UNIVERSITAS COMENIANA BRATISLAVENSIS
FACULTAS PHILOSOPHICA
Tomus 38 ETHNOLOGIA SLOVACA ET SLAVICA 2017

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF HARNESSING CATTLE – AN IMPORTANT CHAPTER IN THE HISTORY OF EUROPEAN ETHNOLOGY[1]

JIŘÍ WOITSCH

PhDr. Jiří Woitsch, Ph.D., The Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Na Florenci 3, 110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic, jiri.woitsch@post.cz

Abstrakt

V 60. letech 20. století došlo v evropské etnologii k mimořádnému rozvoji mezinárodní spolupráce. Stalo se tak zejména v důsledku příznivých mezinárodně-politických okolností, badatelskému vzestupu progresivní generace národopisců i díky institucionálnímu a paradigmatickému etablování komparativní evropské etnologie (Ethnologia Europaea). Do práce na rozsáhlých komparativních projektech (např. Evropský etnologický atlas) a v nadnárodních badatelských týmech a organizacích (např. MKKKB, SIA) se přitom velice aktivně zapojila i generace výjimečných osobností československého (resp. českého a slovenského) národopisu. Mnoho badatelských záměrů zůstalo nedokončeno,

[1] This study is an outcome of the GA15-03754S project *Mezi státním plánem a badatelskou svobodou. Etnografie a folkloristika v českých zemích v kontextu vývoje kultury a společnosti v letech 1945 – 1989* supported by the Czech Science Foundation. Its basic propositions were presented at a conference held in Trnava on 18 May 2016 on the occasion of the 90th birthday of prof. Ján Podolák. This study respectfully gives credit to this outstanding Slovak expert on traditional agrarian culture in Central and Eastern Europe.

jiné však byly završeny výjimečnými a stále platnými vědeckými výstupy věnovanými např. transportu, pěstování obilí či chovu dobytka. Typickým příkladem takového projektu byl i promyšlený srovnávací výzkum zápřahu skotu v 18. – 20. století, který byl koordinován Komisí pro dějiny a vývoj evropského zemědělství SIEF a jehož hybateli byli Jaroslav Kramařík a Wolfgang Jacobeit. Výzkum byl završen publikací monotematického čísla Národopisného věstníku československého v roce 1969, do kterého přispěla řada špičkových badatelů z celé Evropy. Problematiku slovenskou v něm zpracoval Ján Podolák. V příspěvku, který vychází zejména z nezpracované pozůstalosti J. Kramaříka a dalších pramenů a literatury je rozebráno organizační pozadí výzkumu zápřahu dobytka, jeho výsledky a zhodnocen jejich přínos pro rozvoj české, slovenské i evropské agrární etnografie.
Klíčova slova: *zápřah skotu, evropská etnologie, dějiny etnologie, teorie a metodologie, mezinárodní spolupráce, SIEF*

Abstract

During the 1960s, international co-operation within European ethnology underwent huge development. This was particularly the result of favourable international political circumstances, increasing research activities of a progressive generation of ethnologists and also due to the institutional and paradigmatic establishment of comparative European ethnology (Ethnologia Europaea). A generation of exceptional figures in Czechoslovak (or Czech and Slovak) ethnology were also very actively involved within international research teams and organisations. Many research plans have remained uncompleted, while others resulted in outstanding and still valid scientific outputs dealing with, e.g. transport, growing grains and cattle farming. A typical example of such a project is the carefully considered comparative study of harnessing cattle in the 18th – 20th century co-ordinated by SIEF's Commission for the History and Development of European Agriculture, driven forward by Jaroslav Kramařík and Wolfgang Jacobeit. This research culminated in the publication of an issue of Národopisný věstník československý dedicated to this single topic in 1969, in which a number of leading researchers from throughout Europe made contributions. Study, which is mainly based on papers in J. Kramařík's estate, which had not been worked on, along with additional sources and literature, looks at the organisation of this research into harnessing cattle, its results and an assessment of its benefit for the development and Czech, Slovak and European agrarian ethnology.
Key words: *harnessing cattle, European ethnology, history of ethnology, theory and methodology, international collaboration, SIEF*

Introduction

During the 1960s, international co-operation within European ethnology underwent huge, and to this day unsurpassed, development. This was in particular the result of favourable international political circumstances leading to a reduction in tensions between the so-called East and West, increasing research from a progressive generation of ethnologists, and also due to the institutional and paradigmatic establishment of comparative European ethnology (Ethnologia Europaea) promoted in particular by Sigurd Erixon and those working with him, which was especially developed in Scandinavia and the German-speaking countries of Europe. The unprecedented 'networking' of ethnology across even the Iron Curtain, at least for a short time, brought it closer to the situation in folkloristic research, which had been marked by significant internationalisation, even in Central Europe's case, since the end of the 19th century (Bendix, 2012; Šrámková, 2008).

A generation of exceptional figures in Czechoslovak (or Czech and Slovak) ethnology were also very actively involved in work on large comparative projects (e.g. the Ethnological Atlas of Europe, the Handbook of European Ethnology) and international research teams and organisations (e.g. International Commission of the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathians and Balkans – MKKKB, Ständige Internationale Atlaskommission – SIA, various CIAP working groups – Commission des Arts et Traditions Populaires, later transformed into SIEF – Société Internationale d´Ethnologie et de Folklore). The Czechs and Slovaks who established themselves within ethnology during this specific period (e.g. Jaroslav Kramařík, Josef Vařeka, Václav Frolec, Ján Podolák) were mainly younger and middle-generation researchers, specialists in 'traditional' fields of ethnology in which Central European research had a long tradition – research into traditional architecture, production, clothing and agriculture. Almost all those named had also studied with major figures of First Republic and immediate post-war ethnology (Karel Chotek, Antonín Václavík, Andrej Melicherčík) and although some of them (J. Kramařík in particular) had gone through a period of dogmatic inclination towards Marxist-Stalinist science in the 1950s, they were entirely established ethnologists, surprisingly well familiar with the ethnology theory and methodology used throughout Europe. We can observe similar figures at this time, e.g., in Hungarian and Polish ethnology, something which naturally facilitated international co-operation. Also of great importance in the development of internationally-based comparative projects was the interest of numerous generational and methodologically allied so-called Western researchers in seeking partners for comparative projects covering a greater territorial extent. This was due both to their methodological focus on comparative methods, and

their pragmatic need to seek 'allies' at a time of heated conceptual debates on the further direction of ethnology in Europe.

For organisational, financial, personal and political, or power and ideology reasons, and also because of the later quite fundamental theoretical and methodological reorientation of European ethnology during the 1970s and 1980s, many research plans in which Czech and Slovak ethnologists were involved remained uncompleted. Many others however, mainly dealing in agrarian ethnology, resulted in outstanding and still valid scientific outputs dealing with, e.g., transport, growing grains and cattle farming. A typical example of such a project is the carefully considered comparative study of harnessing cattle in the 18th-20th century co-ordinated by SIEF's Commission for the History and Development of European Agriculture, driven forward by Jaroslav Kramařík and German ethnologist, Wolfgang Jacobeit. Many years of scientific and organisational work resulted in the publication of an issue of *Národopisný věstník československý* dedicated to this one topic in 1969, in which a number of leading researchers from throughout Europe made contributions. In it, Ján Podolák looked at the issue of Slovakia.

This study looks at the organisational background of Europe-wide research into harnessing cattle and their results, and gives an assessment of their benefit for the development of Czech, Slovak and European agrarian ethnology. The objective of the text is in particular to place this project within the wider context of the development of comparative European ethnology in the 1960s, using it to document a number of phenomena and processes we can assume are generally applicable, which mark similarly-focused research during the time looked at. The study is based on an analysis of published research outputs of harnessing cattle comparative studies, and also material explaining the organisational background in particular found amongst papers in the estate of one of the project's initiators, J. Kramařík, stored at the CAS's Institute of Ethnology in Prague. Interpretations therein are also based on the latest findings in the history of European ethnology, of which the whole of J. Kramařík's and W. Jacobeit's co-ordinated project can be considered an undoubted part (in terms of topic, theory and method and also figures involved.

The study of harnessing cattle within agrarian ethnology and historiography

The study of harnessing cattle – in terms of the classification of ethnology studies, straddling research into livestock farming, agricultural technologies and human transport – represented one of the fundamental parts of so-called

agrarian ethnology. In Europe, ethnology began to look at the issue of traditional agriculture at the end of the 19th century at the latest (Altman, 2013; Horák, 1933; Kafka, 1897), at roughly the same time that other specialised fields were being established (in particular agrarian history) which looked at the development of agricultural technologies, the everyday life of peasant communities and the economic and social aspects of agrarian production. In Central Europe, the beginnings of systematic historical and ethnological study of agriculture can be linked in particular with German, or German-language (Rau, 1845; Braungart, 1881; Leser, 1931; Lozoviuk, 2008) ethnology, with Lubor Niederle (1902 – 1925; 1917) and Kazimierz Mosyzński (1929) taking direct interest in our territory a little later, establishing a comparative study discourse of 'Slavic agriculture', later particularly intense. However, specialised agricultural (e.g. Hungary) or general ethnology museums (Scandinavia) were also of great importance in the development of agrarian ethnology. One must not forget the benefit of agricultural higher education institutes either, which generally fostered a high level of agrarian history studies (e.g. the University of Wageningen in Holland). Within Central Europe, socio-political circumstances played their part in the unprecedented growth of agrarian historiography and agrarian ethnology, through the strong influence of agrarianism of the period and agrarian political parties (Kubů, Lorenz, Müller, Šouša, 2013). In the Czech, or Czechoslovak context, all major figures within ethnology at the time connected to Karel Chotek and his Prague and Bratislava students studied agriculture to a greater or lesser extent.

We can consider agrarian ethnology an established ethnology specialisation by the 1930s at the latest, although it is naturally nurtured at various intensities in different European countries and with significant methodological differences. Broad attention was paid to agrarian culture in all major research projects and published works (ethnographic atlases, encyclopaedias, national and regional ethnological monographs), which appeared across Europe before the Second World War. Unfortunately, we do not have enough space here to evaluate these works, but this can be found in widely available modern overviews (Collinson, 2000; Válka, 2007; Válka, 2012; Slavkovský, 2013).

Following the Second World War, agrarian ethnology continued to develop mainly in Western European countries in regard to ethnocartographic documentation of old agricultural technologies and tools. The endeavour at a detailed typologisation of traditional agricultural artefacts was marked by museological and technical and historical approaches, centred mainly in museums (Hohenheim, Copenhagen). In 1968, a specialised journal, *Tools and Tillage* began to be published looking at the history of agricultural technologies, and here one can encounter a wide range of pure agrarian ethnological texts.

From the 1940s, ethnological study of traditional agriculture in Central, and Eastern Europe in particular, developed in a somewhat different manner. In some cases, it was partially based on older research traditions (Poland, the Czech lands), while elsewhere this ethnological subdiscipline established itself on new foundations (Slovakia, to a certain extent). The driver of East European agrarian ethnology at a theoretical and methodological level became the implementation of Marxist (heavily evolutionist) focused approaches seeking out and studying so-called revivals. We can also interpret the strong support for implementing comprehensive 'protective' field research into traditional agriculture, or the countryside in general as the result of academic attempts to document disappearing cultural forms, and as a route to acquiring information, which was to facilitate – in many cases forced – processes of rural collectivisation and socialisation (Kiliánová, Popelková, 2010; Koffer, 2011; Petráňová, 2000).

Regardless of the political instrumentalisation of certain pieces of research, it must be noted that in the Carpathian-Pannonian-Balkan area in particular, agrarian ethnology achieved unprecedented outcomes during this period, and the quality of field research and their outputs exceeded even those in Western Europe. This was also caused, however, by the fact that in the 'West' at this time, researchers had practically no opportunities to study traditional agrarian culture in the field because of a different social and economic rural development dynamic. Agrarian ethnology's main problem throughout Europe, however, proved to be the limited territorial focus of research separated off within national ethnological schools. Gradual disruption to ethnically or nationally limited research horizons began to occur in the research of traditional agriculture in Switzerland and Scandinavia to begin with, and in Eastern Europe mainly thanks to comparative projects initiated by MKKKB. True Europe-wide comparison, however, only came to occur, as will be further examined, in the mid-1960s.

We can find information directly related to harnessing livestock in the above mentioned founding works of agrarian ethnology (Niederle, 1921; Niederle, 1902 – 1925), with K. Moszyński (1929) also publishing the first regional typology of yoked oxen, as well as in works dedicated to traditional Slavic legal systems (the phenomenon of so called *spřeha* descibed by Saturník, 1934, pp. 188-191). The oldest German, and also Czech and Polish works, however, involve strong use of so-called ethnicity theories erroneously equating material culture with the ethnicity (generally Slavic or German) of those involved.

And it was the attempt to overcome unfortunate ethnicising interpretations, which made Central Europe in the period following the Second World War the main centre of research into harnessing animals. Unsurprisingly, here and elsewhere in Europe this was closely related to the study of ploughs and tilling tools (also heavily deformed by the application of ethnicity theories) and it was

from specialists studying methods of tillage that most of those involved in the international harnessing animal research project were recruited at the end of the 1960s. On Czech-German land, J. Kramařík attempted to challenge some of R. Braungart's (1881) older outputs on 'harnessing animal ethnicity' on material from the Bohemian Forest and Pošumaví region on the Czech-German (or Slavic-German) border region both by careful field research and by studying the foundations for the German and Austrian ethnological atlas (Kramařík, 1960). The author subsequently turns his attention to more general Central and Eastern European contexts, which he synthetically discusses (Kramařík, 1962; Kramařík, 1966). At roughly the same time, W. Jacobeit (1950) began to look into this issue during his studies in Göttingen – and it should be noted he did so much more thoroughly and with particular emphasis on creating a universally applicable typology and harness terminology. Another Czech specialist began collaboration with him during the 1950s (agrarian historian, technologist and museologist) František Šach (Šach, Jacobeit, 1958), although his later attention was solely devoted to the study of tillage tools (Šach, 1963; Šach, 1978). Subsequently, J. Kramařík fully took up the baton of this Czech-German collaboration. In this way, a strong, highly intellectual and organisationally capable pair was formed which was later able to interconnect a number of European researchers. As has already been suggested, research into ploughs and harnesses was being undertaken in parallel in many other areas, whether through ethnocartographic projects (e.g. Sweden, Hungary, Portugal), or in the field of museum documentation of archaic forms of agriculture and tools used (Slovakia, Bulgaria, Great Britain). The harness as one of the joint topics of European ethnology was thus undoubtedly 'on the table'. We can find triggers for the internationalisation of its research, however, in the much wider contexts of the development of ethnology on the European continent.

European, Czech and Slovak ethnology in the 1960s: On the path to international networking

The period which we can very roughly define as being between 1955 and 1975, or more narrowly the 1960s in particular, is characterised in the history of European ethnology as a period of unprecedented development in international research projects, networks of researchers and thorough application of comparistics as a key methodological and interpretative approach, or unprecedented in that in earlier periods this was typical only for the study of folkloristics. No great theoretical ground was broken at this time in ethnology, with the older diffusionist and evolutionist paradigm remaining applicable, along with newer functional and structural approaches. Neither was there a thematic

refocusing of the issue of agrarian culture, with the wider issue of material culture specifically remaining a legitimate research field. The key driver for further development was thus first of all the huge rise in comparative study, and also and in particular unprecedented intensive connections between researchers across Europe, the establishment of a number of professional associations (some still today operating) and publishing platforms (Rogan, 2008b), and finally the acceleration in the radical redefinition of the whole discipline away from national ethnology (burdened by its often problematic nationalist past) towards a Europe-wide modern discipline: European ethnology – Ethnologia Europaea (Nikitisch, 2005; Kuhn, 2015; Moser, Götz, Ege, 2015).

In the spirit of its founder, Sigurd Erixon, European ethnology was meant to be a comparative historic science focused on researching social relationships and structure, providing a comprehensive view of material culture (incl. accounting for symbolic and other 'non-material' meanings of artefacts, something particularly typical of research in Scandinavia) and European folklore (Rogan, 2013). But it was now also meant to involve research into contemporary social phenomena and processes. In this sense, European ethnology was strongly influenced by Anglophone traditions of anthropological research, and S. Erixon himself perceived it as a clearly delineated and autonomous, yet also integral part of the science of man. Today, one might use the term 'general anthropology'. Erixon's long refining and changing programme of European ethnology (Erixon, 1937; Erixon, 1938; Erixon, 1956; Erixon, 1967a; Erixon, 1967b), although little-influenced by Marxism, was easily comprehensible thanks to its stress on materiality and folklore and its application of historical methods of research – and with ideological monitoring subsiding it was also acceptable in Central and Eastern Europe. Furthermore, within the Czech and Slovak context, Erixon's European ethnology was at least in certain cases also acceptable for researchers openly or covertly building on the tradition of Chotek and Václavík ethnology, and also for ethnologists and folklorists preferring functional and structural approaches.

In terms of cultural, political and social development, the coherent programme of European ethnology appeared at a time when certain barriers between the so-called East and West were being relaxed, and in a Czechoslovak context in a period of dynamic cultural changes heading since at least the mid-1960s towards reform of the state's socialist establishment. These changes also had practical consequences in Czechoslovakia, such as the restriction of censorship, easier travel and better access to foreign literature. Progressive research centres such as *Kabinet etnológie* at Bratislava University's Faculty of Arts and the *Národopisný věstník československý* journal were established or restored. All this facilitated previously unthinkable scientific communication and the establishment of close personal relations even across the so-called Iron Curtain.

At the same time, like in Western Europe, here and elsewhere in East Europe a generation of researchers came of age intellectually or were at the height of their strengths and organisational and academic capabilities, marked by their courage to redefine their own discipline.

Finally, it must be noted that personal and institutional conditions in European ethnology research were strongly affected by a split between traditionalists (mainly, though not exclusively, certain folklorists) and the reformist group of S Erixon and his students and partners. This was strongly expressed in the conflict over the future direction of CIAP / SIEF in 1964 (Rogan, 2008a; Rogan, 2014). The proponents of a new concept of the discipline came out of this temporarily defeated and they immediately began to seek a path to new forms of international co-operation, including welcome co-operation – as a boost to the new discourse's territory, researcher numbers and intellectual knowledge – with researchers from Eastern Europe.

The outlined complexion of the little-related or entirely unrelated scientific, social and other processes and the further intensive searching for new topics, methods, approaches and contacts resulted in a huge rise in the European ethnology paradigm, subsequently proving itself as a discourse capable in Europe of fully competing with both sociocultural anthropology and the ever more obsolete nature of particular national ethnology. This statement still fully applies today.

International co-operation within European ethnology occurred mainly within the context of formalised newly established international organisations and working associations, or it had an informal form, but more intensive communication between individual researchers and their groups, and both these levels of scientific networking intersected at many levels. In the Czech and Slovak environment, we must include in the first mentioned formal grouping the already mentioned so-called Carpathian Commission – International Commission of the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathians and Balkans (the broadening of its focus to include the Balkans and the change in the commission's name formally occurred in the mid-1970s). Its secretariat was based in Bratislava and it was headed by J. Podolák, and later V. Frolec. The commission was established in 1959, a time before the massive rise of the European ethnology paradigm by which it was later influenced (Frolec, 1991; Podoba, 2006). Another key platform was the International Ethnocartographic Commission (Ständige Internationale Atlaskommission – SIA), which was established through the secession of the ethnocartographic working group from SIEF in 1965. Its changing membership base comprised roughly 30 scientists, mostly heavily engaged in national atlas projects in previous decades, who were also heavily involved in other international comparative studies (Woitsch, 2012).

The publication channel for presenting research within the European ethnology paradigm was the Ethnologia Europaea (EE) journal, founded in 1966 and which began publication a year later. On the editorial board and within the journal's pages were a number of ethnologists operating within SIA, within the Carpathian Commission which had been operating for some time now, and finally also in the last of the major formalised European ethnology platforms – the Ethnological Commission for History and the Development of European Agriculture at the SIEF. This was established within SIEF at a meeting of the Presidium in Marburg in April 1965. At the next meeting of SIEF's Presidium in September 1966 in Prague, its programme was officially ratified, W. Jacobeit and Portuguese museologist, Ernesto Veiga de Oliveira were put in charge, and the Commission could begin developing its activities. In spring (i.e. at a time when research of harnessing was still ongoing), the Commission issued its first informative circular, simply entitled 'information', in which it presented its programme, which was distributed to ethnologists throughout Europe. The document itself is not dated, although the date it was issued can be indirectly determined by Schmidt (1967).

The Agricultural Commission was established within SIEF at a time when this organisation (or more specifically its leaders) were not particularly in favour of the European ethnology programme as outlined above. Nevertheless, the commission's research programme was eventually accepted by SIEF and we can consider its operation as a kind of breakthrough, as even within leading ethnological associations, a group of researchers had been officially established whose objectives clearly reflected the fundamental basis of Erixon's comparative European ethnology.

If one were to attempt to give a named list of the most active proponents of European ethnology within SIA, EE, MKKKB and SIEF, then our alphabetical list, with no claims to completeness, might encompass the following figures which includes also ethnologists operating outside Europe: Jenö Barabás, Julio Caro Baroja, Branimir Bratanić, Gösta Berg, Nils-Arvid Bringéus, Ernst Burgstaller, Alberto Cirese, Jorge Dias, Sigurd Erixon, Alexander Fenton, Václav Frolec, Józef Gajek, John Granlund, Béla Gunda, Ole Hojrup, August Johan Bernet Kempers, Knut Kolsrud, Jaroslav Kramařík, Ludvík Kunz, Paul Leser, Anthony Lucas, Marcel Maget, Pieter J. Meertens, Arnold Niederer, Ján Podolák, Holger Rasmussen, Géza de Rohan-Czermak, Hilmar Stigum, Bjarne Stoklund, George B. Thompson, Sergej Tokarev, André Varagnac, Josef Vařeka, Kustaa Vilkuna, Johannes Voskuil, Toivo Vuorela, Günter Wiegelmann, Karl Robert Wikmann, Matthias Zender.

In terms of informal, often very personal and friendly relations, we find ourselves in a significantly more complex situation from the perspective of the options for historical research than for the institutionalised forms of co-operation

between researchers involved in European ethnology as detailed above. This applies fully to the Czech and Slovak context. One can naturally partially use preserved correspondence and other rather fragmentary published written materials along with the oral reminiscences of the researchers themselves, and even literary works etc. (Rooijakkers, Meurkens, 2000) A complete reconstruction of the 'scientific operation' and everyday activities within European ethnology of the 1960s, however, must unfortunately be considered infeasible.

This fact is that much more annoying because it was informal communication which was most likely behind large agrarian-ethnological comparative projects (although we are not here looking at others focused, e.g., on architecture, customers, folklore, etc., we are nevertheless aware of their importance) which were supported by the above detailed scientific organisations – if at all – only once they were already taking place. Some of these restricted themselves to only the Central and Eastern Europe area, or a Carpathian-Balkan context. The most ambitious, however, including the research on cattle harnessing we are looking at, were Europe-wide in extent. Some of the projects were not fully implemented in the end for various reasons, but they did bring extremely valuable findings at the level of local, regional and national monographs, and this was particularly the case in studies of Carpathian sheep herding and other issues (Podolák, 1982; Mjartan, 1972), which were made within MKKKB, and research into tilling tools, which aimed to create a volume the like of which had never been published before – in contrast to the volume (Zender, 1980) looking at yearly fires – of the Ethnological Atlas of Europe, and was co-ordinated by SIA.

Of the completed studies whose outputs were generally published in the form of proceedings, those which deserve particular mention include a comparative study of cereal growing in Central and Eastern Europe (Ballasa, 1972), and Central- and Eastern-European focused research on lowland cattle farming and the life of herdsmen (Földes, 1961; Földes, 1969). Research into land transport was ground-breaking in its Europe-wide focus, this again culminating in representative proceedings (Fenton, Podolák, Rasmussen, 1973), which of the Czechoslovak researchers included L. Baran as well as J. Podolák. Finally, the last of the large projects completed was the international comparative study of harnessing cattle.

J. Kramařík and W. Jacobeit's comparative study of harnessing cattle and its results

As has been noted above, harnessing cattle had been one of the constituent topics of agrarian ethnology in many European countries since at least the end of the 19th century. In light of differing research, or theoretical and methodological

traditions and classifications of academic fields within different states, however, over the subsequent decades it developed in quite different manners, including from an institutional perspective. In countries with little tradition of ethnology focused on the historic research of their own territory (e.g. Great Britain, France), the topic was mainly dealt with in narrowly defined 'national study' regional contexts. In a number of countries of Western and Northern Europe (e.g. Holland, Denmark) the history of harnessing (along with the development of tillage tools) was considered a part of the history of technology and agriculture and studied by historians and museologists in the field with a long historic perspective (often beginning in prehistory), mainly on the basis of typological analysis of preserved artefacts. Museum research into issues of agrarian ethnology also played a large role, e.g. in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. In other European countries, especially those where sophisticated forms of ethnocartography were developed early on (e.g. Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, Poland), a large amount of data was collected early on historic forms of harnessing which captured its forms in earlier eras – approx. from the 18th century onwards. The massive development of ethnology in Central and Eastern Europe following the Second World War (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria) connected with the amount of field research done of a documentary and protective nature significantly grew the amount of empirical material as well, especially from the Carpathian-Balkan area.

The fundamental problem with all the studies mentioned was their absolute inco-ordination, focused on differently defined time and nationality terms, and last but not least their total absence of a single terminology and typology. Although the yoking of pairs of cattle in particular can be considered universal within European culture at least, during the 1960s there was no single approach in any of the relevant disciplines in Europe for studying this issue, and difference between the amount of empirical material collected and the opportunities for making comparisons between them was huge.

In this complicated situation the two figures already mentioned of German and Czech, or Czechoslovak, ethnology, W. Jacobeit and J. Kramařík – besides many others – began after the Second World War to undertake the historical study of the history of harnessing, their fates becoming significantly entwined during the 1960s and their bold personal engagement in the issue requiring at least a brief outline of their biographies.

The first to display research interest in harnessing was W. Jacobeit (Naumburg 13. 5. 1921), who studied history and Volkskunds in Leipzig and Königsberg (Kaliningrad) in 1939 – 1941 (Kaschuba, Scholze, Scholze-Irrlitz, 1996; Brinkel, 2009). After an intermission in the German army and his capture by the British, he continued in his studies of ethnology, history and the new subject of prehistory at university in Göttingen, which he completed in 1948 with a thesis on harnessing.

This was followed by another gap in his academic life (similar to Kramařík's work at a sawmill during the Second World War) – specifically he was employed by an aluminium plant. He was also undertaking scientific work in parallel, however, which he spent a lot more time on following his resettlement to East Berlin at the beginning of 1956, to a large extent initiated by Wolfgang Steinitz.

As is seen in Jacobeit's extraordinary autobiography (Jacobeit, 2000), the reasons for taking this step were more practical and economic rather than ideological. He had always considered himself a 'crosser of borders' and a 'true rebel' (Jacobeit, 2000, p. 278). And there is no doubt that despite the highly turbulent relations between and the FRG and the GDR following the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961, Jacobeit was able to sustain very productive contacts even with 'Western' colleagues (in particular Hermann Bausinger and the so-called Tübingen School) and he was an important mediator of scientific and academic contacts (Brinkel, 2012). In contrast to Kramařík, he never displayed unquestioning adoration for Stalinist-perceived ethnology, was never a member of any political party and over the long period of his career he was fully engaged in the descriptive conceptualised issue of agrarian ethnology. He worked as an employee of Institut für Volkskunde DAW, where he remained until 1972. From 1972 to 1980, he was the director of the ethnology museum in Berlin. In 1961, Jacobeit received the Docent title at Humboldt University with a thesis on Central European sheep farming (Jacobeit, 1961), and from 1962 he worked here as a private docent, from 1970 to 1980 as an extraordinary professor, and subsequently until his retirement in 1986 as an ordinary professor and head of the Volkskunde department. From the 1970s onwards, he left behind purely agrarian ethnological topics and focused first (Jacobeit, Jacobeit, 1985-1987) on the very broadly conceived history of material culture and everyday life in Germany from the 16th to the 20th century (heavily influenced by the French Annales School), and later also the history of ethnology in German-speaking countries (Jacobeit, Lixfeld, Bockhorn, Dow, 1994).

For Jacobeit, as for Kramařík, devising wider conceptual questions was always typical. Even in his earliest works on harnessing, sheep herding, agricultural tools, etc., he endeavoured to go beyond narrow national terms and discuss the topic regardless of its ethnic, political or other borders in the past and present (Jacobeit, 1957; Jacobeit, 1965). His reflections on ethnology as a discipline on the everyday during the 1980s were not always accepted, but bear witness to his unique abilities to consider the very essence of the field in which he was working. In hindsight, his status as a 'West' German living and working in the GDR was of great benefit, playing an important integrating role at a time of a divided Germany both in his everyday academic work and his work in SIEF's presidium and in leading the Association Internationale des Musées

d'Agriculture (AIMA). Jacobeit remained highly respected and renowned even after the reunification of Germany and was one of the last living players in the scientific boom of the 1960s.

Jacobeit's companion of the same generation, Jaroslav Kramařík (Domažlice 27. 6. 1923 – Prague 1. 3. 1974) studied history, philosophy and ethnology at Charles University's Faculty of Arts after the Second World War, finishing in 1948. After a short interlude as an assistant at the same faculty, and now with the status of a dogmatic Marxist or even Stalinist (Kramařík & Nahodil, 1952), Kramařík was first of all involved in the establishment of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences's Cabinet for Ethnology, and was also its head, while in 1954 he joined the new Institute for Ethnology and Folkloristics of Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (ÚEF ČSAV) as deputy director, and also working here as an academic secretary. From the beginning of the 1970s he was the head of the Department of Ethnology of National Revival (Tyllner, Suchomelová, Thořová, 2005). In contrast to Jacobeit (and also, e.g. J. Podolák in Slovakia) Kramařík was not systematically involved in educating university students and was did not particularly influence the next generation of Czech ethnologists, which proved especially fatal for agrarian ethnology in Prague following Kramařík's premature death.

However, Kramařík's other scientific, organisational and administrative activities were of importance, and the first of these one should mention is his work as editor in chief of the journal Český lid (1963 – 1968), during which time he succeeded in significantly modernising the journal and opening it to the progressive research approaches of the time (Woitsch, 2013). Kramařík – following his break with Stalinist dogma – managed to have a positive effect on the working of the Czechoslovak Ethnology Society (Národopisná společnost československá) from his position of chairman in 1967 – 1969 (Smrčka, 2011). In terms of the topic we are examining, his involvement in international research teams is important – amongst other positions, he was a member of SIA and a regular participant in international ethnocartographic conferences, a founding member of SIEF's agricultural commission, and a member of the journal Ethnologia Europaea's editorial board.

In terms of specialist interests, J. Kramařík was in a generation of ethnologists who had still at least partially been taught in the spirit of the older First Republic traditions of ethnology sciences, although at least at the beginnings of his career he radically departed from this tradition, even using a rather vulgar formulation to do so (Kramařík, Nahodil, 1952). Later, however, he was clearly focusing on carefully considered historic comparative study and was also familiar with the development of American cultural anthropology. Kramařík's specialist interests were unusually broad and always based on knowledge of empirical material while standing on solid theoretical and methodological foundations and he can

undoubtedly be considered one of the most progressive Czech ethnologists of the second half of the 20th century. Kramařík had unusually broad European comparative breadth and like Jacobeit (both had also studied history), he always understood the traditional culture phenomena studied and compared them within a wider historic and typological context.

J. Kramařík's published works (Válka, 1998) can be divided into a number of main fields of interest. Kramařík evidently focused much of his efforts on so-called agrarian ethnology and folk architecture, in particular in the Bohemian Forest and Pošumaví regions, with his comparative study on the issue of cattle farming and harnessing of greatest significance, his first publication on this topic dating to the early 1960s (Kramařík, 1960; Kramařík, 1962; Kramařík, Ryneš, 1962). Kramařík's second great life-long interest was the region of Chodsko and its people, mainly from a folkloristic perspective, in particular undertaking research into local legends (Kramařík, 1972). In this sense, Kramařík's field of interest was somewhat larger than Jacobeit's, who remained faithful to the study of material culture.

As we can see, in terms of specialist training, research experience of the topic, the ability for conceptual synthetic thought and last but not least organisational potential and international renown, Kramařík and Jacobeit had the best preconditions for organising international research into cattle harnessing, an issue straddling many fields. Exactly when the research careers of these two figures became intertwined we can unfortunately no longer precisely determine, not even using Jacobeit's (2000) published memoirs. Mutual citations of each other's work are first seen in studies published at the end of the 1950s. In the very early 1960s one also comes across (mostly positive though not uncritical) reviews which both scientists wrote about the other's works (Kramařík, 1963; Jacobeit, 1968). It is my belief that the contact between Jacobeit and Kramařík must have surpassed the level of mere reflection on published works or brief contact during science conferences at the beginning of the 1960s and both researchers must have got to know each other personally too, something also indicated in the fragments of correspondence, which have been preserved. During the whole of the 1960s, they maintained intensive and very friendly contact. Jacobeit, for example, addressed Kramařík as 'amigo mio' in his letters and was not averse to the use of swearing in these letters. There were also frequent visits to each other, with Kramařík ensuring he paid such a visit on almost every business trip to Jacobeit's place of work, Berlin, even if he was just passing through.

The harnessing comparative study project itself, it would appear, had been brewing for a significantly longer period than from their joint research trip to the Upper Palatine Forest and the Bohemian Forest in spring 1966 as is suggested in the Czech and German foreword to the later outcome of the whole project

(Jacobeit, Kramařík, 1969, p. 7, p. 9). The speed with which the project was formally proposed and subsequently implemented indicates that the project had been debated and certain questions had been worked upon even before the spring of 1966 suggested. As such, it is no exaggeration to term the events of 1966 – 1969, especially when we consider the technical and communication limits of the time, literally an organisational whirlwind. The following paragraphs will look at reconstructing this time.

In September 1966, the programme for SIEF's formally established Commission for the History and Development of European Agriculture was accepted in Prague. Even before the information circular previously mentioned was issued, the Commission sent out a brief circular in autumn 1966 which stated as its first main task, *'...die Herausgabe von Aufsatz-Sammelbänden zu bestimmten Fragen, die in einer Reihe von Ländern schon seit längerer Zeit bearbeitet werden und so weit herangereift sind, dass es für die europäische Forschung nützlich wäre, die bisherigen Ergebnisse zusammenzufassen.*' This general requirement to collect, connect and compare European research was further specified in the circular into the proposal that the first work of the published series thus conceived would be a volume looking at the harnessing of cattle in the 18th – 20th centuries.

In this way, Kramařík and Jacobeit flexibly brought their own specialist fields of interest together with the organisational activities of convening leading proponents of European ethnology and they managed to find an immediate and meaningful research programme for the Commission which also offered the opportunity to bring together and summarise the numerous completed and still underway research studies. Both men were also aware of the impossibility of taking an exhaustive and exhausting perspective on the issue, and as such they restricted the timeframe of harnessing research to the 18th – 20th centuries, the period ethnologists were most familiar with and which had already been looked at in a number of previous studies.

The circular had the form of a precise 'call for articles' and specified the focus of the content and technical parameters of the papers in detail – e. g., they were to be 15 – 20 pages of typescript, there were to be no more than 6 pictures, and papers would be accepted in German, English or French, etc. In parallel with this official route, Kramařík and Jacobeit contacted a number of selected colleagues who were involved in researching harnessing or the related issue of the history of the plough at the end of 1966. Unfortunately, preserved sources do not allow for a precise reconstruction of the complete list of those who were contacted to participate in the project, and nor do they reveal who responded spontaneously to the written circular but who did not later deliver an article, or who were rejected by the project's organisers. J. Kramařík's estate includes just fragments

of correspondence with certain ethnologists. As early as 4 January 1967, for example, Jacobeit informed Kramařík of the interest of 'friend' Alexander Fenton and also enclosed his letter with recommendations of other British researchers. On 11 January 1967, Jacobeit wrote of the confirmed interest of J. Granlund, M. Gavazzi, A. Viires, V. Marinov, J. Podolák, A. Fenton and S. Avitsur. Finally in spring 1967 (a more specific date cannot unfortunately be determined), the SIEF Commission sent out another brief circular, which included a reminder of the deadline for submitting reports, and notifying that 18 researchers had promised to send articles. It is particularly important here to stress that at this time both editors were working with a promise to prepare the articles focused on Austria, Holland, Poland, Romania and Albania, although it seems that none of these texts were ever delivered. Other fragmentarily preserved materials show only editorial preparation of articles, which were printed as outputs of the project in 1969. From this, one can conclude the following facts, amongst others:

(1) The autumn 1966 circular determined 1 November 1967 as the deadline for submission of manuscripts, and the vast majority of articles were delivered over the course of 1967, with the last being accepted by the editors by 1 March 1968, roughly one year after the research project had been publicly presented. After the final deadline, only a very extensive article by Mariel Jean-Brunhes Delamarre on harnessing in France was accepted (Jean-Brunhes Delamarre, 1969), which was published in 1969 by the Ethnology Association and Museum in Uherské Hradiště in 1969 as a separate monograph 'thanks to the unusual willingness of the manager of the Slovácko Museum in Uherské Hradiště, J. Jančář.' (Jacobeit, Kramařík, 1969, p. 2).

It is quite clear that – detrimentally to how comprehensively the issue was dealt with – it was entirely impossible for studies produced in such a short time to be worked on afresh on the basis of undertaking new research. They were prepared by researchers who had either been looking at the issue of harnessing for some time already (even if this was as part of research looking primarily at something else), or who built on older topics which had been looked at in older national or regional research studies. Larger areas of Europe where there were insufficient publications on harnessing, or research was only just beginning, were eliminated in advance due to the project's short timeframe.

(2) Kramařík and Jacobeit paid extraordinary attention to the editorial preparation of individual papers in material, terminology and language terms. SIEF's official languages were chosen for publishing the project outputs (mostly German, which all the authors of papers from Central and Eastern Europe used). German's dominance allowed Jacobeit in particular to make extensive adjustments to the manuscripts delivered, which the authors always respected as they appreciated the perspective of a native speaker. Authors of papers

published in English and French were advised to apply a single typology (though not terminology). Both editors consulted thoroughly on editorial revisions to papers from Slavic and Eastern European regions, doing so through letters and at a number of personal meetings over the course of 1967 – 1968. We know for certain that Kramařík visited Berlin privately in February 1967, and he paid an official long-term study visit to DAW's ethnology institute on the invitation of its director, W. Steinitz (sent to the Czech side on 10 November 1966) in May 1967. A record of Kramařík's discussions within the institute of 11 March 1967 demonstrate another visit in regard first of all to preparation of SIEF's Agricultural Commission circular, and also to work on the book on harnessing directly.

Jacobeit and Kramařík's editorial revisions usually went far beyond mere language correction. It is quite clear that as early as the time the first manuscripts were being prepared in 1967, the initiators of the whole enterprise were working with the final form of the single German terminology and typology of harnessing, which was later published as the initial chapter to the project's main output. The editors undertook the final determination of terminology by the beginning of 1967 during a visit by Kramařík to Berlin to which he had been invited urgently by Jacobeit in order to complete discussions of terminology and typology issues on 11 January 1967.

The editors later carefully edited all the manuscripts in accordance with these typological and terminological principles, sometimes at the cost of quite radical adjustments to the original 'national' typologies and terminologies of the different authors. Most authors, going by the manuscript corrections and correspondence preserved, did not protest against these adjustments, and rather welcomed them (e.g. L. Timaffy). At least one person, M. Gavazzi, however, did not agree with the changes, as shown in Jacobeit's letter of 28 May 1968, written after the editorial deadline. This naturally complicated the preparation of the journal.

(3) A marked organisational obstacle for issuing project outputs could have been finding suitable publication platforms. SIEF itself (never mind the infighting over its direction at the time) did not have its own journal and the flagship publication for European ethnology comparative research – the Ethnologia Europaea journal – had only just been conceived. Its first issue was published in 1967. Jaroslav Kramařík, however, took great advantage of the opportunity, which the restoration of the *Národopisný věstník československý* journal in 1966 offered. This journal was published by Národopisná společnost československá při ČSAV and was newly conceived as an annual designed for publishing wider scientific studies (Válka, 2013). The periodical's editor in chief was Václav Frolec and the editorial board contained young, progressively-focused Czech

and Slovak ethnologists for the most part: Dušan Holý, Josef Jančář, Jaromír Jech, Richard Jeřábek, Jaroslav Kramařík, Ján Mjartan, Štefan Mruškovič, Ján Podolák, Oldřich Sirovátka, Josef Tomeš and Josef Vařeka. Moreover, Kramařík himself was elected chairman from 1967 – 1969 at the Národopisná společnost general meeting in Martin (Smrčka, 2011, p. 235) and in collaboration with Frolec he was able to provide institutional support and a guarantee for the publication of the studies on harnessing. Publication in Národopisný věstník was promised in a circular in autumn 1966 and a clear guarantee of a publishing channel must surely have motivated the authors to send their papers to Jacobeit and Kramařík.

The project's main output and one of the most extraordinary works of European ethnology ever to have been published in Czechoslovakia, was published under the title *Zápřah skotu (18. – 20. století) – Rinderanschirrung (18.–20. Jahrhundert) – L'attelage des boeufs (18. – 20. siècle)*, edited by W. Jacobeit and J. Kramařík as a single-topic issue of Národopisný věstník československý 3 – 4 (36-37)/1968 – 1969 in 1969 (Jacobeit, Kramařík, 1969). The journal, or rather thanks to the deliberate concept a true collective monograph, contained a Czech and German foreword briefly outlining the concept and organisational basis for the project, followed by an introduction (more extensive in German and somewhat reduced in Czech) in which Kramařík and Jacobeit clearly and concisely present their key typological and terminological rules, and this was followed by individual regionally-focused papers.

There are a total of 12 of these in the publication, and we can categorise their authors according to age, specialisation and other criteria into a number of mutually overlapping groups (see Fig. 1). A smaller section of papers were sent by authors born around 1900 or shortly thereafter (e.g. Ernesto Veiga de Oliveira, John Granlund, Milovan Gavazzi), whom we can consider true giants and leading figures in the field at a national and European-wide level at the end of the 1960s. They were mostly evolutionistic and positivistic focused ethnologists, geographers and museologists, many of them influenced by ethnocartography and thus open to a comparative approach. Their specialist interests were not limited to just agrarian ethnology.

The main burden in organising the whole project and authorship of most of the papers fell on the shoulders of the leading younger and middle generation of researchers (from the perspective of the 1960s) mostly born during the 1920s or even later. We can consider these researchers better equipped theoretically and methodologically, and more accessible to the ideas of Erixon's comparative European ethnology. On the other hand, in some cases these were scientists – at a certain phase of their career – somewhat more narrowly specialised on just the issue of agrarian culture. Taking account of the topic being looked at, however, this was not reflected in the quality of their contributions. In most cases, they shared

an interest in museological artefact systematics and especially the application of certain ethnocartographical approaches in collecting (a combination of field research and surveys) and assessing (geographic systematisation of material culture) data with their earlier born colleagues.

Fig. 1:
Authors involved in the international research into cattle harnessing in the 1960s.

Author	Biographical data	Article / Book	Territory covered
Shmuel Avitsur	1908 – 1999	The Last Days of the Yoke in Israel (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 79-98)	Israel, Palestine
Afanasij. S. Bežkovič	*?*	Zur Frage der Rinderanschirrung in Osteuropa (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 139-150)	USSR (Russia, Ukraine, Caucasus region)
Sándor Bodó	born 1943	Einzeljoche in Ungarn (NVČ 36 -– 37, pp. 179-194)	Hungary
Mariel Jean-Brunhes Delamarre	1905 – 2001	Géographie et ethnologie de l'attelage au joug en France du XVIIe siècle à nos jours. Uherské Hradiště, 1969	France
Alexander Fenton	1929 – 2012	Draught Oxen in Britain (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 17-54)	Great Britain
Fernando Galhano	*?*	L'attelage des boeufs en Portugal (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 55-78)	Portugal
Milovan Gavazzi	1895 – 1992	Das Joch in Jugoslawien (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 151-162)	Yugoslavia (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Macedonia, Montenegro)
John Granlund	1901 – 1982	Rinderanspannung und Joche in Schweden (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 99-120)	Sweden

Wolfgang Jacobeit	**born 1921**	Einleitung / Úvod (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 11-16); Jochgeschierr- und Spanntiergrenze. *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, 3, 1957, pp. 119-144	Germany, Austria
Josef Jančář	born 1931	Das Rindergespann in Ostmähren (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 205-212)	Moravia
Jaroslav Kramařík	**1923 – 1974**	Einleitung / Úvod (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 11-16); Zur Frage der Rinderanspannung bei den Westslawen. *Vznik a počátky Slovanů*, 6, 1966, pp. 295-334	Czech Republic, Poland, Slovakia
Vasil Alexandrov Marinov	1907 – 1990	Zur Ethnographie des Jochs in Bulgarien (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 163-178)	Bulgaria
Benjamin Enes Pereira	born 1928	L'attelage des boeufs en Portugal (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 55-78)	Portugal
Ján Podolák	born 1926	Beiträge zur Rinderanspannung in der Slowakei (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 213-246)	Slovakia
László Timaffy	born 1916	Rindereinzelanspannung in Westungarn (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 195-204)	Hungary
Ernesto Veiga de Oliveira	1910 – 1990	L'attelage des boeufs en Portugal (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 55-78)	Portugal
Ants Viires	1918 – 2015	Rinderanschirrung im Baltikum (NVČ 36 – 37, pp. 121-138)	Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania

It should be stated that Kramařík and Jacobeit achieved the maximum possible in the conditions of the time and taking account of the state of research into the issue in Europe. In my opinion, almost all the specialists whose work involved the study of tilling tools or harnessing in Europe at the time contributed to the book, and most of them submitted a truly original, comprehensive paper based

on field data and all the available literature. We can truly consider some of them (J. Granlund, J. Podolák) as model, brilliant and tireless works on the issue in their territory, which take account of an even wider comparative framework than that required of them by Jacobeit and Kramařík. J. Podolák's work reaped the fruit of the author's field research into agriculture and livestock farming and his work on the typology of tilling tools (Podolák, 1957; Podolák, 1962).

The high quality of the printed studies, however, should not overshadow some clear deficiencies and failures within the enterprise. We can say that one of the less fundamental of these (and paradoxically of benefit to the quality of the works) was the failure to respect the formal rules – most of the papers published are longer and include a much larger number of pictures than was originally required. Mariel Jean-Brunhes Delamarre's (1969) submission was even published separately because of its late delivery and large size. More problematic is the failure to follow publication rules in the opposite way – i.e. the excessive brevity or even superficiality of certain chapters (A. Bežkovič). We can also consider the fragmentation of the issue over small territories or just certain types of harness (S. Bódo, L. Timaffy, J. Jančář) as confusing and unfortunate, although this in no way takes away from the quality of the studies themselves.

But I see the greatest weaknesses in the published book and the project itself principally in two aspects. Kramařík and Jacobeit 'given the limited scope' (Jacobeit, Kramařík, 1969, p. 8, p. 10) did not include their own work in the book, and instead referred to their older papers (Kramařík, 1966; Jacobeit, 1957). These, however were not necessarily particularly accessible to everyone everywhere at the time the book was published, never mind the situation today, and thus the absolutely key region for comparative study of Central Europe (Germany, Austria, Bohemia, Poland) remained uncovered. Even worse – though to be clear we should add that at the time the work was published this was insoluble in most cases despite all the attempts of both compilers – was the absence of papers looking at certain other important regions for studying harnessing from a historic and ethnological context. Entirely absent are papers on Mediterranean countries – Italy and Spain. The inclusion of a text on Israel and negotiations on the Caucasus region of the USSR literally call for the inclusion of Turkey, although this did not occur. Not even Mariel Jean-Brunhes Delamarre's (1969) separately printed work makes up for the absence of the countries of Benelux and Switzerland in particular. The originally promised papers on Austria, Holland, Poland, Romania and Albania were not submitted or printed either. Similarly, J. Granlund eventually focused on Sweden alone, and thus we are missing works on most of the Scandinavian countries.

Strictly critical views of the single-topic issue of *Národopisný věstník československý* of 1969 and other related publications of a more than

comprehensive truly Europe-wide treatment of the issue are thus reminiscent of Swiss cheese. Each individual part is always of high quality and thanks to the endeavours of the editors they are well connected together. But the 'holes' left out and the territorial disparities of the whole work are critical. The heretical question comes to mind as to whether Kramařík and Jacobeit really succeeded in fulfilling their objective.

Conclusions

The comparative study of harnessing cattle in Europe project completed in 1969 through the publication of a single-topic issue of Národopisný věstník československý (Jacobeit, Kramařík, 1969) and Mariel Jean-Brunhes Delamarre's monograph (1969) can be considered one of the most fundamental empirically focused research and publication acts of European ethnology at the end of the 1960s. Its benefit for the development of the field, bringing together material findings and advances in theory and methodology are fundamental and unquestionable. For Czechoslovak, or Czech and Slovak, ethnology, the project is even more fundamental in that Czech and Slovak scientists were involved both as authors (J. Jančář, J. Kramařík, J. Podolák) and in its organisation (J. Kramařík, and also V. Frolec in preparing published outputs). The papers published are almost all still useable today both from a material and methodological perspective, in particular the universal typology and terminology for yoke harnessing formulated by J. Kramařík and W. Jacobeit. This typology is based on a classification of methods ('from where and how') with which the tractive force is taken from the animals' bodies, and in German terminology (and its national language modifications) it remains in use today often without changes in ethnological literature. The single-topic *Národopisný věstník československý* was and is repeatedly quoted from the 1970s across the whole of Europe. Although we cannot prove it definitively, one might consider it one of the ethnological works published on Czech territory with the greatest international resonance.

The project and its outputs, as I have endeavoured to show, were dependent above all on the extraordinary organisational efforts of J. Kramařík and in tandem dominating W. Jacobeit, the initiators of the establishment of SIEF's Commission for the History and Development of European Agriculture. Without their dedication, expert contacts and personal interest in the issue of harnessing cattle, in all likelihood the project would never have been realised. Apart from anything else, then, we can consider it the unreproducible outcome of two extraordinary people. The editors managed to exploit the generally favourable circumstances at a national and international socio-political level and skilfully grasped the

opportunity offered to such a project by the often complex employment of the comparatist paradigm of European ethnology formulated by S Erixon and his colleagues.

In all the above detailed regards, it is an extraordinary and successful chapter in the history of Central European and European ethnology. At the same time, however, it cannot be overlooked that the project itself and in particular the opportunities for its further development and continuation failed in certain regards. The editors and authors worked under great pressure of time, and an ideal outcome was far from achieved – i. e. a comprehensive discussion of the issue of harnessing with no gaps and with Europe-wide comparison. Ethnological research into material culture and general and agrarian ethnology issues in particular was not yet ripe for this in the 1960s in many parts of Europe. Or – and the reasons for this are debatable – willing collaborators could not be found in certain countries (Switzerland).

At the time the project was completed and immediately subsequently, there was also a series of events, which had a fatal impact for the development of agrarian ethnological research in Czechoslovakia and Europe. The invasion of Warsaw Pact armies in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and the subsequent so-called Normalisation period, which also applied to science, restricted collaboration with 'Western' scientists, and sometimes made it impossible (Míšková, Barvíková, Šmidák, 1998; Petráň, Petráňová, 2015). A number of progressively-focused European authors were more or less persecuted in the 1970s (including J. Podolák) and international projects were suspended (e.g. Bratislava University Faculty of Arts' Seminarium Ethnologicum). Publication of *Národopisný věstník československý* was once again banned. The radical internal transformation of ÚEF ČSAV redirected the institute to the study of labour and so-called ethnic processes, leaving a minimum of space for agrarian ethnology and other fields, which had been developed until then (Skalníková, Petráňová, 2003). All these trends also overlapped with unfavourable circumstances regarding researchers – here I am particularly referring to the deteriorating health and premature death of J. Kramařík in 1974 and W. Jacobeit's departure from DAW to a prestigious, but in many regards just clerical – position as head of Berlin's Ethnology Museum in 1972.

The principal reasons why the comparative study of harnessing became one of the last Europe-wide agrarian ethnology projects, however, lie elsewhere. Ethnology, like other historical sciences, found itself under severe fire and criticism in Western Europe during the 1970s as a result of the radical applications of noetic challenges in regard to the so-called linguistic turn and the rise of philosophical and scientific postmodernism (Dow, Lixfeld, 1986). The field, even comparatively perceived, was pilloried for its alleged naïve empiricism, nationalism or even hidden racism, insufficiently analysed research, and for

insufficient regard being given to the position of the researchers themselves as players and interpreters, and the literary nature of the papers, etc. The very term and concept of culture was literally crucified (Clifford, Marcus, 1986). The critical offensive, often excessively and unfairly framed in a generational conflicting debate of legitimate questions and doubts over the nature of ethnological research and writing, deeply affected Western European ethnology.

The outcome was the often abandoning of standard topics and approaches and a movement towards constructivism, or scientific post-structuralism. Ethnology – including Erixon's version – became primarily a science about ethnicity and identity and most marginalised was the study of material culture. Sometimes this involved a permanent and irreversible process replacing ethnology with social anthropology. In the traditional ethnological powers (German-speaking countries, Scandinavia), this process was temporary and was replaced during the 1990s at the latest by a return to a distinct comparative European ethnology focused on intercultural communication (Gerholm, 1995; Bredchich, 1994; Stoklund, 2000; Lozoviuk, 2005); that is to say, an ethnology more or less inspired by S Erixon's programme, though with rare exceptions reduced by the study of material culture. This changes in ethnology, and even sociocultural anthropology (with the rise of symmetrical anthropology, new materialism, heritage studies etc.) by 2010 at the latest, but this is beyond the framework of our analysis (Kaschuba, 2003; Čapo, 2014; Kiliánová, 2012).

The linguistic turn and the rise of post-structuralism in the 1970s and 1980s had fatal consequences for agrarian ethnology. In a number of countries, research which had been ongoing for various lengths of time was reduced or entirely abandoned as antiquated and irrelevant for the field. This was soon also reflected in the activities of SIEF's Ethnological Commission for the History and Development of European Agriculture, which ceased to operate (although this was never formalised) sometime during the 1980s without an output similar in importance to the book on harnessing having ever been implemented until that time. Yet opportunities had been there for this to be done through ethnocartographic and historical technological research into tillage tools. During the 1970s, this had been at the same, or even better, level as the comparative study of harnessing, and this continued into the next decades at a museum and technology history level.

If historically focused research into agrarian ethnological issues did continue in some places (Slovakia, Romania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Denmark), this occurred again mainly within national ethnological schools. This represented a clear step backwards compared to the situation in the prior period. We can see a convergence of agrarian ethnology and the histories of the everyday life and material culture, social historiography, historical demography and other historical

fields around the year 2000 and later with research often once again based on a Europe-wide comparison, although this is a period we do not wish to focus on here. We can, however, in no way speak of a revival of this specialisation and certainly not a revival of the international collaboration typical of the 1960s. We can consider this phase in the history of agrarian ethnology as finished, deserving attention from historians of the field and requiring further broad exploration and assessment.

REFERENCES

ALTMAN, K. (2013) *Úvod do studia dějin národopisu na Moravě.* Brno : Masarykova univerzita.

BALLASA, I. (Ed.). (1972) *Getreidebau in Ost- und Mitteleuropa*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó.

BENDIX, R. F. (2012) From Volkskunde to the "Field of Many Names". Folklore Studies in German-Speaking Europe since 1945. In R. F. Bendix & G. Hasam-Rokem (Eds.), *A Companion to Folklore*. Chichester : John Wiley & Sons, pp. 364-390.

BRAUNGART, R. (1881) *Die Ackerbaugeräthe in ihren praktischen Beziehungen wie nach ihrer urgeschichtlichen und ethnographischen Bedeutung*. Heidelberg : C. Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

BREDCHICH, R. W. (1994) *Grundriss der Volkskunde. Einführung in die Forschungsfelder Europäischen Ethnologie*. Berlin : Dietrich Reimer.

BRINKEL, T. (2009) Institutionalising Volkskunde in Early East Germany. In *Journal of Folklore Research*, 46, pp. 141-172.

BRINKEL, T. (2012) *Volkskundliche Wissensproduktion in der DDR. Zur Geschichte eines Faches und seiner Abwicklung*. Berlin : LIT.

COLLINSON, M. (2000) *A History of Farming Systems Research*. Wallingford : CABI Publishing.

ČAPO, J. (2014) Ethnology and Anthropology in Europe. Towards a Trans-National Discipline. In *Cultural Analysis*, 13, pp. 51-76.

CLIFFORD, J., MARCUS, G. E. (Eds.) (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley : University of California Press.

DOW, J. R., LIXFELD, J. R. (Eds.).(1986) *German Volkskunde: A Decade of Theoretical Confrontation, Debate, and Reorientation (1967 – 1977)*. Bloomington : Indiana University Press.

DRÁPALA, D. (Ed.) (2010) *Antonín Václavík (1891 – 1959) a evropská etnologie. Kontexty doby a díla*. Brno : Ústav evropské etnologie.

ERIXON, S. (1937) Regional European Ethnology I. Main Principles and Aims with Special Reference to Nordic Ethnology. In *Folk-liv*, 1a, pp. 89-108.

ERIXON, S. (1938) Regional European Ethnology II. Functional Analysis – Time Studies. In *Folk-liv*, 2, pp. 26-294.

ERIXON, S. (1956) European Ethnology as Social Science. In *Actes du Congrès International d'Ethnologie Régionale. Arnhem 1955*. Arnhem : Het Nederlands Openluchtmuseum, pp. 56-61.

ERIXON, S. (1967a) European Ethnology in our Time. In *Ethnologia Europaea*, 1, pp. 3-11.

ERIXON, S. (1967b) Urgent Ethnological Tasks. In *Ethnologia Europaea*, 1, pp. 163-169.

FENTON, A., PODOLÁK, J., RASMUSSEN, H. (Eds.). (1973). La*nd Transport in Europe.* Copenhagen : Nationalmuseet.

FÖLDES, L. (Ed.) (1961) *Viehzucht und Hirtenleben in Ostmitteleuropa. Ethnographische Studien*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó.

FÖLDES, L. (Ed.) (1969) *Viehwirtschaft und Hirtenkultur. Ethnographische Studien*. Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó.

FROLEC., V. (1991) 30 Years of the International Commission of the Study of Folk Culture in the Carpathians and Balkans (MKKKB). In *Ethnologia Slavica*, 23, pp. 255-263.

GERHOLM, T. (1995). Sweden: central ethnology, peripheral anthropology. In H. Vermeulen, A. A. Roldán (Eds.) *Fieldwork and Footnotes. Studies in History of European Anthropology* . London; New York : Routledge, pp. 159-170.

HORÁK, J. (1933) Národopis československý. Přehledný nástin. In *Československá vlastivěda II. Člověk*. Praha : Sfinx – Bohumil Janda, pp. 305-472.

JACOBEIT, S., JACOBEIT, W. (1985 – 1987) *Illustrierte Alltagsgeschichte des deutschen Volkes I – II*. Leipzig; Jena; Berlin : Urania.

JACOBEIT, W. (1950) Zuz Altersfrage des Joches in Mitteleuropa. In *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, 26, pp. 171-182.

JACOBEIT, W. (1957) Jochgeschierr- und Spanntiergrenze. In *Deutsches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, 3, pp. 119-144.

JACOBEIT, W. (1961) *Schafhaltung und Schäfer in Zentraleuropa bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Berlin : Akademie-Verlag.

JACOBEIT, W. (1965) *Bauerliche Arbeit und Wirtschaft. Ein Beitrag zur Wissenschafts-geschichte der deutschen Volkskunde*. Berlin : Akademie-Verlag.

JACOBEIT, W. (1968) J. Kramařík. Zur Frage der Rinderanspannung bei den Westslawen. In *DEMOS*, 9, p. 256.

JACOBEIT, W. (2000) *Von West nach Ost - und zurück.* Autobiographisches eines Grenzgängers zwischen Tradition und Novation. Münster : Westfälisches Dampfboot Verlag.

JACOBEIT, W., KRAMAŘÍK, J. (Eds.) (1969) Zápřah skotu (18. – 20. století). Rinderanschirrung (18. – 20. Jahrhundert). L'attelage des boeufs (18. – 20. siècle). In *Národopisný věstník československý*, pp. 36-37, 1-246.

JACOBEIT, W., LIXFELD, H., BOCKHORN, O., DOW, J. R. (Eds.) (1994) *Völkische Wissenschaft: Gestalten und Tendenzen der deutschen und österreichischen Volkskunde in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Wien; Köln; Weimar : Böhlau.

JEAN-BRUNHES DELAMARRE, M. (1969) *Géographie et ethnologie de l'attelage au joug en France du XVIIe siècle à nos jours. Zeměpis a národopis jařmového zápřahu ve Francii od 17. století po naše dny*. Uherské Hradiště : Národopisná společnost československá při ČSAV a Slovácké muzeum v Uherském Hradišti.

KAFKA, J. (1897) Zaměstnání lidu. In *Národopisná výstava československanská v Praze 1895*. Praha : J. Otto, pp. 207-214.

KASCHUBA, W. (2003) *Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*. München : Beck.

Kaschuba, W., Scholze, T., Scholze-Irrlitz, L. (Eds.) (1996) *Alltagskultur im Umbruch. Festschrift für Wolfgang Jacobeit zu seinem 75. Geburtstag*. Weimar : Böhlau.

KILIÁNOVÁ, G. (2012) Mitteleuropean Ethnology in Transition. In U. Kockel, M. Nic Craith, Frykman (Eds.) *A Companion to the Anthropology of Europe*. Oxford : Wiley Blackwell, pp. 103-121.

KILIÁNOVÁ, G., POPELKOVÁ, G. (2010) Zavádzanie marxistickej etnografie v národopise na Slovensku: změna vedeckého myslenia? In *Slovenský národopis,* 58, pp. 410-424.

KOFFER, B. (2011). Ethnography in the ČS(S)R: Scientification through Sovietization? In U. Brunnbauer, C. Kraft, M. Schulze Wessel (Eds.) *Sociology and ethnography in East- Central Europe and South-East Europe: Scientific self-description in state socialist countries*. November 2008. Münich : Oldebourg Verlag, pp. 173-184.

KRAMAŘÍK, J. (1960) Zápřah skotu v Pošumaví. In *Československá Ethnografie*, 8, pp. 253-272.

KRAMAŘÍK, J. (1962) K některým otázkám vývoje zápřahu. In *Český lid*, 49, pp. 27-30.

KRAMAŘÍK, J. (1963) W. Jacobeit. Schafhaltung und Schäfer in Zentraleuropa bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts. Berlin 1961. In *Český lid*, 50, pp. 308-309.

KRAMAŘÍK, J. (1966) Zur Frage der Rinderanspannung bei den Westslawen. In *Vznik a počátky Slovanů*, 6, pp. 295-334.

KRAMAŘÍK, J. (1972) *Kozina a Lomikar v Chodské lidové tradici*. Praha : Academia.

KRAMAŘÍK, J., NAHODIL, O. (1952) *J. V. Stalin a národopisná věda*. Praha: Nakladatelství Československo-sovětského institutu.

KRAMAŘÍK, J., RYNEŠ, V. (1962) Orba a spřežení dobytka na obrázcích staroboleslavské pověsti o vyorání mariánského reliéfu. In *Český lid*, 57, pp. 20-34.

KUBŮ, E., LORENZ, T., MÜLLER, U., ŠOUŠA, J. (Eds.) (2013) Agrarrismus und Agrareliten in Ostmitteleuropa. Praha : Dokořán.

KUHN, K. J. (2015) Europeanization as Strategy. Disciplinary Shifts in Switzerland and the Formation of European Ethnology. In *Ethnologia Europaea*, 45, pp. 80-97.

LESER, P. (1931) *Entstehung und Verbreitung des Pfluges*. Münster : Aschendorff.

LOZOVIUK, P. (2005). *Evropská etnologie ve středoevropské perspektivě*. Pardubice : Univerzita Pardubice.

LOZOVIUK, P. (2008) Interethnik im Wissenschaftsprozess. Deutschsprachige Volkskunde in Böhmen und ihre gesellschaftlichen Auswirkungen. Leipzig : Leipziger Universitätsverlag.

MÍŠKOVÁ, A., BARVÍKOVÁ, H., ŠMIDÁK, M. (1998) *Československá akademie věd 1969 – 1972: Restaurace komunistické moci ve vědě.* Praha : Ústav pro soudobé dějiny AV ČR.

MJARTAN, J. (Ed.) (1972) *Ľudová kultúra v Karpatoch*. Bratislava : Vydavateľstvo SAV.

MOSER, J., GÖTZ, I., EGE, M. (Eds.) (2015) *Zur Situation der Volkskunde 1945 – 1970. Orientierungen einer Wissenschaft zur Zeit des Kalten Krieges*. Münster : Waxmann.

MOSZYŃSKI, K. (1929) *Kultura ludowa Słowian. Kultura materialna*. Kraków : Polska Akademja Umiejętności.

NIEDERLE, L. (1902 – 1925) *Slovanské starožitnosti I – IV*. Praha : Bursík a Kohout.

NIEDERLE, L. (1917) Radlo a pluh. In *Národopisný věstník československý*, 12, pp. 1-19, 153-174.

NIEDERLE, L. (1921) *Život starých Slovanů III/1. Hospodářství a ves*. Praha : Bursík a Kohout.

NIKITISCH, H. (2005) Volkskunde in Österreich nach 1945. In P. Lozoviuk, J. Moser (Eds.) *Probleme und Perspektiven der volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftlichen Fachgeschichtsschreibung*. Dresden : Thelem, pp. 79-101.

PETRÁŇ, J., PETRÁŇOVÁ, L. (2015) *Filozofové dělají revoluci: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy během komunistického experimentu (1948 – 1968 – 1989)*. Praha : Karolinum.

PETRÁŇOVÁ, L. (2000) Lid, národ a český národopis v letech 1953 – 1963. In H. Barvíková, M. Ďurčanský, P. Kodera (Eds.) *Věda v Československu v letech 1953 - 1963.* Praha : Archiv AV ČR, pp. 305-322.

PODOBA, J. (2006) MKKKB: Jeden pohľad na úspěšnú medzinárodnú vedeckú organizáciu, ktorá neskončila dobře. In *Etnologické rozpravy*, 13, pp. 95-102.

PODOLÁK, J. (1957) Nomenklatúra pluhu na území slovenského etnika. In *Slovenský národopis*, 5, pp. 307-335.

PODOLÁK, J. (1962) *Spôsoby chovu hospodárskych zvierat. Návod na etnografický výskum*. Bratislava : Vydavateľstvo SAV.

PODOLÁK, J. (1982) *Tradičné ovčiarstvo na Slovensku*. Bratislava : VEDA.

RAU, K. H. (1845).*Geschichte des Pfluges*. Heidelberg : C. F. Winter.

ROGAN, B. (2008a) From CIAP to SIEF. Visions for a Discipline or Power Struggle? In M. Nic Craith, U. Kockel, R. Johler (Eds.) *Everyday Culture in Europe: Case-Studies and Methodologies*. London : Ashgate, pp. 19-64.

ROGAN, B. (2008b) The Troubled Past of European Ethnology. SIEF and International Cooperation from Prague to Derry. In *Ethnologia Europaea*, 1, pp. 66-78.

ROGAN, B. (2013) Sigurd Erixon on the Post-War International Scene. International Activities. European Ethnology and CIAP from 1945 to the mid 1950s. In *Arv. Nordic Yearbook of Folklore*, 69, pp. 89-152.

ROGAN, B. (2014) When the Folklorists Won the Battle but Lost the War: The Cumbersome (Re-)Birth of SIEF in 1964. In *Cultural Analysis*, 13, pp. 23-50.

ROOIJAKKERS, G., MEURKENS, P. (2000) Struggling with the European Atlas: Voskuil's Portrait of European Ethnology. In *Ethnologia Europaea*, 30, pp. 75-95.

SATURNÍK, T. (1934) *Slovanské starožitnosti. Oddíl kulturní. Dílu II. Svazek 2. O právu soukromém u Slovanů v dobách starších*. Praha : Česká akademie věd a umění.

SCHMIDT, L. (1967) Ernst Klein unter Mitwirkung von Wilhelm Krepala. Die historischen Pflüge der Hohenheimer Sammlung landwirtschaftlicher Geräte und Maschinen. In *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, 21, pp. 149-150.

SKALNÍKOVÁ, O., PETRÁŇOVÁ, L. (2003) Etnografické studium v letech 1964 – 1975. In *Věda v Československu v období normalizace (1970 – 1975)*. Praha : Výzkumné centrum pro dějiny vědy, pp. 287-304.

SLAVKOVSKÝ, P. (2013) *Slovenská etnografia (kompendium dejín vedného odboru)*. Bratislava : VEDA.

SMRČKA, V. (2011) *Dějiny psané národopisem*. Praha : Česká národopisná společnost.

STOKLUND, B. (2000) European Ethnology between Two Turns of Centuries. The Danish Experience. In *Volkskultur und Moderne. Europäische Ethnologie zur Jahrtausendwende. Festschrift für Konrad Köstlin zum 60. Geburtstag am 8. Mai 2000*. Wien : Institut für Europäische Ethnologie, pp. 47-59.

ŠACH, F. (1963) Soustava oradel Starého světa a zařazení nářadí z území Československa. In *Vědecké práce Zemědělského muzea*, 3, pp. 173-231.

ŠACH, F. (1978) Typy rádel v Čechách a na Moravě. In *Etnografický atlas I.*. Praha : Ústav pro etnografii a folkloristiku ČSAV, pp. 156-206.

ŠACH, F., JACOBEIT, W. (1958) Zápřah a hranice tažných zvířat. In *Historie a muzejnictví*, 4, pp, 241-244.

ŠRÁMKOVÁ, M. (2008) *Česká prozaická folkloristika v letech 1945 – 2000 (přehled, vývoj, témata, bibliografie)*. Praha : Etnologický ústav AV ČR.

TYLLNER, L., SUCHOMELOVÁ, M., THOŘOVÁ, V. (Eds.) (2005) *Etnologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky 1905 – 2005*. Praha : Etnologický ústav AV ČR.

VÁLKA, M. (1998). *Jaroslav Kramařík (1923 – 1974). Bibliografická příloha Národopisné revue, sv. 11*. Strážnice : Národní ústav lidové kultury.

VÁLKA, M. (2007).Tradiční agrární kultura a její výzkum v české etnografii (etnologii). In M. Válka (Ed.) *Agrární kultura. O tradičních formách zemědělského hospodaření a života na vesnici*. Brno : Masarykova univerzita, pp. 21-42.

VÁLKA, M. (2012) K problematice tradiční agrární kultury a jejího výzkumu ve středoevropském areálu. In Z. Klodnicki, M. Luković, P. Slavkovský, R. Stoličná, M. Válka

Tradiční agrární kultura v kontextu společenského vývoje střední Evropy a Balkánu). Brno : Masarykova univerzita, pp. 7-52.

VÁLKA, M. (2013) Národopisný věstník československý jako tisková platforma Národopisné společnosti československé a nástupnických organizací. In *Český lid*, 100, pp. 107-120.

WOITSCH, J. (2012) Etnografický atlas Čech, Moravy a Slezska. Stav a perspektivy výzkumu. In *Český lid*, 99, pp. 67-83.

WOITSCH, J. (2013) Sto ročníků Českého lidu v osobách a poselstvích vedoucích redaktorů. In *Český lid*, 100, pp. 63-98.

ZENDER, M. (1980).*Forschungen zum ethnologischen Atlas Europas und seiner Nachbarländer. Bd. I: Die Termine der Jahresfeuer in Europa*. Göttingen : Schwanz.

Primary sources

Etnologický ústav AV ČR, personal fund Jaroslav Kramařík (not-inventoried), box 4, box 14, box 28, box 35, box 36