia, such as those that were published in the *Journal Of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs* between 1896 and 1919 (Chapter IV). Instead, as Čulinović-Konstatinović (1984) reports, immediately after the First World War, within the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, the Committee for Folklore at the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts, which was in charge of publishing

The Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs, discussed how to alter their activities in order to "improve the quality of their work" (p. 78). This change took a direction in favor of "better quality of researchers, who now came mostly from the ranks of ethnologists, musicologists, historians, lawyers, and other professionals, who through ethnographic records wanted to *preserve certain aspects of traditional culture* [italics added]" (p. 78). Croatian ethnology was obviously changing and redefining itself as an academic discipline.

In this chapter, this second phase of ethnological research will be analyzed with a focus on publications dealing with clothing and textiles. It must be mentioned, however, that the intention is not to give an exhaustive analysis of all the publications on textiles that were published during that time. Instead, only those authors and their selected activities and publications that best represent different research approaches which were used in the study of textiles during that period of time will be discussed. These are Josip Matasović, Vladimir Tkalčić, Mirko Kus-Nikolajev, and Milovan Gavazzi. Since all of these authors were associated with the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb at some point in time during the 1920s and the 1930s, the Museum's activities will first be briefly described in order to facilitate later discussion of individual authors and their work.

The Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb and Its Research Activities

The Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb was established in 1919, immediately after the First World War, within the newly created Kingdom of

Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The initial collection of the Museum consisted of 20,000 textile artifacts which had been assembled from several smaller museum and private collections. The largest collection was acquired from Samuel Berger, a collector and textile merchant, who also became the Museum's first director (Gjetvaj, 1989). Over the years, Berger collected textiles from rural regions of Croatia with a specific purpose in mind; namely, to serve rural home industries of textiles, both as a source of design ideas, and as an aid in displaying and marketing home industry products. Berger continued to engage in such activities in his new capacity as the Museum's director. In collaboration with the Ministry of Trade and Industry, the Museum actively participated in organizing displays and promoting home industry products on international and domestic exhibitions and trade fairs (Chapter VI).

However, from its very beginnings, the Museum had a mandate to create much broader public programming, as described by the Museum's first curator (1919-1925) and later its director (1925-1934), Vladimir Tkalčić (1922b).

> The goal of ... the Museum is to represent all life and culture of our nation, above all peasants, who to this day have best preserved our national characteristics .... The Museum's ... aim is to serve scientific research of the characteristics of our people, as well as man in general. Also, to advance all school instruction and public education; to be a source of inspiration for arts and crafts; and finally as a high culture institution to represent ... [this aspect] of our culture .... [to] the international community and [people] from other parts of our nation, who were prevented for centuries to learn about each other. (p. 347)

From this description, it is obvious that the Museum's primary mandate was to pursue research activities and create programs that will serve to educate

and inform the public about rural aspects of Croatian culture, and especially peasant culture. It was an attempt by the newly created Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes to use peasant arts and culture on the territory of Yugoslavia as a symbol in creating a new supra-national identity, emphasizing the common pan-Slavic identity of its peoples. At the same time, however, as the Museum focused mostly on preserving peasant arts and culture from the territory of Croatia, the intention of the central government could easily be subverted. As will be seen in the subsequent sections of this chapter, some of the publications in the Museum's journal *National Heritage* simultaneously served to affirm the specificity of Croatian nation.

It is instructive to note that Tkalčić used a more specific term *peasant culture*, rather than the term *folk culture* that Radić used when he defined the focus of ethnological research. Radić's definition of folk culture was indeed somewhat broader, as it referred to the totality of life and culture of rural communities at the turn of the century. As will be seen in the subsequent sections of this chapter, during the 1920s and 1930s, Tkalčić and other authors often explicitly used the term *peasant culture* and *peasant arts,* instead of *folk culture* and *folk arts.* This change in terminology reflected the shift in ethnological studies towards historical research in general, and more specifically towards "traditional" or "authentic" aspects of rural culture, which were perceived as remnants of the once pristine peasant way of life on the land.

According to Vladimir Tkalčić, the intention of the Museum was to create new collections of artifacts and archival data that would be assembled on the basis of scientific research. The goal of assembling new collections and archives was to recreate "the totality of folk life of our people" (Tkalčić, 1922a, p. 74). While this statement appears identical in its formulation to the one given by

Radić when he first defined the goal for Croatian ethnological research in 1897, the intentions behind it were markedly different. Radić wanted to document and interpret the totality of folk life or folk culture as it was both practiced (the way people live) and experienced (the way people think) at that time in rural communities. He also considered it important to document and understand what impact the ongoing processes of "modernization" had on rural communities (Chapter IV). By contrast, the intent of the research program of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb was quite different, as revealed in the concluding passage of the same article by Tkalčić (1922a):

> We need to make up for the missed opportunities in the past. Because traditional spirit, (- part of our national being, carrier of our own most beautiful characteristics, which we need to place as our most beautiful gift at the altar of the progress of our culture -), harmonious spirit, with which our popular creations were made until now, that spirit is vanishing day by day in front of all of us...(p. 75)

In line with other ethnographic museums across Europe, the intention of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb was to "preserve" and study only what remained of "traditional", and obviously idealized, aspects of peasant culture that was destined to vanish in the face of "modernization". In fact, collections of artifacts of Croatian and other Slavic peasant cultures were displayed in the Museum side by side with a large collection of artifacts of non-European, mostly "primitive" cultures from Asia, Americas, Africa, Australia, and Oceania donated to the Museum by Croatian collectors and explorers.

Tkalčić, who received training in museology during his specialization in Paris and Vienna, immediately set out to create conditions for conducting ethnographic research in rural regions of Croatia. He set up basic technical

laboratories and acquired equipment for recording different kinds of data: phonograph for recording music, and photographic equipment for recording objects and people in situ. He also planned to organize film recording of dances and other customs and rituals (Tkalčić, 1922a, p. 75).

Soon after Tkalčić secured the equipment, the Museum curators[1] set out to conduct fieldwork in rural regions. For example, in the summer of 1923, Vladimir Tkalčić, Milovan Gavazzi, together with eight other friends and enthusiasts, organized a rather spectacular month long expedition in Pokuplje. They took with them the necessary provisions, heavy phonographic and photographic recording equipment and, traveling by kayaks along the river Kupa, collected artifacts and other data in numerous villages situated along the river (Muraj, Echkel, & Zorić, 1993). Among other data, they brought back photographs of clothing and textiles, some of which were documentary, others obviously staged for the purposes of being photographed (Muraj, Echkel, & Zorić, 1993, pp. 60-68). Over the years, numerous photographic and phonographic records were collected from many regions of Croatia. Gjetvaj (1989) writes that "the first several thousand photographs represent the most valuable part of the Museum's Photographic Archives, and they were taken during the first few years after the Museum was founded" (p. 21).

When it comes to written ethnographic records, the great majority of them were collected during ethnographic fieldwork conducted by the Museum's curators and later by professors in the Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb, as well as other scholars. These professionals pursued their own specific research interests and projects with the help of local informants. Tkalčić initially proposed that the written data be also collected by local informants in various regions, and recommended that they use the

questionnaire prepared by Antun Radić (Tkalčić, 1922b, p. 349). However, while numerous fragmentary reports from different regions continued to be submitted and published in various journals, no comprehensive monograph based on Radić's questionnaire, and written by someone from the region, was published either in the *Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs* or in the Museum's publications between 1919 and 1940.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb started its own library, and engaged in the following publishing activities between 1919 and 1940: *National Heritage* [Narodna starina] (1922-1935) (only partially associated with the Museum); *Ethnological Library* [Etnološka biblioteka] (1925-1934); *Collection of Yugoslav Ornaments* [Zbirka Jugoslavenskih ornamenata] (1925-1934); *Ethnological Research and Data* [Etnološka istraživanja i građa] (1934-1942); and *Journal of the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb* [Vjesnik Ethnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu] (1935-1938). The main editor of the journal *National Heritage*, Josip Matasović, who played a significant role in Croatian ethnology between 1922 and 1935, will be discussed in the next section.

Josip Matasović: A Historian of Everyday Life and Culture

Aleksandra Muraj (1993) has already discussed the unique contribution of Josip Matasović to Croatian ethnology. Muraj described Matasović as a politically active youth who, during the early 1900's, propagated the idea of independent Croatia not only by means of political separation, but also through the active creation of national identity among Croats; that is, "through both political and cultural emancipation of Croats" (Muraj, 1993, p. 12). A historian,

Miroslava Despot, found in these early political ideas, which were based on the ideas of Ante Starčević, the origin of Matisović's general cultural-historical orientation which marked all of his later work (Muraj, 1993, p. 13). Matasović, a broadly educated intellectual, studied geography and history at universities of Zagreb, Zurich, and Vienna where he received a doctorate in 1915. While in Zurich, he attended lectures of Dr. Otto Stoll, a medical doctor, ethnographer, geographer and anthropologist, who likely brought ethnology into Matasović's sphere of interest (Muraj, 1993, p. 12). This helps to explain why Matasović, both as a scholar and as the editor of *National Heritage*, maintained an open and multidisciplinary approach to the study of both elite and popular cultural history. In retrospect, his contribution to academic disciplines, history and ethnology, has been hailed as truly original for his time (Janeković-Romer, 1993; Muraj, 1993).

Matasović published and edited the journal *National Heritage* between 1922 and 1935. The journal simultaneously served three cultural institutions: Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb, The City Museum of Zagreb, and Graphic Collection in Zagreb. It therefore brought together a broad spectrum of historians of culture. This fact alone contributed to the multidisciplinary nature of *National Heritage*. They brought together publications on a great variety of topics, a variety of research approaches to the study of cultural history, as well as numerous documentary and fragmentary reports relevant for both urban and rural cultural history. Perhaps more importantly, Matasović's own interests as a historian gravitated towards social, economical, and cultural history, rather than political history. In other words, he was interested in the "little history" of professional and everyday life of both elite and non-elite segments of population[2]. Muraj (1993) writes that Matasović showed in both his scholarly

and editorial work "how historiographic research can be useful to ethnology, and how ... ethnological knowledge can complement historical [knowledge]" (p. 31). Matasović can therefore be seen today as anticipating the later developments during the 1970s, when the interdisciplinary dialogue became part of the international scholarly debate and changed the research practice of the disciplines of history, ethnology, and anthropology.

The multidisciplinary character of *National Heritage* is also evident in the articles focused on clothing and textiles published in the journal over the years. Firstly, one can find ethnological studies of textiles which were mostly written by authors associated with the Ethnographic Museum and the Department of Ethnology in Zagreb (Gavazzi, 1922a, 1928a; Gušić, 1930; Kus-Nikolajev, 1934; Tkalčić, 1925). Some of these publications will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent sections of this paper. Secondly, a number of publications described historical documents or books by 18th and 19th century travelers, who painted rural costumes while travelling through various regions of Croatia (Ibrovac, 1935; Novak, 1930; Žega, 1923), while several publications described painted images of peasant costumes that were found in anonymous religious paintings in rural churches (Tkalčić, 1931, 1934). Thirdly, Matasović himself wrote several publications in *National Heritage* in which he discussed historical documents that contained valuable information about rural life, including clothing and textiles, in the regions of military borders in Croatia during the 17th and 18th century (Matasović, 1923a, 1923b, 1931). For example, Matasović (1923a) described a document from Slavonia, written by Relković between 1782 and 1786, from which we learn about male and female dress in *zadrugas* in one of the regions of Croatia's military border, as well as data about state promoted production of silk:

> The promotion of material culture [consumption] which started during the rule of Maria Theresia, continued during the period of Joseph's rule. At the end of 1782, [in Babina Greda] there were, numbered according to their size, 219, 828, and 10,355 trees for raising silk worms. Silk manufacturing was done in Vinkovci." (p. 52)

Finally, a number of publications discussed economic history relevant for both urban and rural history of clothing and textile in Croatia. For example, Popović (1927) published his findings about a collection of letters and business books of one Bosnian Serb family in Sarajevo, Budimlić. This family was involved in long distance trade between Turkey, Bosnia, Dalmatia, and Italy in the first half of the 19th century. Popović (1927) writes that "the most important good, which was transported on this route, was cotton" (p. 60). In the section in which Popović lists all the goods that were imported or exported, one finds that, among other items, Budimlić traders imported cotton from Trieste, scarves and trims from Dubrovnik, while they exported washed wool (from Bosnia and Mostar) and fur to Trieste (p. 68). Popović (1927) concludes that, already in the early 19th century, Bosnian Serbs appear to have been well versed in domestic and foreign trade:

> The number of Yugoslav merchants, their agility, their mutual connections and their presence on all important surrounding trading centers in nearby countries (Vienna, Trieste, Dubrovnik, Split, Brod, Skoplje) their understanding of merchant's work and particularly their participation in the cotton trade ... suggests that the period when Serbs switched from other occupations such as crafts to trade must be moved much further back in time ...

> The results which we have obtained about the cultural and economic history of our people during quite a long period of time and over a wide territory, out of a single, and not even extensive, document, make us think how much precious materials such private archives contain, and how much of it has already been lost ...
>
> Our urban communities, their past, the origins of their populations, the development of their crafts and trade have not received as much attention as rural communities. Such research would emphasize and solve many interesting historical, economic, and social questions....Merchant's archives offer accurate picture not only about trade efforts but also about the intimate life and culture of the whole social setting.". (p. 69).

These eloquent words by Popović can also be taken as a tribute to Matasović, as a scholar and as the editor of *National Heritage*, for his pioneering efforts to begin recreating a historical record of everyday life in both urban and rural regions of Croatia. The interdisciplinary approach to the study of both rural and urban history that Matasović advocated and practiced so consistently, ended in 1935 due to financial difficulties, when he was forced to stop publishing *National Heritage*. Unfortunately, in the subsequent years his perceptions of ethnology as a historical science did not become a dominant approach in Croatian ethnological research, especially in the domain of clothing and textiles. The importance of the work that Matasović initiated in the area of clothing and textiles cannot be overestimated, and is awaiting to be further developed by Croatian ethnologists.

Vladimir Tkalčić: A Historian in a Museum Setting

As described in the section on the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb, Vladimir Tkalčić was one of the central figures in developing the research program of the Museum, both in the capacity of its first curator (1919-1925) and later its director (1925-1934). When it comes to his formal education, Tkalčić received a degree from the University in Zagreb, with a major in geography and history and minor in archeology and art history. He later specialized in Paris and Vienna in museum work. When reading his main publication "Seljačke nošnje u području Zagrebačke Gore" [Peasant Costumes in the Region of Zagreb Mountain], one can detect a tension in his research between his museological orientation and his background education in history, which makes his work both interesting and to a certain extent original (Tkalčić, 1925).

In the introduction to the article, Tkalčić (1925) states that the goal of his museological research was to learn about origins and development of peasant costumes in Croatia. Since hardly any historical documents about peasant costumes existed, he writes that it was imperative to collect ethnographic data through oral interviews, in order to "reconstruct the history of peasant costumes" (p. 133). He goes on to say that he used the "ethnographic method in preparing this descriptive monograph, and it was therefore necessary to go - mostly by foot - from village to village" (p. 133). His orientation as a museologist is also evident in his careful analysis of the artifacts themselves, including drawings of clothing construction, as well as attention to detail in ornamentation.

On the basis of visual analysis of costume construction, Tkalčić divided women's costumes from that region into three different types, and compared

them to the construction patterns of elite women's costumes dating from pre-renaissance, renaissance, and more "modern" times. The fact that Tkalčić resorted to a mere visual comparison of objects from such vastly different contexts and periods of time, suggests that in this particular aspect he was not applying the methods of a historian. Instead, Tkalčić was obviously influenced by the cultural-historical research model that Gavazzi was introducing to Croatian ethnology at that time. In the cultural-historical model, material, visual, or functional characteristics of peasant material culture are compared with historical and even archaic material culture, in order to speculate about their possible origins and geographical diffusion patterns. Peasant material culture is therefore perceived as a survival of much older forms and elements which persisted, albeit at times in a modified form, within autochthonous peasant culture. Cultural-historical research aims to develop such classifications of possible origins and diffusion patterns of cultural forms, and does not inquire into socio-historical context within which the cultural forms were transmitted in time and space (Wolf, 1982).

Tkalčić, however, did not use this kind of comparative method in the rest of his analysis, and I believe this is where his background as a historian became evident. Instead, Tkalčić introduced into his analysis the available historical documents (three citations) and literature (four references), as well as socio-historical data he assembled from oral interviews and his personal knowledge about the region. For example, he found that he could further divide women's costumes from that region into eight different types according to decorative and design elements (p. 138). He immediately noted that these eight types of costume decoration overlapped with the past administrative borders of feudal

land holdings, and present day borders of parishes, which he suggested must have influenced these regional differences in costume decoration (p. 133).

Tkalčić further indicated the importance of learning more about textile trade in rural Croatia before drawing conclusions about archaic origins of peasant costumes. For example, he cited an example when trade of certain industrial materials quite arbitrarily influenced changes in costume decorations (p. 133). Also, when describing how women from Bistra used to cover their head with a "large or small scarf decorated with embroidery...which they used to buy from *Toti* (traveling Slovak merchants)" (p. 153), he added the following note:

> ...*Toti,* Slovak [merchants] who sold cloth and lace, have long been, and continue to be, an important factor on fairs and trade posts in Croatia and Slavonia (Csaplovics, Slavonien und zum Theil Croatien, Pesth 1819, p. 196). By bringing goods from their regions they also introduced new elements into our ornamentation, and this is how we could have come to think about the continuity of some forms from as far back as pre-Slavic social communities.
>
> (p. 153)

Tkalčić also indicated that older styles of peasant costume may persist in spite of intense interaction between some villages and the city. When describing the Šestine type of costume, for example, he noted that peasants from Šestine and three other different parishes (Remete, Gracani, Markusevac) wore the same costume. He went on to say:

> The city squares in Zagreb, especially during the mornings, are filled with men and women from Šestine (in Zagreb they consider everyone with such costume to be from Šestine) who come to the city because of trade

> or washing of laundry [for Zagreb citizens]....It is significant for the peasant, especially from the northern surroundings of Zagreb, that in spite of such close and continuous interaction with the city, he retained his costume almost untouched by the foreign spirit, and at the same time did not stagnate in his cultural progress. (p. 138-140)

From this description one can speculate that this particular costume persisted not *in spite of*, but precisely *because of* trade with the city; Šestine costume likely persisted because it became the trademark of the quality of peasant services for Zagreb citizens.

In his conclusion, Tkalčić lamented that the lack of data, especially of historical documents, made that particular work only an incomplete, preliminary, and merely descriptive document. Nevertheless, he ventured to propose a few tentative yet perceptive conclusions. First, he suggested that in the past the costumes in this whole region were likely the same, or at least much more similar; hence, he thought that pronounced differences in clothing styles in these regions were of relatively recent making. Among the reasons for increased regional differentiation in costumes, he gives the dissolution of the feudal order in 1848 and consequent increase in "general, and therefore also peasant, moral and economic individualism" (p. 163). He would return to support this view in his later publications, in which he presented evidence of relatively simple peasant costumes in anonymous church paintings from the first half of the 19th century (Tkalčić, 1931, 1934).

Another conclusion that Tkalčić tentatively drew from his research concerned the historical change of peasant costumes:

> ...just as differentiation is now evident among different regions...there are also differences among costumes in a historical sense; every period gave

also its mark to peasant costume. We must not forget, that even though peasant costume is conservative and full of traditional forms, it is still subject to constant and gradual change. It, too, has its "fashion", only it has less upheavals than it does in city life. The less developed individualism among peasant people corresponds to less differentiation in their costume. (p. 163)

Tkalčić initially approached this particular project as a museologist/ethnographer of his time. However, in the process of doing his research, he obviously combined ethnographic methods with those of a historian, and on the whole demonstrated his preference for historical documentation rather than speculation about the history of peasant costume. His keen interest in the multiplicity of urban-rural interactions and their effect on peasant costume, also shows that he was more interested in reading material culture as an index of social and historical processes, than in doing diffusionist type of classification of origins and cultural layers of various elements of costume according to a certain schema. One can only regret that Tkalčić did not leave behind more publications.

Mirko Kus-Nikolajev: A Theoretician of Peasant Visual Arts

During the late 1920s and 1930s, Mirko Kus-Nikolajev introduced to Croatian ethnology a new kind of theoretical discourse concerning the study of peasant visual arts, including textile arts (Kus-Nikolajev, 1929a, 1929b, 1935). In his publication "Expressionism in Peasant Art", Kus-Nikolajev (1929a) for the first time articulated the basic outline of what he called a *sociological* approach to the study of peasant visual arts. Even though in this first publication he did

not give full references to any sources of literature, he mentioned the names of several authors (Naumann, Picard, and Walden), thus indicating that he had developed his model on the basis of works already published in German speaking countries. In the same year he published "Croatian Peasant Baroque" in which he applied this research model to Croatian materials (Kus-Nikolajev, 1929b). Then, in 1935, he published "Peasant Ornamentation: Contributions Towards a Sociology of Peasant Art of South Slavs", where he further elaborated upon his proposed research model, this time situating it more precisely within the German ethnological and art historical scholarship of that time[3].

Although Kus-Nikolajev clearly articulated and described his sociological research model for studying peasant textile arts, neither he nor other Croatian ethnologists continued to use his model in the subsequent years[4]. Nevertheless, I consider that through his publications Kus-Nikolajev influenced Croatian ethnology in an indirect but still important way: namely, he gave a scholarly legitimacy to the notion of the autochthonous Croatian peasant arts. I shall therefore examine more closely this aspect of his work.

Back in 1897, Antun Radić already introduced to Croatian ethnology a well established notion in European and especially German scholarship, namely the notion that European culture lost its singular place among world cultures as a measure of absolute values; other cultures were not to be evaluated by the standards of European high culture, but should instead be studied within the parameters of their own historical circumstance (Chapter IV). Kus-Nikolajev (1929a) again introduced this notion, only as interpreted within a narrower concept of peasant art. He stated that although European peasant art was in principle equal to European high art, it should neither be evaluated by the same

standards, nor studied from the theoretical perspectives developed for high art: "It is to be expected that metaphysical and purely psychological interpretation of peasant art could not have resulted in a correct analysis, since the starting point of such analysis was the individual, artistic person" (p.1). Only after "sociological methods began to be applied in the study of evolution of art and art forms...could the problem of peasant art be resolved" (p. 1). Peasant art, according to Kus-Nikolajev, could only be compared with "art of primitive or half-cultured peoples of prehistoric and historic periods and [those that still exist] today" (p.2). The main characteristic of both peasant and primitive art was its collective artistic expression, so an "aesthetic ideal" is common to the whole ethnic group and is not expressed individually, but collectively" (p. 2). Other characteristics that were common to both peasant and primitive art, according to Kus-Nikolajev, were the limited number of art forms, and simple technology (p. 2).

Kus-Nikolajev further developed the thesis that *ornamentation*, characterized by harmony and rhythm of its geometric elements, was the main *collective expressive form* of peasant art. In the early stone age, such ornamental art replaced the figurative art of primitive hunters, and ever since that time continued to persist among agricultural populations of Europe (p. 4). Among urban population in Europe, by contrast, the development of technology, change in property laws, and formation of wider economic and political formations, led to the development of new art forms. "Urban development and its economic structures became the carrier of new cultural and artistic values. Its most visible artistic manifestations appear in architecture and in the representation of man in art" (p. 5). Therefore, peasant primitivism expressed through ornamentation "is the result of certain spiritual qualities....An

agricultural way of life...creates a specific spiritual life with strong reflexive qualities, which are not known to a realistic and active life of hunter, worrier, and merchant." (Kus-Nikolajev, 1935, p. 46)

Kus-Nokolajev stressed that peasant art was not to be taken as a mere repository of European high art that lagged behind in time and in the process became deformed and vulgarized. Instead, it once developed and existed in its pristine form and genuine peasant expression. Thus Kus-Nikolajev (1935) writes:

> ...to take an example from our own peasant art - there are many traces left by cultured arts. So, for example, influences of antique, Byzantine and Western-European (particularly baroque) art are well known. But these assimilated influences of cultured art can in no way be taken as standards for fixing the inner qualities of peasant art in our country. In our peasant art many traditional elements are preserved which testify that our peasant art has retained in itself several ancient forms, some of which date as far back as the prehistoric times....It is in these old traditional forms, preserved from generation to generation, that one must look for the archetype of our peasant art....As long as the old artistic forms live in a nation, the nation instinctively resists all foreign influences, and in so far as it assimilates them, it splits them up in its spiritual prism and weaves them into the texture of its artistic life as integral parts of its very own art....Ornament is the typical form through which the artistic life of the peasant manifests itself; ornament is his means of expression." (p. 47)

According to Kus-Nikolajev, the essential conditions for the development of peasant art were certain economic forms, namely the special type of "collective economy" of corporate estates. In contrast to the rest of Europe, this type of

economy survived much longer in the Balkans, in the form of the well known multiple family unit, *zadruga*. According to Kus-Nikolajev, the division of labour in *zadruga* allowed women to devote their time to textile arts, and thus develop textile ornamentation into the most elaborate and "true" expression of peasant art (Kus-Nikolajev, 1935, p. 48). As long as a "collective economy" in *zadruga* prevailed, outside influences were assimilated into peasant art without disturbing its essential, autochthonous qualities. Only when *zadruga* began to gradually dissolve, as was the case in Croatia after 1854, the autochthonous peasant art was destined to disappear. Kus-Nikolajev (1935) thus concluded:

> National handiworks were the product of *a special spiritual attitude which resulted from particular economic and social conditions*....To him [peasant] this minute decorative art was that which for cultured nations were monumental buildings. Instead of huge architecture he produced his tiny little ornaments in needlework, weaving, woodcarving and other handicrafts.
>
> One must bear in mind that along with the process of modernization of our villages goes also the decay of peasant art....This decay is the result of a historical necessity and of an economic transformation. Conditions for prosperity of peasant art are linked with the economic forms of the life of the peasant. *With these economic forms peasant art lives and with them it dies.* (p. 48)

Kus-Nikolajev also considered that applied folk textiles made in rural home industries for rural or urban consumption were not expressions of "true" peasant art. "Beautiful copies, but without inner expression" (Kus-Nikolajev, 1934, p. 185).

Kus-Nikolajev rightly brought attention to sociological and economic factors that, during the 19th century influenced the family division of labour and modes of textile production in rural Croatia. However, the importance that he gave to *zadruga* for making the woman's labor available for the development of "true" peasant art[5], the idealization of the special kind of spirituality resulting from a closed collective life in *zadruga*, the narrow definition of the primitive or archaic origins and ornamental qualities of autochthonous peasant art, all these would likely not survive a close scrutiny of historical documentation. Also, from today's perspective, theories which defined high art and its figurative forms as psychological *individual expression* of an artist, and peasant and primitive art and their ornamental forms as a social-psychological *collective expression* of a group, would be considered inadequate for explaining historical dynamics of change in art forms. In contemporary research, (elite and non-elite, Western and non-Western) art is no longer considered to be either personal or collective *expression*, but a *sign* that mediates between producer and consumer; analogously, changes in art form are studied within the dynamics of the semiotic (poly)system (Even-Zohar, 1990), or, in sociological parlance, the *field* of cultural production (Bourdieu, 1991).

Nevertheless, during the late 1920s and 1930s, Kus-Nikolajev's publications exerted an important influence on Croatian ethnology; they contributed towards a scholarly legitimacy of the concept of the autochthonous peasant art, and therefore legitimized a scholarly distinction between the older (authentic) and modern (inauthentic) forms of peasant art. Consequently, his publications indirectly supported the shift from Radić's design for Croatian ethnology as a study of the totality of folk life and culture in the living rural communities at that time, towards Gavazzi's diffusionist model of the search for

origins and cultural layers inscribed in the selected products (objects and behaviour) which could still be found in rural Croatia, and which needed to be "preserved" as the only surviving documents of what was once an autochthonous Croatian peasant culture.

Milovan Gavazzi and the Creation of a New Research Paradigm in Croatian Ethnology

Milovan Gavazzi officially entered the stage of Croatian ethnology, so to speak, in 1922, when he was appointed a curator of The Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb. In 1927 he left that position to become a professor at the newly founded Department of Ethnology, and later also the leader of the Ethnological Seminar at the University of Zagreb. Gavazzi, however, continued to maintain close working relations with the Museum, and again served as the Museum's director between 1939 and 1941 (Gavazzi, 1991, p. 5).

Gavazzi received his doctoral degree in Slavic Studies from the University in Zagreb in 1919. During his studies he spent several semesters at the University of Prague where he "attended the lectures of the distinguished archeologist and comparative ethnologist of Slavic peoples, Lubor Niederle" (Belaj, 1992). In 1925/1926, as a curator of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, he again went to Prague for specialization, during which time he "toured German and Polish museums" (Šestan, 1995). While in Krakow, he met a Polish ethnologist, Kazimir Moszynski, with whom he later collaborated. Muraj (1989) writes that Gavazzi's specialization in Prague, and "especially the contact with Lubor Niederle and Kazimir Moszynski left a lasting mark on the subject of

Gavazzi's investigations, theoretical orientation, and methods of research" (p. 23).

It was the diffusionist model (or cultural-historical model as it was called in German speaking and Eastern-European countries) that Gavazzi assimilated during his studies and later specialization in Prague, and that he consistently used in his research in later years. Yet, in his early publications in which he first outlined his research approach and methods, he did not refer to the available literature on that subject. Instead, he presented his approach as the only model for studying peasant culture. Such narrow yet authoritative methodological outlook was to characterize Gavazzi's teaching and research activities throughout his career. As Muraj (1989) writes, during a period of over half a century, Gavazzi never questioned or changed his research approach and methods, "remaining outside of all developments, schools, and directions that came (and left) European and world ethnology during the time of Gavazzi's active [professional] life" (p. 25).

Muraj (1989) also pointed out that Gavazzi wrote his review articles on the basis of previously collected ethnographic data that were published in Croatian ethnological and other journals, archival and ethnographic data collected by his students and curators in the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb, as well as the data he himself collected while pursuing ethnographic fieldwork in many regions of Croatia (p. 24). That Gavazzi was well informed about all of the previously published and collected ethnographic data on the whole territory of Yugoslavia is evident from his publication, "The Development and Present State of Ethnography in Yugoslavia", which he published in the Polish journal, *Łud Slowianski*, edited by K. Moszynski (Gavazzi, 1930, 1931). However, in his review articles, in which he must have relied on data previously collected or

published by other authors, Gavazzi hardly ever directly cited the sources and literature references, or explained when and how he obtained his own data[6]. Such a style was not typical of Croatian scholarship at that time; no other Croatian ethnologist, between 1896 and 1940, produced such an authoritative discourse as did Gavazzi. Perhaps he followed the example of Moszynski, who was criticized for not giving sources of his data in his work *Kultura Ludowa Slowian*. According to Šestan (1995), Gavazzi defended Moszynski in 1959 with these words:

> The main thing was...the lack of sources for all the given data...But who knew...Prof. Moszynski, was not confused or worried that he will be left without this scientific tool. The author wanted it that way, because of simplicity and because of tactical reasons (as he explained to his close friends), so that he could ask for funds to publish as the last volume...all of the sources for his data, notes, etc.....Still what is here, even without sources of literature and without systematic bibliography, is today without doubt an unsurpassed compendium, the treasury of the whole Slavic ethnography. (p.6)

Young and energetic, Gavazzi passionately engaged in extensive fieldwork, teaching, publishing[7], and other related public activities. Muraj (1989) writes:

> In contrast to Radić, the conditions were favorable [for Gavazzi] since through his appointments over several decades....he was constantly at the center of ethnological activities in Croatia, influencing not only the education of ethnologists but also research directions, the content and the way of collecting ethnographic materials, as well as the manner of

their presentation (in publications, on exhibitions, and folk festivals). (p. 23)

Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that Gavazzi not only found himself at the center of ethnological activities in Croatia, but often actively sought to dominate them. Through the energetic pursuit of fieldwork, he accumulated knowledge about Croatian rural culture that could not be disputed. As a professor at the University, he largely determined the education of many generations of ethnologists. While he transferred to students his legendary knowledge and enthusiasm for his work, he did not encourage them to think independently, or to be open to other developments in Croatian and international scholarship in social sciences and humanities.

Since Gavazzi's research interests centered on older products (objects and behavior) of rural culture, he worked with great energy and urgency to "preserve" them in their "authentic" form in museums and archives (artifacts, written records, photographs, films, or sound recordings), as well as through staged public performances (Sremac, 1978). As a curator, close collaborator, and later the director of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, he greatly influenced the Museum's collection, documentation, and research practice. He was also a main figure among Croatian ethnologists who pursued film documentation of various rural customs. In film projects, Gavazzi was both eager and confident to assume the role of a specialist/ethnologist who was qualified to direct the staged performances of "authentic" dances, customs, rituals, or demonstrations of craft production. In his report on the first filming project, Gavazzi (1922b) writes:

> Whenever there is a need for human endeavor to be captured and fixed in a certain form, and in this way forever preserved, one has to resort to film as the most appropriate medium....In order to give such filming a

> certain ethnographic value - yet not forgetting of course its marketability - our film organization "Jugoslavija" embarked to record a series of films about our folk life and customs. The first such filming took place....in Selišće and Greda near Sunja, with the help and direction of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb...so that the film could have a certain ethnographic value in the Museum's own archives. Typical wedding scenes from those villages were filmed....with the sad realization that pure folk customs, especially in details, no longer exist or are rapidly disappearing, and that "elite ways" are creeping in everywhere, especially into men's costume. (p. 85)

This quotation offers information not only about the event itself, but indirectly also demonstrates Gavazzi's own intentions, perceptions and attitudes as an ethnologist at the time. This particular film series was not realized; instead, during the 1930s, Gavazzi acquired a simple camera which he could operate himself. His attitude to filmed documentation, however, hardly changed in later years. He considered a specialist/ethnologist to be best qualified to select the material and recreate the event by staging various "authentic" performances. His priorities always centered on those activities that were about to disappear, and therefore needed to be preserved on film in their "pure" form for purposes of teaching and museum documentation (Križnar, 1992).

During the 1930s, Gavazzi also initiated the project of creating ethnological maps for the territory of Croatia (Gavazzi, 1930, p. 293). All of these various ethnographic records were to serve science in interpreting the way human culture developed in general, and within Croatian territory in particular. Let us now turn to examine how Gavazzi approached ethnological

interpretation of ethnographic data, using his diffusionist or cultural-historical model.

In his first review article, "Cultural Analysis of the Croat Ethnography", Gavazzi (1928a) stated that the aim of ethnological research was: 1) to describe the ethnographic unit in its details and the distribution [of its elements] within a given territory; 2) to compare such ethnographic unit with analogous phenomena in other regions; and 3) to draw ethnological conclusions from comparisons about origins, about paths and ways that the ethnographic unit was created, developed, changed, how it was enriched, or how [some of its elements] waned and even disappeared (Gavazzi, 1928a, p. 115). He then stated that the 'ethnographic unit' can be chosen according to different criteria, one of the criteria being that of an ethnic group. This was the criteria that Gavazzi employed in his publications, namely that of the ethnographic unit of Croats. Gavazzi hastened to add that the general ethnographic picture of Croats was by no means uniform; on the contrary, its structure was complex. The aim of ethnological research was to explicate the structure of the ethnography of Croats: its predominant Old Slavic elements and various other elements which have penetrated into it from other cultural spheres ever since Croats came to what is now Croatian territory. Gavazzi identified the following cultural stratas to be evident in the ethnographic materials that could still be found in various regions of rural Croatia at the beginning of the 20th century: Old-Slavic or Old-Croatian; Early Balkan; Early Mediterranean; Early Panonian; Oriental; Turkish-Oriental; Alpine; Magyar; and urban or high culture which descended to peasant culture from higher cultural strata of European civilization. Gavazzi stressed, however, that this complex structure was not a mere collection of disparate elements, but that it was held together by the predominance of old-

Slavic or old-Croatian cultural elements. While Gavazzi, therefore, obviously considered that Croatian peasant culture was a dynamic and complex structure of ethnographic elements, he continuously projected the value judgement that the older elements were more "authentic" than the more recent elements which were influences of the so called "modernization". It is also instructive to note that Gavazzi did not account in this publication for the presence of other ethnic groups within the territory of Croatia (Serbs, Italians, Slovaks, etc.).

In the domain of textiles, Gavazzi's research interests ranged from technologies of production of fibers, yarns, and cloth (Gavazzi, 1922a, 1928b, 1938a); by way of decoration of cloth, and clothing construction; to older symbolic functions of cloth, for example, a symbolic function of a headcover for married women (Gavazzi, Tkalčić & Paulić, 1938b). The diffusionist approach limited the research questions he posed to those of origins and various cultural layers and past influences inscribed in various aspects of production or consumption of textile artifacts. As Muraj (1989) pointed out:

> By faithfully applying the cultural-historical model, [Gavazzi] could not avoid the limitations of this school....While he searched for roots of separate phenomena, while he was creating synchronic and diachronic mosaics, in the total picture man remained in the background; man-creator, consumer and carrier - of separate phenomena - and of culture as a whole. It seems that in his foremost effort to penetrate the "moving forces of culture", to determine "cultural flows" and to document "autochthonous forms", he somehow came to neglect the "real life." (pp. 30-31)

The diffusionist research approach that Gavazzi introduced to Croatian ethnology eventually became canonized as the "true" model for ethnological

research in Croatia, or, as Čapo-Žmegač (1995) put it, became a new scientific paradigm in Croatian ethnology.

Conclusion

This review suggests that the establishment of the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb in 1919 influenced Croatian ethnology on several levels. Since the Museum's main goal was to preserve older forms of peasant culture, its collection and research practices shifted away from rural life and culture at that time, and inquired only into its past. It must be mentioned that the newly formed government in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, favoured the preservation of older forms of rural culture as a symbol of a common pan-Slavic identity. While Croatian peasant culture was the central focus of research and predominated in permanent displays, the Museum also displayed objects of other South Slavic peasant cultures, as well as non-European collections.

The Museum also contributed to livelier publishing activities in the field of ethnology. The present review of ethnological publications shows that, during the 1920s and early 1930s, the authors who at the time contributed most to Croatian ethnology all worked for the Museum in different capacities. In their research they all focused on rural history, but used different research models and approaches, and therefore contributed to different interpretations of rural life and culture in the past. Matasović, and to a certain extent Tkalčić, favoured the conception of ethnology as a historical science, and therefore considered it necessary to use both ethnographic data and historical records in order to reconstruct the history of rural life, including production, exchange and consumption of clothing and textiles. Kus-Nikolajev and Gavazzi, on the other

hand, used research models that were developed in German speaking countries specifically for studying peasant and other "primitive" cultures.

Kus-Nikolajev introduced the *sociological* model for studying peasant visual arts. This model defined "true" peasant art as having archaic origins stylistically characterized by ornamentation; it also considered such "true" peasant art to be a *collective* expression of peasants who lived in extended family households, *zadruga*. According to Kus-Nikolajev, the gradual dissolution of *zadruga* among Croatian peasants brought about the gradual but inevitable death of "genuine" peasant art. Kus-Nikolajev's research model was eventually not accepted or further applied among Croatian ethnologists. However, his discourse gave scholarly legitimacy to the concept of autochthonous peasant art that needed to be saved since it was destined to disappear in face of changes in land ownership and family structures that were affecting rural regions at the time.

Gavazzi introduced a diffusionist or cultural-historical model into Croatian ethnological research of the history of rural culture. This model was also developed by German ethnologists specifically for peasant and other "primitive" societies. It aimed at "reconstructing cultural history without written documents, starting patiently from the present state into the past" (Bratanić, 1976). Gavazzi's model focused not only on peasant visual arts, but on all products (objects and behaviour) of peasant culture. This model also focused on older *autochthonous* products of peasant culture, although it did not define the term *autochthonous* in very clear terms, except for placing it in opposition to various influences of "modernization" and contemporary urban products. Gavazzi applied this model in his more specific studies of various elements of rural culture in Croatia. Importantly, however, in 1928 he also wrote his first

review article on the main characteristics of "traditional forms" of Croatian peasant culture, thus beginning to provide a more synthetic and totalizing interpretation of peasant culture for the whole territory of Croatia. This signaled a new direction and, from that time onwards, Gavazzi's model gradually prevailed in Croatian ethnology.

Matasović was forced to end the publication of his journal *National Heritage* in 1935. Tkalčić left the Ethnographic museum of Zagreb in 1934 to become the director of the Museum of Arts and Crafts in Zagreb. Gavazzi, on the other hand, continued to participate in many aspects of ethnological activities in Croatia, eager to pursue his type of research much further. Perhaps most importantly, Gavazzi's position as a professor at the department of Ethnology enabled him not only to engage students in collecting necessary data, but also to educate generations of ethnologists exclusively in his theoretical approach and methodology.

As a consequence, Radić's initially broad design for Croatian ethnology as a multidisciplinary study of the totality of folk culture was abandoned before it could be fully developed and articulated. Instead, the focus of ethnology as a discipline shifted towards the diffusionist study of only "traditional" aspects of rural culture which were perceived to be survivals of what was once an autochthonous Croatian peasant culture. In other words, the focus shifted from the study of people and their way of life to the study of selected cultural products (objects and behaviour) and their classification.

Notes

1. Božidar Širola joined the Museum in 1920 as a volunteer, and in 1925 as a curator in charge of ethnomusicology; Milovan Gavazzi became a curator between 1922 and 1927; and Mirko Kus-Nikolajev in 1925 (Gjetvaj, 1989).

2. Janeković-Romer (1993) comments that Matasović always strove for the total perception of social conditions in a given period, and gives an impressive list of the themes Matasović addressed in his scholarly publications: social consciousness, culture of living, material culture, aesthetics, civilization traits, way of life and mentality of urban society, Illyric Movement, customs, germanization, fashion, arts, language, food, hunger, medicine, police force, leisure activities, political topics, patriotism,...home life, furniture, guilds, emotional life, plotting and gossip, trade, literature written in [kajkavski] dialect, professional problems, clothing, manners, etc." (p. 159)

3. In the 1935 publication, Kus-Nikolajev cites twenty eight references of mostly German scholars, as well as German translations of few works from France, Britain, and Italy which were already incorporated into German scholarship of "primitive" arts. Among them are Wilhelm Worringer, Abstraktion und Einfuhlung, Munchen 1919, and Karl Marx, Das Kapital, Stuttgart 1922. He seemed to have particularly relied on the work of Herbert Kuhn, Die Kunst der Primitiven, Munchen 1923, as evident from this comment: "Kuhn went further. Guided by the methods of dialectical materialism he examined all art expression of primitive man in relation to the material conditions of his life, and in this way penetrated to the core of the origin and expression of the artistic life in general" (Kus-Nikolajev, 1935, p. 25).

4. Only recently, Reana Senjković (1994) has returned to examine the theoretical discourse of Kus-Nikolajev, focusing mostly on the concept of a "peasant baroque" that Kus-Nikolajev introduced in the study of Croatian peasant textiles in 1929. Senjković considered Kus-Nikolajev's definition of "peasant baroque" too narrow, and proposed her own broader definition.

5. Rihtman-Auguštin (1982) offered a different "reading" of documentary accounts about life in zadruga, pointing out that women worked much harder in *zadruga* than has been usually presented in ethnological literature which, until recently, consistently idealized life in *zadruga.*

6. For example, in the third and revised edition of a collection of his review articles from 1928, 1940, and 1959, published in 1991 as *Croatian Village Heritage*, Gavazzi only gave a short bibliography at the end, referring to four relatively old works by Niederle (1911-1956); six of his own works; the journal, *Kultura Ludowa Slowian,* edited by Moszynski between 1929 and 1939; one work by the Croatian author Bratanić (1952); and one by the Slovenian author Korošec (1952).

7. Belaj (1992) reports that Gavazzi published the results of his work in books and various international journals, totaling over 240 publications.

References

Belaj, Vitomir. (1992). In memoriam: Prof. Milovan Gavazzi. *Etnološka tribina, 15.*

Bourdieu, Pierre, & Wacquant, Loic, J. D. (Eds.). (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bratanić, Branimir. (1976). Pogled na 200 godina etnološke znanosti [A glance at the 200 years of ethnological science]. *Izvješća Hrvatskog Etnološkog Društva, 5-6,* 5-47.

Čapo-Žmegač, Jasna. (1995). Two scientific paradigms in Croatian ethnology: Antun Radić and Milovan Gavazzi. *Narodna umjetnost, 32* (1), 25-38.

Čulinović-Konstantinović, Vesna. (1979). Historijski prikaz etnoloških istraživanja i interesa za narodnu kulturu u Hrvatskoj [Historical review of ethnological investigations and interest for folk culture in Croatia]. *Etnološka tribina, 2,* 67-88.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1990). Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today, 11-1,* 1-253.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1922a). Tkanje tkanica osobitom spravom u Posavini [Weaving of belts [tkanica] with a speacial tool in Posavina]. *Narodna starina, 1* (1), 40-46.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1922b). Kinematografsko snimanje naših narodnih običaja [Filming of our folk customs]. *Narodna starina, 1* (1), 85.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1928a). Kulturna analiza etnografije Hrvata [Cultural analysis of Croatian ethnography]. *Narodna starina, VII* (17), 115-144.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1928b). Praslavenski tkalački stan i tkalačka daštica [Old-Slavic weaving loom and weaving card]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 26,* 1-31.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1930). Razvoj i stanje etnografije u Jugoslaviji [The development and present state of ethnography in Yugoslavia]. Lud Slowianski, I (2), 266-296.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1931). Razvoj i stanje etnografije u Jugoslaviji [The development and present state of ethnography in Yugoslavia]. *Łud Slowianski, II (1)*, 72-106.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1938a). Tkanje uskih tkanica ("gačnjaka", "bradešnjaka") Pletenje uskih kapica ("jalba") [Weaving of narrow cloth ("gačnjak" and "bradešnjak") Knitting of narrow caps ("jalbe")]. *Etnografska istraživanja i građa, 1*, 43-46.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1991). Baština hrvatskog sela [Croatian village heritage]. Zagreb: Otvoreno Sveučilište.

Gavazzi, Milovan, Tkalčić, Vladimir, & Paulić, Tereza. (1938b). Oprema ženske glave [Covering of woman's head]. *Etnografska istraživanja i građa, 1*, 53-68.

Gjetvaj, Nada. (1989). Etnografski Muzej u Zagrebu - u povodu 70. obljetnice [Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb - on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary]. *Etnološka istraživanja, 5.*

Gušić, Branimir. (1930). Starinsko ruho na otoku Mljetu [Older dress on the island of Mljet]. *Narodna starina, IX* (21), 53-90.

Ibrovac, Miodrag. (1935). Teodor Valerio i Teofil Gotje, slikari naših narodnih tipova [Theodor Valerio and Theophile Gautier, painters of our folk types]. *Narodna starina, XIV* (35), 33-58.

Janeković-Romer, Zdenka. (1993). *Narodna Starina.* Historiografski vrhunci i borba za opstanak [*Narodna Starina.* Historiographic heights and the struggle for survival]. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest, 25* (1), 155-162.

Križnar, Naško. (1992). Razgovor s Milovanom Gavazzijem [Conversations with Milovan Gavazzi]. *Etnološka tribina, 15*, 187-200.

Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. (1927). *Šetnje kroz Etnografski Muzej u Zagrebu: Privremeni vodič* [Walks through the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb: Temporary guide]. Zagreb: S. Berger.

Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. (1929a). Expressionizam u seljačkoj umjetnosti [Expressionism in peasant art]. *Etnološka biblioteka, 6*, 1-11.

Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. (1929b). Hrvatski seljački barok [Croatian peasant baroque]. *Etnološka biblioteka, 7*, 55-72.

Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. (1934). Oblici kulture sela [Forms of village culture]. *Narodna starina, XIII* (34), 183-186.

Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. (1935). Seljačka ornamentika: Prilog sociologiji jugoslavenske seljačke umetnosti [Peasant ornamentation: Contributions to the sociology of the peasant arts of South Slavs]. *Vjesnik Etnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu, I* (1), 15-46.

Matasović, Josip. (1923a) Kompanija kapetana Relkovića [Kompanija of captain Relković]. *Narodna starina, II* (4), 45-64.

Matasović, Josip. (1923b). Sarod Rakitica [Sarod Rakitica]. *Narodna starina, II*, (5), 240-256.

Matasović, Josip. (1931). Neki fragmenti historije XVIII stoljeća, II [Some historical fragments from the 18th century, II]. *Narodna starina, X*, (26), 267-272.

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1989). *Živim znači stanujem: Etnološka studija o kulturi stanovanja u Žumberackim Sočicama* [I live therefore I inhabit: Ethnological study about the culture of habitation in Sočice, Žumberak]. Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1993). Josip Matasović u svjetlu hrvatske etnologije [Josip Matasović in the light of Croatian ethnology]. *Etnološka tribina, 16*, 11-34.

Muraj, Aleksandra, Echkel, Nerina, & Zorić, Vesna. (1993). *Pokupska sjećanja: Etnografska ekspedicija 1923* [Memories from Pokupsko: Ethnographic expedition in 1923]. Zagreb: Etnografski Muzej Zagreb. (Exhibition Catalog)

Novak, Grga. (1930). Jedan anonimni rukopis iz 1775/6 godine o dalmatinskim zagorcima (Morlakima), primorcima i otočanima [An anonimous document from 1775/6 about people from Dalmatian Zagora (Morlaks), costal regions, and islands]. *Narodna starina, IX* (21), 21-38.

Popović, Vasilj. (1927). Trgovina Budimlića u prvoj polovini XIX. stoljeća [Trade of Budimlić's in the first half of the 19th century]. *Narodna starina, VI* (14), 59-70.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1982). O ženskoj subkulturi u Slavonskoj zadruzi [On woman's subculture in Slavonian zadruga]. In V. Domačinović (Ed.). *Žena u seoskoj kulturi Slavonije* (pp. 33-38). Zagreb: Etnološka tribina.

Senjković, Reana. (1994). O baroku [On the Baroque]. *Etnološka tribina, 17*, 123-138.

Sremac, Stjepan. (1978). Smotre folklora nekad i danas [Folk festivals in the past and present]. *Narodna umjetnost, 15*, 97-116.

Šestan, Ivan. (1995). *Milovan Gavazzi: Proživljeno stoljeće* [Milovan Gavazzi: Lived century]. Zagreb: Etnografski Muzej. (Exhibition catalog)

Tkalčić,Vladimir. (1922a). Etnografski Muzej u Zagrebu [Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb]. *Narodna starina, I* (1), 73-75.

Tkalčić,Vladimir. (1922b). Naputak za povjerenike Etnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu [Instructions for commissioners of the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb]. *Narodna starina, I* (3), 347-352.

Tkalčić,Vladimir. (1925). Seljačke nošnje u području Zagrebačke gore [Peasant costumes in the region of Zagreb mountain]. *Narodna starina, IV* (10), 133-164.

Tkalčić, Vladimir. (1931). Crkvene slike sa narodnim nošnjama [Church painting with folk costumes]. *Narodna starina, X* (26), 122-123.

Tkalčić,Vladimir. (1934). Međimurska seljačka nošnja na slici Čakovečkoga grada iz prve polovine XIX. stoljeća [Peasant costume from Međimuje on the painting depicting the town of Čakovec from the first half of the 19th century]. *Narodna starina, XIII* (33). 53-58.

Wolf, Eric. (1982). *Europe and the people without history.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Žega, Nikola. (1923). Zbirka Nikole Arsenovića (sa 17 slika) [The Nikola Arsenović collection (with 17 illustrations)]. *Narodna starina, II* (5), 129-150.

CHAPTER VI

FROM PRACTICE TO THEORY AND BACK AGAIN: THE ROLE OF THE ETHNOGRAPHIC MUSEUM IN ZAGREB IN THE CANONIZATION OF AUTOCHTHONOUS FOLK TEXTILES IN CROATIA

Introduction

A visitor to the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb cannot but be impressed by a large and visually attractive permanent display of Croatian folk costumes and textiles. The written guide to the exhibit explains that the displayed artifacts were selected to represent three ethnographic regions in Croatia, where, until recently, natural conditions determined the type of peasant economy and textile production. This has gradually changed over the course of this century, the guide informs us, "as a consequence of big transformations which started to shake the peasant society at the turn of the century....The process of degeneration and rejection of the national costume took place between the Wars.... while we can observe the last phases of its final extinction in the post war period." (Radauš-Ribarić, 1972, p. 5). The displayed textile artifacts themselves are predominantly from the end of the 19th century, but the guide suggests that "the origins of the particular type of costume, specific cut of costume, decorative motifs, kind and shape of adornment, woman's or man's head-gear, and even the hair style" (p. 6), are often hundreds and even thousands of years old.

This paper has been accepted for publication in the edited book, *Implementing Diversity in Museums*, to be published by the Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull, Quebec.

The traditional/modern dichotomy that can be discerned from the above interpretation of Croatian folk textiles is quite familiar, and certainly not an isolated phenomenon. The preoccupation with the origins of older textiles that were defined as traditional and evaluated as "autochthonous" or "authentic", and neglect of the more recent or "non-authentic" textiles, has been much discussed lately among textile scholars and museologists in North America. However, here the "other" is not a native agrarian but a native Indian, Inuit, or representative of some other non-Western culture. The focus in North American textile studies has been gradually shifting towards comparative and historical study of cloth dynamics on a world-wide scale, including processes of "modernization" in more recent times (Schneider, 1987). More generally, a model of non-Western and non-elite Western cultures as static, closed systems embedded in traditional frameworks that were eventually destroyed by modernization, is now giving way to a model of all cultures (Western and non-Western, elite and non-elite) as dynamic, functional, heterogeneous, stratified, open (poly)systems (Even-Zohar, 1990).

In Croatia, this shift is already evident within the discipline of ethnology and folklore studies[1]. However, it has not yet been extensively applied to all folklore phenomena, especially costumes and textiles. The Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, one of the major institutions devoted to the study of folk textiles, has been slow in incorporating these changes into its collection, exhibition and research practices. They are, though, gradually becoming evident[2] and are likely to accelerate in the near future due to the following pressures: 1) changes in research approach that have already occurred within the discipline of ethnology and folklore studies in Croatia; 2) recent political events which have destabilized the whole cultural system with its rapid opening

to the West; and 3) a recent redefinition of Croatian national identity which places less emphasis on the old pan-Slavic roots, and more on the cultural ties with Western Europe during its more recent history (Chapter II). Hence, the interest will likely shift from the study of archaic aspects of peasant textiles, to the study of historical change in production, exchange, and consumption of textiles in Croatia during the 19th and 20th century.

It is therefore particularly relevant now, at this time of potential transformation, to examine the Museum's past practice and ask the question of how the interpretation of folk textiles in the Museum's permanent exhibit came to be. When and how did textiles from rural areas first come to be elevated to the status of folk textile arts or Croatian national textile arts? When and how did subsequent canonization[3] of folk textiles occur? How did the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb both respond and contribute to the process of canonization?

In this chapter I will suggest that the elevation of folk textiles to the status of Croatian national textile arts occurred during the 19th and early 20th century. During that time, modified folk textiles entered urban fashions as a symbol of emerging Croatian identity within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and later became an important branch of the economy.

I will also suggest that the canonization of selected peasant textiles as the "autochthonous" or "true" Croatian national textile heritage occurred much later, during the 1930's, when a particular research model began to dominate Croatian ethnology and folklore studies. During that time, the autochthonous folk textiles were also instrumentalized as a symbol of both Yugoslav and Croatian national identity, but in the quite different context of the newly formed Yugoslavia.

Finally, I will show how the Museum, from the time of its inception in 1919 through to 1940, contributed to the canonization of selected folk textiles through its research and educational activities, and discuss the Museum's involvement with the economic and political instrumentalization of folk textiles during that time.

From Peasant Textiles to Croatian National Textile Arts

When the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb was established in 1919, the initial collection of folk textiles was created from the holdings of a number of earlier collections (Gjetvaj, 1989). These early collections were indicative of the raison d'être and criteria for collecting textiles from rural areas during the 19th and early 20th century.

In Croatia, the interest in folklore emerged during the first half of the 19th century within the Croatian National Revival or Illyrian Movement, in the midst of political struggles for national liberation (Bošković-Stulli, 1971). The folk culture of rural populations, in contrast to elite culture associated with towns and foreign rulers, became a symbol of the emerging national identity, which, under the influence of Herder and romanticism, was defined as a revival of the original essence of the people (Volk). Intellectuals who participated in the Illyrian Movement were first to introduce certain elements of rural costumes into Croatian urban fashions (Balog, 1987; Bošković-Stulli, 1971; Maruševski, 1978; Schneider, 1985). The Illyrian Movement also inspired the quest for the preservation of folk culture. Various manifestations of folk culture began to be recorded in written form, while material culture was collected in private and museum collections (Gjetvaj, 1989).

Towards the end of the 19th century, a new motivation became evident in the collection of textiles from rural regions: to promote textile instruction in regular schools across Croatia, and also in specialized schools which trained women for production of handmade textiles in rural home industries. The criteria for selection of folk textiles for such museum and private collections were the perceived aesthetic values of the decorative elements or other design features, as well as their applicability to the manufacture of textiles for town consumption.

Already in 1873, Matković wrote a brief summary about textile home industries in Croatia and Slavonia for the World Exhibition held in Vienna. He mentioned home industry production of linen and hemp cloth, silk yarn, woolen cloth, and other woolen textile products such as "carpets, aprons, bedcovers, bags, belts, socks, overcoats, etc. which are artfully decorated with special colorful ornaments. Such crafts have also internationally acquired high reputation" (pp. 97-98). Other individuals, such as S. Lay, S. Subotić, N. A. Plavšić, and D. Herman, were also involved in the early international trade of textiles made in Croatian home industries which they promoted on trade exhibitions in Moscow (1867), Budapest (1885, 1896), Trieste (1883), Bruxelles (1888), Barcelona (1888), and Paris (1889, 1900) (Hrvatska umjetnost, pp. 735-736).

Petrović (1992) writes that, in 1880, the Hungarian Ministry sent a request to the Art Society in Zagreb to prepare a collection of Croatian folk embroideries for the Museum in Budapest, along with "description of technology, coloring, suggestions for the improvements of looms, etc." (p. 150). This particular request was not only a sign of interest in trade of handmade textiles, but also a sign of the Hungarian claim to sovereignity over Croatia

which was particularly strong at that time. The founder of the Art Society in Zagreb, Iso Kršnjavi, went to rural Slavonia to collect the requested selection of embroidered textiles. He published his findings about rural textiles and other material culture in the form of a travelogue, *Pages from Slavonia*, in which he expressed the need to establish a trade museum in Zagreb, and to publish an illustrated technological dictionary of weaving and related technologies. He supplied collections of Croatian folk textiles to the Museum in Budapest as well as other European museums. Kršnjavi also taught in schools and lectured with the intention of educating the public about Croatian folk crafts. Petrović (1992) reports: "In order to raise the level of taste and arouse interest in folk crafts, he [Kršnjavi] lectured in the monastery of sisters of charity about style in textile arts, and in this way reformed in that monastery all handicrafts and the making of ecclesiastical textiles." (p. 153). Kršnjavi promoted textile crafts as Croatian national arts, and eventually paved the way for the opening of the Museum of Arts and Crafts in Zagreb in 1880. In 1919, the ethnographic section of the Museum of Arts and Crafts was transferred to the Ethnographic Museum.

Another collection that became part of the Ethnographic Museum in 1919 came from the Trade and Craft Museum associated with the Craft School in Zagreb. The content and purpose of this collection can be glimpsed from the catalogue describing it (Belović-Bernadzikowska, 1910). The collection consisted predominantly of samples of embroidery, lace, knitted textiles, kilims, and other woven textiles suitable for town consumption. They were to serve home industries of handmade textiles, an increasingly important branch of the Croatian economy because textiles were largely intended for export. "All over our country associations are being formed for the preservation of folk textile arts, where our intelligent and patriotic women will invest their knowledge and

effort to help peasant women in that direction" (p. 1). The intention was "to save the magnificent Croatian folk textile arts from being destroyed or forgotten; moreover, to educate new workers and create a new economic branch on the old basis" (p. 1).

Yet another textile collection that was transferred to the Ethnographic Museum in 1919 came from the School Museum in Zagreb. Šufflay (1917) writes how around 1907 "the government ordered women's schools to offer textile instruction in the national spirit" (p. 11). Belović-Bernadzikowska (1910) mentions that the central professional woman's school in Zagreb opened an atelier, "a nursery of the most beautiful folk ornaments, intended for women's schools all over the country - for schools that sinned in the past by tending only foreign works instead of our own Croatian ones" (p. 2).

The fourth and most spectacular early collection of folk textiles was from a legendary private collector, a merchant and textile industrialist, Salamon Berger. He collected folk textiles extensively, and either organized or collaborated with home industries of various types of textiles in several parts of Croatia, and later in Dalmatia, Serbia, and Slovenia. When necessary, he organized training for peasant women in order to teach them new technical skills. Over the years, he exhibited textiles made in home industries at ninety six trade exhibitions in Europe, North America, and Australia, where he reportedly received large orders from many international traders, including ones from Montreal and Winnipeg in Canada (Franić, 1935a; Gjetvaj, 1989; Šufflay, 1928).

It was also thanks to Berger's energetic collecting, marketing, and promoting that the opening of the Ethnographic Museum became a reality in 1919: the year after the fall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and subsequent formation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Berger sold his entire

collection to the Museum, donated money for its operation, and became its director between 1919 and 1925, and later its honorary director until his death in 1934 (Gjetvaj, 1989). Perhaps it was due to Berger that, during that period, one of the important activities of the Museum was the promotion of textile home industries. For example, the Museum exhibited folk textiles made in home industries at the World Exhibition of Decorative Arts in Paris (1925), and the World Exhibition in Paris (1927), Barcelona (1929), Copenhagen (1930), and Saarbrucken (1931/32) (Gjetvaj, 1989). The Museum also participated in trade exhibitions of folk textiles made in home industries that were held in Zagreb, and hosted the largest of such trade exhibitions on its grounds in 1935 (Franić, 1936).

Thus, it can be seen that the production of textiles in home industry was extensive, and that it was promoted both at home and abroad as the Croatian folk (or national) textile art. To what extent were these textiles based on folk textiles collected in rural areas? The answers will vary from one home industry to another. My research of the history of needle lace production on the island of Pag has shown that a lace making school and a home industry of lace were set up and operated in the town of Pag between 1907 and 1940. The materials used for making lace were not locally made. The basic needle lace technique was known to women in Pag, but the school training introduced many new technical aspects, and some new needle lace techniques. The smaller elements of lace design were retained as a trademark of Pag lace; however, the overall design of objects was done by outside designers, in order to meet market requirements for urban fashions and interior decorations (Bonifačić, 1992).

In Lepoglava, women traditionally made bobbin lace for sale at local fairs. Šufflay (1917) reported that such lace was often of poor quality and made with

foreign (Slovenian, Czech, and German) ornamental motifs (p. 12). Her intention was to introduce Croatian motifs for lace in the home industry she helped establish in Lepoglava. However, she actually adopted decorative motifs from samples of Croatian embroidery into patterns for lace making - an indication that textile ornamentation from various regions of Croatia traveled not only geographical distances through school instruction, but also from one textile technique to another.

With government support, Salamon Berger operated a weaving school in Zagreb between 1902 and 1905. The government donated ten German looms *Tisov* to Berger's schools. During that time Berger trained 16 women from rural areas in his school, and employed a total of 600 women in home industry production of various textiles (Berger, 1907). Berger (1907) described the purpose and organization of his school as following:

1. to gather peasant women from various parts of our country, and instruct them in our various [textile] techniques...
2. to train them...how to supervise and further teach women in their village...
3. Peasant women received from me materials for weaving and embroidery for 10 to 30 women in their village...
4 In this school we created new decorations on the basis of old Croatian ornaments, as well as collections of samples for [international]...trade representatives. Of particular significance were samples to be given out to women in rural areas free of charge. (p. 6)

Obviously, Berger trained women to use new types of looms and new weaving and embroidery techniques and ornaments. Franić (1935a) describes the way Berger modified decorative aspects of rural textiles for domestic and international urban consumption.

> Berger altered form and colour of ornament, but did not touch embroidery [decorative] techniques, he did not change spiritual values and disturb the inner content of ornament. He left the essence untouched, and altered and adjusted only the form so that the altered [textile] could serve [its new function]. Only in this way he succeeded to introduce Yugoslav folk [national] ornamentation onto the international world market as a desired good.
>
> From samples of his applied ornaments, five large folders have been retained by the Museum, and represent the important document of his efforts to save our rural home industry. (p. 9)

Stjepan Šajnović operated another textile home industry in Osekovo between the two wars. He had "40 women weavers and embroiderers who made folk costumes, ecclesiastical textiles, banners, and other clothing and decorative textiles" (Moslavac, 1995, p. 10). Šajnović exhibited his products at Zagreb trade exhibitions. During summer months he sold his products at his booth in Crikvenica, one of the earliest tourist seaside resorts in Croatia between the two World Wars (Moslavac, 1995, p. 10). Again, Šajnović altered the designs and created his own styles of modified folk costumes and other textiles.

Franić (1936) describes numerous other home industries that were operating in 1935 in rural regions of Croatia, as well as the two largest home industries in the cities of Split and Zagreb. In general, it appears that textile

home industries were encouraged and established in rural or urban locations where local women already possessed the basic necessary skills, but were at times given additional training to master new technical or technological aspects. The designs for textile products were provided by various outsiders, such as merchants, designers, teachers, or consumers. Certain aspects of the design were sometimes local, but often only related to Croatian folk textiles in general, and at times even imported from abroad. As a rule, the decorative designs were simplified, and the overall designs altered, in order to satisfy urban tastes.

It is therefore obvious that textiles made in home industries differed greatly from textiles made by peasants for their own use. However, this difference was generally not reflected in the popular nomenclature until the 1930's. Until then, all textiles were usually referred to by the same name: *narodna tekstilna umjetnost*, which can be translated as either folk or national textile arts. As will be seen later, the effort to create Croatian national arts by modification of folk arts, was not limited to textiles, but was, for example, also flourishing in the field of music (Sremac, 1978). However, by the 1930's, such notions were gradually replaced by the desire to primarily preserve the "authentic" forms of folklore, while at the same time encouraging further artistic and commercial applications of folk textiles for consumption in cities and towns. Thus, in the article describing the large trade exhibition in Zagreb in 1935, textiles made in home industries for urban and international markets were referred to as *applied popular arts* [primjenjena pučka umjetnost] in contrast to *autochthonous folk arts* [izvorna narodna umjetnost] which signified selected older textiles that peasants made for their own use (Franić, 1936). One of the main reasons for this change in classification and nomenclature was, I believe, that the canonization of selected textiles as "autochthonous" Croatian folk

textile heritage became quite clearly established around 1930 as a result of developments in ethnological research.

Ethnological Research of Textiles in Croatia: 1896 to 1940

In 1896, the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts in Zagreb initiated the systematic study of peasant culture with the publication of *The Journal for Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs*; at the same time its editor, Antun Radić, introduced a new academic discipline - ethnology: "a science about people" (Muraj, 1989). This also marked the official beginning of folk textile research in Croatia, which then further expanded during the first half of the century through the establishment of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb (1919), the Department of Ethnology at the University of Zagreb (1924), and various new journals and publications.

As described in Chapter IV, Antun Radić (1897) gave the initial framework to the newly established discipline with the publication of a questionnaire for collecting ethnographic data about material, social, and spiritual aspects of life and customs in rural regions. While Radić did not provide a well articulated theory and methodology, he did favour the interdisciplinary approach in ethnological research (Muraj, 1989, p. 17). The main publications based on Radić's questionnaire that were published in the *Journal of Folk Life and Culture of South Slavs* are nine monographs describing selected rural communities or parishes consisting of several communities. The ethnographic methods used in preparing these monographs are those of participant observation and informal interviews, since Radić insisted that only local people who knew the life and people in the community undertake collection of data.

The monographs are rich in information on many aspects of rural life, but particularly interesting in the domain of textiles, as they inquire into changes in rural clothing that were taking place at the time. From the questions that Radić posed in the questionnaire about clothing and textiles, it is obvious that Radić did not consider only handmade or older style clothing to be the valid subject of ethnological research, but all textile products that were either produced or used in rural communities.

As described in Chapter V, following the establishment of the Ethnographic Museum in 1919 within the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, ethnological activities in Croatia became more varied. As the Museum concerned itself with "preservation" of material culture that was perceived as being destroyed by the process of "modernization" of rural regions, the focus of their research generally shifted towards older folk costumes and textiles and their history. An influential scholar at that time, Josip Matasović, exerted an important influence on ethnological activities in Croatia as the main editor and publisher of his multidisciplinary journal devoted to history, art history, and ethnography of South Slavs, *National Heritage* (1922 -1935). Matasović considered that the interdisciplinary research approach would be beneficial for both ethnology and history (Muraj, 1993). Vladimir Tkalčić, a curator and later a director of the Museum, also combined ethnographic methods with those used by historians in his research of folk costumes.

Mirko Kus-Nikolajev and Milovan Gavazzi, however, introduced new theoretical models which were specifically designed by German scholars for studying peasant and other "primitive" arts and culture. It was the diffusionist or cultural-historical research model introduced by Milovan Gavazzi that eventually prevailed and dominated Croatian ethnology, beginning in 1928

with the publication of his first review article "The Cultural Analysis of Croat Ethnography", through to the 1980's (Muraj, 1989, p. 24). Gavazzi's appointments as curator (1922-1927) and then director (1939-1941) of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, professor at the Department of Ethnology (from the 1927 onwards), and leader of the Ethnological Seminar at the University of Zagreb, reflect the fact that he was at the center of ethnological activities in Croatia.

Gavazzi's cultural-historical (diffusionist) research approach was positivistic and descriptive (Muraj, 1989, p. 38). His goal was to determine the genesis of the material, technical, and functional aspects of folk textiles through time (excluding the 20th century processes of "modernization"), and their diffusion through space. His project was later further developed and elaborated upon by other textile scholars, the majority of whom were associated with the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb. The permanent exhibitions in the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, along with the published catalogues, provide quite an accurate reflection of the development of Gavazzi's project, and perhaps the most visible evidence of the dominance of his research model from its introduction in the late 1920's onwards (Kus-Nikolajev, 1927; Franić, 1935b; Gušić, 1955; Radauš-Ribarić, 1972).

It is important to distinguish at this point between the two levels of canonization. The described canonization was that of research models centered upon the question *how* to study textiles. The other canonization was that of the textile objects themselves which were consequently selected for study. The criteria for selection of textile objects were naturally not very clear cut. In general, older (largely 19th and early 20th c.) and preferably handmade festive costumes and textiles of peasant and non-elite segments of population were

selected for study, with the exclusion of the rural and urban elite, the rural and urban workers, as well as the rural and urban destitute[4]. Secondly, due to the research approach, those textiles that retained some archaic or very old technical, visual or functional characteristics were more likely to be documented, researched or exhibited. Such textiles came to be perceived and presented as the "authentic", autochthonous Croatian cultural heritage. Vernacular costumes and textiles that continued to change during this century in terms of their physical characteristics or social functions, were not only ignored, but devalued as non-authentic.

While the canonization of folk textiles has gradually taken place from the late 1920's onwards among ethnologists and museologists in Croatia, it is also important to determine the channels through which it reached the broader population and became accepted within the Croatian culture in general. The education system, publishing activities, and guided tours through the exhibitions in the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, served to inform the educated segments of the general public in Croatia. The predominant channel of distributing this interpretation and canonization of folk textiles among the broadest segments of uneducated rural population, was undoubtedly through political instrumentalization of "authentic" or autochthonous folk textiles, which will be described in the next section.

Political Instrumentalization of "Autochthonous" Folk Textiles in Croatia: 1928 to 1940

As mentioned earlier, in the first half of the 19th century, intellectuals who participated in the Illyrian movement were the first to introduce certain

elements of rural costumes into Croatian urban fashions as symbols of national identity. The Illyrian movement was limited to Croatia, yet it promoted Yugoslav national identity, that is, the idea of the unity of all south Slavs as one nation. Even though the Illyrian movement was politically crushed in 1849, the ideas of national identity and liberation lived on. However, they became more complex and diverse, internally divided between the quest for Croatian independence and the unity of all South Slav nations, until the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the formation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in 1918.

It was within the newly formed state that folk textiles were instrumentalized once again for political action in Croatia. Banac (1984) describes the policy of centralism in the newly formed state as following:

> ...these were the programs of educated classes, representing most of what was good and everything that was bad about South Slavic intelligencia, whose members were impatient to change Yugoslav reality and were not too particular about the means....They looked upon themselves as engineers who would pull a passive backward country into modernity, if need be by force....they tried to bring about a Great Serbia or a Great Yugoslavia, some out of sheer idealism, some for more pragmatic reasons. Their attempts....were doomed to failure, and only succeeded in provoking resistance of such intensity, notably among the Croats, that it could be stemmed only at the expense of parliamentary democracy. (p. 225)

The strongest opposition to the centralist policy was created by Stjepan Radić and his Croatian Peasant Party who sought greater autonomy for Croatia within the new state. The Party leader Stjepan Radić was a brother of Antun

Radić, the aforementioned ethnologist. Antun Radić abandoned his academic carrier in ethnology in 1902, founded with his brother Stjepan the Croatian Peasant Party in 1904, and devoted himself until his death in 1919 to political writings and activities. Antun Radić largely created the ideological framework and program for the Croatian Peasant Party, while Stjepan became its charismatic and dynamic leader and activist. While they acknowledged the undisputed historical existence of the Croatian nation, they promoted the brotherhood among the Slavic nations, and rejected any hegemonistic conception among them (Šidak, 1968). Thus, while the Party initially supported the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, it strongly rejected the centralist policies of a Serbian dominated government and struggled to gain greater autonomy for Croatia.

The strength of the Party was based on the size of membership, which was a direct result of the introduction of universal suffrage for men in 1920 (Banac, 1984, p. 227). This explains why, at that time, folk costumes and textiles were not instrumentalized among the leaders or the elite, but among peasants. During the 1920's, the ideology of the Party was more oriented towards the future, and aimed for the renewal of the whole Croatian culture on the basis of rural or folk culture (Leček, 1995). In the domain of textiles, this renewal was primarily envisioned through already established notions of bridging elite and folk textiles, by design modification of rural textiles, into new Croatian textile arts. Peasant women were often summoned to create textile decorations, banners, theater curtains, etc. for various programs and events organized by the party. Designs for such new textile creations were most likely made by educated women teachers or party organizers. Sremac (1978) also describes the first folk festival that was organized in Zagreb in 1926 by Peasant Unity, an organization

for peasant cultural and educational activities that was closely connected with the Croatian Peasant Party. This first festival was relatively small. Dressed in folk costumes, rural choirs sang folk songs that were arranged by Croatian composers, since the organizers promoted "songs that are simultaneously folklore and art" (Sremac, 1978, p. 100).

Following the assassination of Stjepan Radić in 1928, the Croatian Peasant Party lost its political power and influence, and the ideology promoted by Peasant Unity became closed in and ultimately regressive, aiming to preserve only the "pure" autochthonous forms of peasant culture. At the festival in 1929, for example, significant changes in relation to folk costumes and folk songs can be observed: increased attention is paid to the "authentic" forms of both costumes and songs. Sremac (1978) writes that on the 1929 festival,

> all peasant choirs were required to perform dressed in the folk costumes of their region, and if the folk costumes were no longer to be found, they had to be reconstructed according to the memory of the oldest people in the village. That is why on the festival there were two "juries". One judged the artistic accomplishments of the choirs, and another "folkloristic jury"...judged the purity of the folk costumes and songs....The appearance of this jury was a sign that greater attention was given to authentic forms; interestingly, greater emphasis was placed on the costumes than on the songs themselves." (p. 101).

With the introduction of political dictatorship in the same year, all activities of the Croatian Peasant Party and Peasant Unity were banned. In 1935, after a six year interruption, the activities of the Peasant Unity were revived and festivals began to be organized with renewed vigor. Between 1935 and 1940, eight central festivals were held in Zagreb, and 150 regional festivals

were held throughout Croatia (Sremac, 1978, p. 103). After the first festival in 1935, members of the "jury" (which included two ethnologists, Gavazzi and Bratanić) decided that in the subsequent years festivals would feature only autochthonous forms of folklore. Increasingly strict rules were further imposed relating to the authenticity of folk songs, dances, and costumes. Folk costumes were reconstructed in many regions, this time with "the help and supervision of experts" (p.103). These experts were Milovan Gavazzi, who was teaching at the Department of Ethnology (1927 -) and serving as director of the Ethnographic Museum (1939-1941) in Zagreb, and Branimir Bratanić who was also a professor at the Department of Ethnology. Bratanić (1936) reports how villages began to compete at festivals in presenting more and more beautiful and pure folk costumes; the Peasant Unity branch in Petrijevci "decided to give a prize every year to the girl featuring the most beautiful folk costume in the village" (p. 75). Almost by definition, with or without the help of experts, the process of costume reconstruction probably resulted in many inventions of "authentic" or autochthonous folk costumes. For example, Gušić (1955) indicates how in Slavonija "the Peasant Unity organization felt it necessary to have different clothes for different regions" (p. 73).

It is evident from Peasant Unity publications that pressure was placed on peasant women to return to making older handmade folk costumes and textiles not only for use in festivals, but even in real life, since the use of industrial materials and new styles in clothing were more and more prevalent in rural regions. Concurrently, there are indications of a resistance to that pressure. For example, at the annual general meeting of Peasant Unity in February 1936, a member, Franjo Novosel, was suggesting that women should return to wearing handmade folk costumes; he was interrupted by protesting voices from the

floor: "We don't want to go backwards! We want factories" ("Ravan put," 1936). This incident was often commented upon in subsequent issues of Peasant Unity publications. Various members argued that the return to the production of homegrown textile fibers and handmade cloth and costumes was a means to advance, and not regress. Such a return was perceived to be positive for economic reasons, as it would allow for peasant self-sufficiency. Equally important, it was a way to preserve autochthonous Croatian culture, as autochthonous folk costumes were perceived to be the "Croatian cultural identification card" (Bratanić, 1936, p. 76).

In 1939, as a concession to the Croats amidst growing internal and international political tensions, the Belgrade authorities reached an agreement with the leader of the Croatian Peasant Party, Vlatko Maček, and created a nominally autonomous province named the Banat of Croatia. The Croatian Peasant Party now became preoccupied with political and constitutional questions, and no longer strove to protect the interests of peasantry (Boban, 1971, p. 183). However, the Party renewed its efforts in organizing cultural activities in order to retain the votes of the peasantry. The fervor among members of Peasant Unity to promote peasant culture and a return to handmade cloth and costumes was therefore growing, rather than diminishing. In issues of Peasant Unity publications from 1940, the representatives of numerous rural chapters reported that the growing of flax and hemp, and production of handmade cloth and costumes had been revived in their villages. The costumes were largely intended for performances at local celebrations or regional and central folk festivals, but some reports indicate that in several areas older costumes were revived for use in everyday life and local rituals. When describing festivals organized by the Peasant Unity between 1935 and 1941, the

ethnologist Bratanić (1941) recounts increasingly strict rules regarding the songs, dances and costumes that could be presented:

> Everything that is presented at the festival must be **strictly** our national, **Croatian** and peasant....Obvious **foreign influences** from towns or from neighbouring nations (German, Italian, Hungarian, etc.) must not be present, nor should there be **wrong** (false) "**patriotism**". Such "patriotism" is manifested by displaying flags and tricolour ribbons, which are otherwise mere factory or store goods...
>
> Costumes must be national and peasant from head to toe, that is, from hats, scarves...to shoes [opanci] to boots...Costumes are not national simply by virtue of being made at home, instead they must be made in the national manner, with local construction patterns and decoration....Often the most beautiful costume is the simplest white costume. (pp. 47-48)

Bratanić (1941) went on to explain the reasons for introducing these rules:

> While foreign influences are usually commented upon with the sayings such as "this is necessary", "this is better and more practical than the old", "this is cheaper", "this requires less effort and suffering", "this is progressive", "this is modern", our festivals seem to say: "this is valuable, good, beautiful", and above all: "this is **ours**" (p. 39)

The Second World War not only disrupted the life in the region, but changed it irrevocably through the dissolution of the Yugoslav state and formation of the Independent State of Croatia in 1941, followed by the formation of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1945. The socialist government sought to industrialize and "modernize" the whole country, including the rural regions, and thus discouraged policies of promoting the return to the "lost paradise" in real life. On the other hand, the new government

continued the tradition of staged folk festivals, by taking over rural chapters of Peasant Unity and creating many new chapters. The change in ideology, however, brought also a significant change in programming by incorporating the folklore traditions of all Yugoslav nations (Rihtman-Auguštin, 1991, p. 83).

Conclusion

Viewed in a broader perspective, the phenomena associated with Croatian folk textiles described in this chapter, were part of international trends and movements: the late 18th and early 19th century "discovery" of folklore and its appropriation as a symbol of emerging national identities; the late 19th and early 20th century international trade in "national" or "ethnic" handmade textiles from home industries; the international Arts and Crafts Movement which, during the first decades of the 20th century, often sought inspiration in either "primitive" or peasant *unknown craftsmen,* as Yanagi (1972) so aptly put it; the early 20th century developments within the disciplines of ethnology and anthropology leading to the systematic study of peasant or "primitive" cultures: and the international trends in 20th century political movements to utilize older, handmade textiles as a means of mobilizing broad segments of illiterate populations[5].

The intention of this chapter was to illustrate the particular form these international trends assumed in Croatia in the first half of this century, and how changing political circumstances and concerns helped to shape both the study and preservation of textile artifacts, as well as their instrumentalization as a symbol of national identity.

A more specific intention was to show that the canonization of selected folk textiles, a significant development within the overall dynamics of the folk textile phenomenon in Croatia, occurred during the late 1920s and early 1930s, when Gavazzi's research approach gradually prevailed within the discipline of ethnology. The Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb actively participated in that process since Gavazzi, as curator in the Museum's formative years, to a large extent determined its research program. The canonization contributed greatly to a shift in Croatian culture in general, from the previous pursuit of creating new Croatian national textile arts on the basis of peasant textiles, toward the preservation of autochthonous folk costumes and textiles. Again, the Museum played an important role in effectively distributing the newly established norms and knowledge in two ways. Firstly, through exhibitions, guided tours, and publications it reached the educated segments of population. Secondly, by directly or indirectly collaborating with Peasant Unity in the organization of folk festivals and the reconstruction of "authentic" autochthonous folk costumes, it reached the uneducated segments of peasant population.

The permanent exhibit in the Museum still communicates the same interpretation of Croatian folk textiles to the visitors. The time has come to reflect upon the strengths, weaknesses, origins, and history of that particular interpretation. Furthermore, the time has come for the Museum to incorporate into its programming both "authentic" and "non-authentic" folk textiles, and embark on a broader historical and comparative study and presentation of cloth dynamics within the territory of Croatia.

Notes

1. As discussed in Chapter II, beginning in the 1970s, scholars associated with the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Studies in Zagreb began to examine the new social functions of "authentic" or canonized folk arts that continued to live outside of their original rural context; as well, they began to examine the long neglected non-canonized folk arts that continued to change during the course of this century (Bošković-Stulli, 1971, 1983; Rajković, 1988; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1979, 1987, 1989, 1991; Sremac, 1978; and others). This broadened area of study created an intense dialogue concerning related theoretical and methodological issues, and relationships of the disciplines of ethnology with those of anthropology, sociology, philosophy, history, and literary theory from both Western and Eastern Europe, and North America. Such interdisciplinary dialogue has irrevocably changed the discipline of ethnology and folklore studies in Croatia.

2. For example, Gjetvaj (1989) mentions that the Museum wished to incorporate into its programming changes in folk costumes and textiles that occurred during this century (p. 134). The Museum's recent temporary exhibition, *Zagreb Memories: Ethnographic Pictures of the Town*, presented several historical periods when folk textiles influenced Zagreb fashions - an indication of the Museum's broadening areas of study (Brenko & Jelavić, 1994).

3. By "canonized" I mean those norms and products "which are accepted as legitimate by the dominant circles within a culture and whose conspicuous products are preserved by the community to become part of its cultural heritage. On the other hand, "non-canonized" means those norms and products which are rejected by these circles as illegitimate and whose conspicuous products are often forgotten in the long run by the community (unless they change their status)" (Even-Zohar, 1990, p.15).

4. These exclusions were also ideologically motivated. At that time, workers and the destitute were the focus of communist ideology which was not widely supported by the Croatian elite, and was also strongly suppressed by the central government. At the same time, the left oriented intellectuals in Croatia rejected the use of folklore traditions as a symbol of national identity as elitist and conservative. For example, the leading figure among leftist intellectuals, Miroslav Krleža, wrote in 1937: "Today, at the time of Diesel machines, a weaving loom or distaff cannot represent means of resistance, and everything that is thought, believed or preached as an all-saving political Truth, all that ideology is from the times of distaffs and weaving looms, all that is long outlived German Romanticism, exactly where and when it preaches autochthonousness" (Krleža, 1937/1973, pp. 125-126).

5. Perhaps the most well known example was Ghandhi's use of *khadi* as both symbolic and economic means of resistance to the British rule (Bean, 1989).

References

Balog, Zdenko. (1987). Modne slike u Zagrebačkoj "Luni": Počeci modne žurnalistike u Hrvatskoj [Fashion plates in Zagreb magazine "Luna": The beginnings of fashion journalism in Croatia]. *Život umjetnosti, 41-42,* 15-24.

Banac, Ivo. (1984). *The national question in Yugoslavia: Origins, history, politics.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bean, Susan, S. (1989). Ghandhi and khadi, the fabric of Indian independence. In A. B. Weiner & J. Schneider (Eds.), *Cloth and human experience* (pp. 355-376). Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Belović-Bernadzikowska, Jelica. (1910). *Katalog Hrvatske narodopisne zbirke Trgovačko-Obrtnog muzeja u Zagrebu* [Catalog of the Croatian folk collection of the Trade-Craft Museum in Zagreb]. Zagreb: Trgovačko-Obrtni Muzej.

Berger, Salomon. (1907). *Tragedija naše kućne industrije* [The tragedy of our home industry]. Zagreb: Tiskara Mile Maravica.

Boban, Ljubo. (1971). Stranke, političke [Parties, political]. In M. Krleža (Ed.), *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* (pp. 162-191). Zagreb: Jugoslavenski Leksikografski Zavod.

Bonifačić, Vjera. (1992) Lace production on the island of Pag, Croatia, from 1900 to the present. In *Textiles in Daily Life, Proceedings of the Third Biennial Symposium of the Textile Society of America* (pp. 237-248). Seattle, Washington, United States: Dos Tejedoras.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1971). O folklorizmu [About folklorism]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 45,* 165-186.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1983). *Usmena književnost nekad i danas* [Oral literature in the past and present]. Beograd: Prosveta.

Bratanić, Branimir. (1936). Narodna nošnja i ljudski napredak [Folk costumes and human progress]. *Seljačka Sloga, 1* (4), 75-78.

Bratanić, Branimir. (1941). *O smotrama hrvatske seljačke kulture* [About festivals of Croatian peasant culture]. Zagreb: Mala Knjižnica Seljačke Sloge.

Brenko, Aida & Jelavić, Željka. (1994). *Zagrebačke uspomene: Etnografske slike grada* [Zagreb memories: Ethnographic pictures of the town]. Zagreb: Etnografski Muzej. (Exhibition catalog)

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1990). Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today, 11-1,* 1-253.

Franić, Ivo. (1935a). S. Berger - Etnografski muzej u Zagrebu - i naša pučka umjetnost [S. Berger - Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb - and our popular arts]. *Vjesnik Etnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu, 1,* 1-14.

Franić, Ivo. (1935b). *Reorganizovani Etnografski Muzej u Zagrebu* [The reorganized Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb]. Zagreb.

Franić, Ivo. (1936). Prva izložba primjenjene pučke umjetnosti na jesenskoj izložbi Zagrebačkog Zbora u Zagrebu [The first exhibition of applied popular arts at the fall exhibition of Zagrebački Zbor in Zagreb]. *Vjesnik Etnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu, 3,* 211-217.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1928). Kulturna analiza etnografije Hrvata [Cultural analysis of Croatian ethnography]. *Narodna starina, 7,* 115-144.

Gjetvaj, Nada. (1989). Etnografski muzej u Zagrebu - u povodu 70. obljetnice [Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb - on the occasion of the seventieth anniversary]. *Etnološka istraživanja, 5.*

Gušić, Marijana. (1955). *Commentary on the exhibited material.* Zagreb: Ethnographical Museum.

Hrvatska umjetnost (Tkanje, vezenje, pletenje i čipkarstvo) [Croatian art (Weaving, embroidery, knitting and lace)]. (1943). *Naša domovina, 2,* 733-737.

Krleža, Miroslav. (1973). Nekoliko riječi o malograđanskom historizmu uopće [Few words about provincial historicity in general]. In M. Krleža, *Deset krvavih godina i drugi politicki eseji* (pp. 81-126). Sarajevo: Oslobođenje. (Original work published 1937)

Kus-Nikolajev, Mirko. (1927). *Šetnje kroz Etnografski Muzej u Zagrebu: Privremeni vodič* [Walks through the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb: Temporary guide]. Zagreb: S. Berger.

Leček, Suzana. (1995). Između izvornog i novog - "Seljačka Sloga" do 1929 godine [Between autochthonous and new - "Peasant Concord" until 1929]. *Etnološka tribina, 18,* 103-123.

Maruševski, Olga. (1978). Da nam naše krasne prionu uz naš list ...[That our beauties would adhere to our leaf ...]. In S. Draganić (Ed.), *Umjetničke znamenitosti Zagreba II* (pp. 73-96). Zagreb: Kajkavsko Spravišče.

Matković, Petar. (1873). *Hrvatska i Slavonija u svojih fizičkih i duševnih odnošaji: Spomenica za svjetsku izložbu u Beču 1873* [Croatia and

Slavonia: Memorial publication of the World Exhibition in Vienna in 1873]. Zagreb: Štamparija Dragutina Albrechta.

Moslavac, Slavica. (1995). *Stjepan Šajnović i Moslavačka narodna nošnja* [Stjepan Šajnović and folk cotume from Moslavina]. Osekovo: Muzej Moslavine Kutina. (Exhibition catalog)

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1989). *Živim znači stanujem: Etnološka studija o kulturi stanovanja u Žumberačkim Sočicama* [I live therefore I inhabit: Ethnological study about the culture of habitation in Sočice, Žumberak]. Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1993). Josip Matasović u svjetlu hrvatske etnologije [Josip Matasović in the light of Croatian ethnology]. *Etnološka tribina, 16*, 11-34.

Petrović, Tihana. (1992). Iso Kršnjavi kao etnograf [Iso Kršnjavi as ethnographer]. *Etnološka tribina, 15*, 149-156.

Radauš-Ribarić, Jelka. (1972). *Guide through the permanent exhibition of the Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb.* Zagreb: Grafički Zavod Hrvatske.

Radić, Antun. (1897). Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu [The basis for the collection and study of data about folk life]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 2*, 1-88.

Rajković, Zorica, Ed. (1988). *Contributions to the study of contemporary folklore in Croatia.* Zagreb: Institute of Folkore Research.

Ravan put Seljačke Sloge [Strait road of Peasant Unity]. (1936). *Seljačka Sloga, 1* (2), p. 38.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1979). Istraživanje folklora i kulturna praksa [Folklore research and cultural practice]. *Narodna umjetnost, 16*, 9-20.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1987). Teorija o dvije kulture (Od Radića do Gramscija, Ciresea i Burkea) [The theory of the two-tiered model of culture (From Radić to Gramsci, Cirese and Burke)]. *Narodna umjetnost, 24*, 177-197.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja, & Povrzanović, Maja. (Eds.). (1989). *Folklore and the historical process.* Zagreb: Institut of Folklore Research.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1991). Istinski ili lažni identitet - ponovno o odnosu folklora i folklorizma [Identity true or false: Again on the relationship between folklore and folklorism]. In Dunja Rihtman-Auguštin (Ed.), *Simboli identiteta* (pp. 78-89). Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Schneider, Jane. (1987). The anthropology of cloth. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 16*, 409-448.

Schneider, Marijana. (1985). Nošnja Iliraca [Illyrian costume]. In *Hrvatski narodni preporod, 1790-1848: Hrvatska u vrijeme Ilirskog pokreta* (pp. 371-379). Zagreb: Muzej za Umjetnost i Obrt.

Sremac, Stjepan. (1978). Smotre folklora nekad i danas [Folk festivals in the past and present]. *Narodna umjetnost, 15*, 97-116.

Šidak, Jaroslav, (1968). Antun Radić. In M. Krleža (Ed.), *Enciklopedija Jugoslavije* (pp. 11-12). Zagreb: Jugoslavenski Leksikografski Zavod.

Šufflay, Zlata. (1917). *Hrvatska narodna čipka u domu i na oltaru* [Croatian folk lace at home and on the church altar].

Šufflay, Zlata. (1928). *Izložba narodnih ručnih radova Zagrebačkog Zbora* [Exhibition of folk handicrafts on Zagrebacki Zbor]. Zagreb: Narodne novine.

Yanagi, Soetsu. (1972). *The unknown craftsmen: A Japanese insight into beauty*. New York: Kodansha International.

CHAPTER VII
CONCLUSION

This study has examined how Croatian ethnological research functioned within the broader polysystem of folk arts in Croatia between 1896 and 1940. Particular emphasis was given to the process of canonization of the diffusionist research model, and subsequent canonization of selected popular folk textiles, suitable for that type of study, as "authentic" or autochthonous folk costumes and textiles. This study further examined the return effects of these canonization processes on practice, namely how it affected interrelationships between different types of folk textiles and their functions in Croatian society during that period of time.

The findings suggest that in its initial phase, between 1896 and 1919, when Croatian provinces were still a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, ethnological research was relatively uniform and stable. Only one academic journal, *The Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs*, was devoted to ethnological research. In its second issue the main editor of the journal, Antun Radić, published a questionnaire to facilitate the collection of ethnographic data about the folk culture of South Slavs. In addition, he sketched out the initial broad design for Croatian ethnology as a newly established science (Radić, 1897). Between 1897 and 1919, the main publications in the journal reported studies which had used Radić's questionnaire to collect data about life and culture in rural communities or regions. These data were to serve further comparative analysis and scientific interpretation of the folk culture of South Slavs, but this later stage of Radić's design was never carried out. Nevertheless, from the way the questionnaire was formulated, it is obvious that the main focus

of ethnological research during this initial phase was to document and interpret the totality of life and culture as it functioned in rural communities. As was particularly evident in the sections of the questionnaire that dealt with clothing and textiles, this totality included processes of "modernization" that were affecting rural regions at that time (Chapter IV). Research results in several monographs from that period suggest that the effects of "modernization" on young women's clothing styles in rural areas were often disapproved of by local priests. Some priests actively promoted a return to handmade ornamentation and older clothing styles on moral, economic, and aesthetic grounds - as repositories of national arts and values. These elitist ideological preferences for "authentic" handmade clothing and textiles signify the early stages of the process of the "nationalization of folk culture" (Logfren, 1991) among the rural population of Croatia.

After the First World War, Croatia became part of the newly formed Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Janjatović (1993) reports that the new government immediately introduced harsh measures on Croatian peasants. The government imposed "taxes that were four times higher than in Serbia...new laws, beatings, physical and psychological mistreatment, arrest for minor infractions...and force used against whole villages....The peasantry thus became a symbol of Croatia's subordination in the new state" (p. 43). As discussed in Chapter VI, the centralist policies of Serbs who dominated the new government provoked the strongest resistance among Croats, notably in Stjepan Radić and his Croatian Peasant Party. This opposition was eventually silenced in 1929, when the government ended parliamentary democracy and enforced dictatorial rule (Banac, 1984).

Under these circumstances, the government had little interest in documenting conditions of life in rural Croatia. The new government did have vested interest, however, in promoting those aspects of history of South Slavs that would serve as symbols of a new Yugoslav national identity. Since folk culture was widely accepted as a legitimate basis for creating new nation-states in Europe at the time, it is not surprising that immediately after the First World War, in 1919, the new government established the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb, Croatia, and in 1921 in Ljubljana, Slovenia. Ethnographic museums already existed in Belgrade, Serbia (1901), Split, Dalmatia (1910), and in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Hercegovina (1913) (Gavazzi, 1931).

The primary mandate of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb was to create new collections about folk culture of Croatians and other South Slavs, based on scientific research. These were meant to "represent all life and culture of our nation, above all peasants, who to this day have best preserved our national characteristics" (Tkalčić, 1922, p. 347). The purpose of such collection was the advancement of school instruction and public education. This aspect of national culture would also be presented to the international community and to different nations within the new state. In other words, the new government established the Museum in order to "preserve", study, and present through its exhibition and publishing activities "traditional" aspects of folk or peasant culture, as a symbol of pan-Slavic identity of all its people. It was most likely not a mere coincidence that in the same year of 1919, the already existing Committee for Folklore at the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts which has been publishing *The Journal for Folk Life and Culture of South Slavs* since 1896, also decided to alter its activities. They abandoned Radić's approach and participant observation methods of documenting life in rural communities, in

favor of "better quality researchers...who through ethnographic record wanted to *preserve certain aspects of traditional culture* [italics added]" (Čulinović-Konstantinović, 1984, p. 78). Then, in 1924, the Department of Ethnology was established at the University of Zagreb, which provided yet another institutional setting not only for conducting research, but also for the formal education of professionals in the field of folklore.

This increase in institutional activities, and a shift towards a historical study of folk culture, can be attributed to the interests of the new government. Paradoxically, it can also be attributed to the disappointment of the Croatian elite with the centralist policies of the new state, and, therefore, to their nationalistic reflex to protect Croatian authenticity. The dynamics of research activities within these institutions, however, were partially autonomous, and depended on the background education and research orientations of the individuals who occupied key positions within these institutions and in publishing activities. As discussed in Chapter V, three new basic models were used in ethnological research of folk culture in Croatia during the 1920s: 1) the historical model, which researched the structures of everyday life of the rural population, including rural-urban interactions; 2) the sociological model which interpreted folk arts as a collective expression of what was perceived to be the closed communal life of peasantry; 3) the diffusionist or cultural-historical model which sought to classify products (both objects and behaviour) of "traditional" aspects of peasant culture according to their origins and patterns of diffusion. The two latter models had been developed in German language areas and were introduced to Croatian ethnological research by Kus-Nikolajev and Gavazzi respectively. Both of these models distinguished between "traditional" and "modern" forms of folk culture, and considered "traditional" forms to be

products of what was once an autochthonous folk culture and a pristine peasant way of life, which were being destroyed by processes of "modernization". Kus-Nikolajev's sociological model was somewhat narrower; it stressed the "primitive" character of visual aspects of material folk arts, and considered them to be a collective expression of a peasant communal way of life and its modes of production. Gavazzi's model was more encompassing, as it took into account all products (objects and behaviour) of "traditional" folk culture and aimed to classify them according to their origins and diffusion patterns. Gavazzi's model also stressed old-Slavic elements as the bases that bound the whole dynamic structure of Croatian peasant culture into a coherent unity (Gavazzi, 1928).

Gavazzi's model was obviously most suited to the needs of the new state to use folk culture as an affirming symbol of the new nation-state of South Slavs. It also encompassed all products of traditional folk culture within the territory of Croatia, and was therefore well suited as a totalizing program for Croatian ethnology, as well as for museum collections and classifications of its holdings. Equally importantly, as a professor and a central figure at the newly established Department of Ethnology, Gavazzi was in a position to determine the education of Croatian ethnologists. As an exceptionally energetic but authoritative educator, Gavazzi promoted exclusively his research model and methods in teaching many generations of Croatian ethnologists (Čapo-Žmegač, 1995; Muraj, 1989). As a consequence of these factors, Gavazzi's diffusionist model prevailed and during the 1930s became canonized as the "true" research model in Croatian ethnology.

The Polysystem Theory postulates that the process of canonization can best be understood by examining relevant institutional dynamics in terms of

their relationship (positive and negative) to the centers of social power, as well as their partially autonomous struggles over *models* for production and/or consumption of the products in question (Even-Zohar, 1990, p. 19). Furthermore, canonization on the level of models leads to the canonization on the level of products. In this case, the described canonization of the diffusionist research model led to the canonization of selected folk textile objects, suitable for that type of study, as the "authentic" folk costumes and textiles. The preference was to study older and largely handmade festive costumes and textiles from the late 19th and early 20th century, in order to reconstruct their technical, visual or functional origins and diffusion patterns. One of the most important aims of diffusionist research was the reconstruction of autochthonous folk costumes and textiles for various regions of Croatia. Along with additional archival and research documentation and publications, these costumes and textiles would then be preserved in museums as part of the national cultural heritage of Yugoslav nations.

Paradoxically, however, during the late 1920s and 1930s, such reconstructed folk costumes found a quite different political function: they were promoted as a symbol of Croatian national identity by the main opposition party, the Croatian Peasant Party, and its cultural section, Peasant Unity. As Leček (1995) describes, during the 1920's, the ideology of the Croatian Peasant Party was future oriented. Having gained concrete political influence and power in political life after the introduction of universal suffrage, the leaders "sought to find a political solution with the center of political power in Belgrade, as well as with urban political parties within Croatia" (p. 104). The Party aimed at improving the position of the peasant population in society, and to determine its place "in the complex process of modernization" (p. 104). This aim was also

reflected in the nature of the organized activities of the Party's educational and cultural section, Peasant Unity. During the 1920s these activities centered on teaching rural populations the values of their own culture, but also of accepting the urban elite values and modernization of villages. Hence they organized literacy courses, lectures, choirs, theater performances, and village libraries. During the 1920s, Peasant Unity generally encouraged artistic creations (literature, theater, music, textile crafts) that were based on rural traditions. They wanted to save Croatian folk heritage "not only by collecting and conserving it in museums, but also...to return it to a village (songs, costumes, crafts) and *make possible the continuation of artistic development on the old basis* [italics added]" (p. 109).

The assassination in 1928 of the leader of the Croatian peasant movement, Stjepan Radić, marked the end of parliamentary democracy and dictatorship by the central government in 1929. This resulted in a shift in the ideology of Peasant Unity from an openness to the future towards a return to the past. In other words, attempts to create a common national art and culture were replaced with ideas of return to the "authentic" forms of peasant culture from the past.

As a result, from 1929 onwards, autochthonous folk costumes were displayed at numerous central and regional folk festivals across Croatia which were organized by Peasant Unity. The standards of authenticity for these costumes were guided and enforced by a jury comprised of ethnologists. As well, reconstruction of "authentic" folk costumes for use in local life was at times guided by ethnologists. This reconstruction effectively transformed practice.

As described in Chapter IV, popular folk clothing and textiles used by the rural population in the context of their local life were changing visibly in most

regions of Croatia. They changed partially due to availability of new materials, techniques, and technologies in textile production. However, until the creation of socialist Yugoslavia in 1946, change (or lack of change) in production and consumption of textiles in rural areas was mostly due to the vital functions clothing and textiles played in women's marriage strategies, and as markers of the professional, economic, and social status of individuals or families in the local community. Throughout the 19th and early 20th century, changes in rural costumes were often disapproved of by the elite in Croatia on moral, economic, or aesthetic grounds. From the 1930s onwards, however, the canonization of older styles of popular folk costumes and textiles as autochthonous, and organized efforts of Peasant Unity to promote their use, legitimized more concretely the hierarchy between the "traditional" (authentic) and "modern" (inauthentic) folk textiles.

The other type of folk textiles, the "applied" folk textile arts, were largely made between the 1890s to 1940s in home industries for Croatian and international urban consumption. As discussed in Chapter VI, the visual and material characteristics of such textiles were only remotely based on rural folk textiles, and were greatly modified for their new functions in urban life. Between the 1890s and late 1920s, such textiles were promoted as Croatian national art by Croatian schools, museums, as well as by Peasant Unity organization. After the canonization of selected older popular folk textiles as the "authentic" or "true" folk textile arts around 1930, the applied folk textiles continued to be made and marketed internationally, but they were relegated to the secondary place of "commercial" arts which lacked the "genuine" peasant artistic expression.

This process of canonization and hierarchization of different types of folk textiles was established in Croatia during the 1930s and remained firmly in place throughout the socialist period. The described process of canonization on the level of research models shows the important role that ethnological research played at first in creating and legitimizing, and later in maintaining, the established hierarchy between different types of folk textiles in Croatian culture from the 1930s onwards.

Suggestions for further research

The natural extension of this study would be to examine the dynamics of change in the folk arts polysystem in Croatia during the later socialist period, and more recently in the post-socialist period. This may include a range of studies of the production, consumption, and institutional or marketing mediation of different types of folk textiles during that period. One of the possible institutional studies of interest in the socialist period would be the opposite process of "de-canonization", i.e. the gradual shift away from the diffusionist research model in ethnological research, and the recent ongoing struggles among institutions over changes in educational and museum programming. Another area of interest would be to examine closely the ideological and political function of autochthonous folk textiles in socialist Yugoslavia, as well as their economic functions in tourist, entertainment, and marketing industries.

As discussed in Chapter II, Croatian ethnologists who study textiles have largely been resisting changes in terms of research models. However, they are bound to introduce changes in the near future if they want to open up not only to international developments in ethnological scholarship, but to developments

in ethnological, folklore, and historical scholarship that have already taken place within Croatia (Bošković-Stulli, 1983a; Gross, in press; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1988). Their geographical focus will likely remain limited to the territory of Croatia. It remains to be seen, however, which time period they will choose to focus on, and which particular theoretical/methodological approaches and research models they will adopt and perhaps even canonize. If they adopt approaches which study textiles within the socio-historical context, they will have to abandon some of the old terminology and create a new one. The term folk textiles is particularly undesirable, not only because of its a-historical character, but also because of its long history and the connotations associated with it. As Bošković-Stulli (1973/1983b) and Rihtman-Auguštin (1988) already suggested, this term should be preserved only when describing the historical processes of the social construction of folk textiles and their changing functions in Croatian society during the 19th and 20th century.

For North American textile studies, which focus on textiles from around the world, it would be valuable to extend this study comparatively to other republics of the former Yugoslavia, and further to other meaningfully selected European countries.

More generally, further application of the Polysystem Theory in both Croatian and North American textile studies offers a broad program of work for historical and comparative study of textile dynamics on either the local or global scale.

References

Banac, Ivo. (1984). *The national question in Yugoslavia: Origins, history, politics.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1983a). *Usmena književnost nekad i danas* [Oral literature in the past and present]. Beograd: Prosveta.

Bošković-Stulli, Maja. (1983b). O pojmovima usmena i pučka književnost i njihovim nazivima [On concepts of oral and popular literature and related terminology]. In M. Bošković-Stulli, *Usmena književnost nekad i danas*, (pp. 5-114). Beograd: Prosveta. (Original work published 1973)

Čapo-Žmegač, Jasna. (1995). Two scientific paradigms in Croatian ethnology: Antun Radić and Milovan Gavazzi. *Narodna umjetnost, 32* (1), 25-38.

Čulinović-Konstantinović, Vesna. (1979). Historijski prikaz etnoloških istraživanja i interesa za narodnu kulturu u Hrvatskoj [Historical review of ethnological investigations and interest for folk culture in Croatia]. *Etnološka tribina, 2*, 67-88.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (1990). Polysystem studies. *Poetics Today, 11* (1), 1-253.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1928a). Kulturna analiza etnografije Hrvata [Cultural analysis of Croatian ethnography]. *Narodna starina, VII* (17), 115-144.

Gavazzi, Milovan. (1931). Razvoj i stanje etnografije u Jugoslaviji [The development and present state of ethnography in Yugoslavia]. *Łud Slowianski, II (1)*, 72-106.

Gross, Mirjana. (in press). *Suvremena historiografija - korijeni, postignuća, traganja* [Contemporary historiography - roots, achievements, explorations].

Janjatović, Bosiljka. (1993). Represija spram hrvatskih seljaka 1918 - 1921 [Repression towards Croatian peasants 1918 - 1921]. *Časopis za suvremenu povijest, 1*, 25-44.

Leček, Suzana. (1995). Između izvornog i novog - "Seljačka Sloga" do 1929 godine [Between autochthonous and new - "Peasant Concord" until 1929]. *Etnološka tribina, 18*, 103-123.

Lofgren, Orvar. (1991). The nationalization of culture: Constructing Swedishness. *Studia ethnologica, 3*, 101-116.

Muraj, Aleksandra. (1989). *Živim znači stanujem: Etnološka studija o kulturi stanovanja u Žumberackim Sočicama* [I live therefore I inhabit:

Ethnological study about the culture of habitation in Sočice, Žumberak]. Zagreb: Hrvatsko Etnološko Društvo.

Radić, Antun. (1897). Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu [Foundations for collecting and interpreting materials about folk life]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena, 2*, 1-88.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. (1988). *Etnologija naše svakodnevnice* [The ethnology of our everyday life]. Zagreb: Školska Knjiga.

Tkalčić, Vladimir. (1922). Naputak za povjerenike Etnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu [Instructions for commissioners of Ethnographic Museum of Zagreb]. *Narodna starina, I* (3), 347-352.

Appendix

Glossary of Croatian Names

Ethnological Journals and Publications

Collection of Yugoslav Ornaments	Zbirka Jugoslavenskih Ornamenata
Ethnological Forum	Etnološka Tribina
Ethnological Library	Ethnološka Biblioteka
Ethnological Research	Etnološka Istraživanja
Ethnological Research and Data	Etnološka Istraživanja i Građā
Folk Arts	Narodna Umjetnost
Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs	Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena
Journal of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb	Vjesnik Etnografskog Muzeja u Zagrebu
National Heritage	Narodna Starina

Institutions

Center for Ethnological Cartography	Centar za etnološku kartografiju
Center for Ethnology	Centar za etnologiju
Craft School	Obrtna škola
Department of Ethnology	Katedra za etnologiju
Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb	Etnografski Muzej u Zagrebu
Ethnological Seminar	Etnološki Seminar
Institute of Folk Arts	Institut za narodnu umjetnost

Institute of Folklore Research	Institut za istraživanje folklora
Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Research	Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku
Museum of Arts and Crafts	Muzej za umjetnost i obrt
School Museum	Školski Muzej
Trade and Craft Museum	Trgovačko-Obrtni Muzej
University of Zagreb	Sveučiliste u Zagrebu
Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts	Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti

States, Political Parties, Organizations

Banat of Croatia	Banovina Hrvatska
Croatian Peasant Party	Hrvatska seljačka stranka
Independent State of Croatia	Nezavisna Država Hrvatska
Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes	Kraljevina Srba, Hrvata i Slovenaca
Peasant Unity	Seljačka sloga