

Přílohy / Appendix:



*František Pospíšil
(foto kolem roku 1910
/ photo taken around 1910)*



Oznámení k 25. výročí svatby manželů Pospíšilových. Kolorovaná kresba Zdenka Buriana. Státní okresní archiv Kroměříž / Commemorating the 25th wedding anniversary of the Pospíšils. Coloured drawing by Zdeněk Burian. Photo: State district archives in Kroměříž



Nahoře: Pospíšil při záznamu lidového zpěvu ve Strání, foto František Pittner 1910. Dole: Pospíšil při natáčení u moravských Chorvatů (Dobré Pole, tehdy Gutfenfeld), foto Karel Dvořák 1910. Fotoarchiv Etnografického ústavu Moravského zemského muzea v Brně / Above: Pospíšil while recording singers in Strání (photo by František Pittner, 1910). Below: Pospíšil while recording Moravian Croatians (in Dobré Pole, then Gutfenfeld). Photo by Karel Dvořák, 1910. Photo: Institute of Ethnography, Moravian Museum, Brno



František Pospíšil s kamerou (30. léta 20. století). Státní okresní archiv Kroměříž / Pospíšil and his camera (the 1930s). Photo: State district archives in Kroměříž



Pospíšil při natáčení tance podšable ve Strání (1922). Fotoarchiv Etnografického ústavu Moravského zemského muzea v Brně / Pospíšil while recording the podšable dance in Strání (1922). Photo: Institute of Ethnography, Moravian Museum, Brno



Pospíšil při natáčení tance poklad na ostrově Lastovo (Chorvatsko), 1924. Státní okresní archiv Kroměříž / Pospíšil while recording the poklad dance in Lastovo island (Croatia), 1924. Photo: State district archives in Kroměříž



František Pospíšil při natáčení tance moreška na ostrově Korčula (Chorvatsko), 1924. Státní okresní archiv Kroměříž / Pospíšil while recording the moreška dance in Korčula island (Croatia), 1924. Photo: State district archives in Kroměříž

FOLKLORE IN THE MIRROR OF INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL INTERESTS (THE CASE OF THE CZECH ETHNOLOGIST FRANTIŠEK POSPÍŠIL)

Martina Pavlicová – Lucie Uhlíková

The existence of František Pospíšil (1885–1958), a Czech ethnologist from Brno, happened to be almost unnoticed by Czech professionals in the second half of the 20th century. This was due to a suspicion that he was collaborating [with Nazis] during World War II, not because of the quality of his work. In May 1945, he was interned, and later ended up at a mental asylum. Finally, he retreated to the Slovak community of Bolešov near Ilava, which was the birth place of his wife, Marie Červinková, also known as Šáry (Dvořáková 2008: 33). No detailed information has been published concerning Pospíšil's life failure; an exception is Richard Jeřábek's article "Případ Melniková-Papoušková" [The Case of Melniková-Papoušková] (1991), where Jeřábek comments on the anti-Semitic thinking of Pospíšil and the way it endangered several personalities of Czech ethnography.¹ It is this contradictory part of Pospíšil's life which caused historiographers to keep a certain distance from him, and consequently obscured his activities, despite the fact that Pospíšil contributed substantially to the history of Czech ethnography and was quite active as a scholar in his time. It was only recently that Hana Dvořáková, director of the the Ethnographic Institute of the Moravian Museum (in Brno), devoted her research to Pospíšil and after a series of separate studies edited and contributed to a volume called *Hanák na Pacifiku. Zapomenutá osobnost Františka Pospíšila / A Man from Haná on the Pacific Coast. The forgotten figure of František Pospíšil* (2008). The volume shows

1. Pospíšil's behaviour during WWII is explained relating to his personal problems and mental lability. See Dvořáková 2008: 8.

how extensive and impressive were the interests of Pospíšil, who served as a curator of the Moravian Regional Museum in Brno from 1920 to 1945.

The present paper focuses on two areas of Pospíšil's efforts: firstly, his study of song and dance folklore, and secondly, his use of top modern technical devices in the service of ethnographical and dialectical research, which was quite unique within the Czech context at his time. The two mentioned areas will be explored within the scope given in the title of the paper, that is, how individual and social consequences could contribute to the research of and presentation of folk culture.

Pospíšil was born in Skaštice in the Haná region to a wealthy family, on whose support he could always rely. Despite their rural roots, the family stressed the importance of education. In 1904, Pospíšil began his studies of theology in Vienna, Austria, and in 1905 moved to Prague, Bohemia, to read Czech and German at the Faculty of Arts. A close look at his study effort reveals not only the wide scope of his interests, but also his study ambitions. While in Vienna, apart from lectures in theology, Pospíšil attended a seminary in ethnography with an outstanding scholar, Michael Haberlandt (1860–1940); he also made himself acquainted with an important ethnological school of culture and history of Wilhelm Schmidt (1868–1945), and attended lectures on phono autography and physiology of speech with Sigmund Exner² (Maloň 2016: 50). Pospíšil became a member of the Austrian Society for Experimental Phonetics, as well as the Austrian Ethnographic Society. In Prague he was a student of philologists Jan Máchal (1855–1939) and Jiří Polívka (1858–

2. Sigmund Exner Ewarten (1846–1926) was a noted Austrian physiologist, who was at the establishing of the Phonogram Archives of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. For more see Lechleitner 2008: 93–94).
3. Jiří Polívka was one of the pioneers of dialect studies with the help of recording technology in the Czech context (see Polívka 1906). For his state exam in Czech language, Pospíšil submitted his *A Phonetic Analysis. Hanatian character of Moravian Hanatian dialects*. See Maloň 2016: 50.

1933)³, among others. The joint impact of the Vienna and Prague studies, especially the combination of Polívka's comparative approach and his support of the dialect research with the help of new methodological practice and modern technical methods (which he already came across in Vienna), provided the young Pospíšil with unique support for his field work. Unique also was Pospíšil's endeavour in the field of ethnography; it was typical by his extensive thematic and geographical scope (including the study of cultural elements which were considered marginal by other scholars⁴), and an proactive managerial approach which he employed later.

Initially, Pospíšil's research focused on the dialects of his native Moravia; nevertheless, very soon he included folk song as well. He approached his two fields of interest equipped with the most modern recording technology of the period: the phonograph. In the Czech context, when the oldest audio recordings of folklore are discussed, one would hear the name of the musicologist Otakar Zich mentioned first; in 1909 Zich recorded bagpipe music bands from the Chodsko region and the Blata of southern Bohemia⁵; in 1909–1912 composer and folklorist Leoš Janáček recorded Moravian and Slovak songs; Janáček's two close colleagues Františka Kyselková and Hynek Bím recorded songs as well.⁶ A little known fact is that in the summer of 1910 František Pospíšil recorded his field research as well. At that time, Pospíšil

4. For instance, the naive art, folklore manifestations on examples of mass production of postcards, kitch-like wax arrangements under a glass bell, and objects of textile threads for the game of cats' cradle (see. Dvořáková 2008, 2013).
5. Tyllner, Lubomír (editor.) 2001: *Dudy a dudácká muzika 1909 [Bagpipe and Bagpipe Music 1909]*. Praha: Etnologický ústav AV ČR. [Audio Series].
6. Procházková, Jarmila et al.: *As Recorded by the Phonograph. Slovak and Moravian Songs Recorded by Hynek Bím, Leoš Janáček and Františka Kyselková in 1909–1912*. Brno: Etnologický ústav AV ČR, v. v. i., Praha – pracoviště Brno, 2012 [included 3 CD, DVD]; Plocek, Jiří 1998: *Nejstarší zvukové záznamy moravského a slovenského lidového zpěvu. Z folkloristické činnosti Leoše Janáčka a jeho spolupracovníků [The oldest recordings of Moravian and Slovak folk singing : (on folkloristic activities of Leoš Janáček and his collaborators)]*. Brno: Gnosis; Ústav pro etnografii a folkloristiku AV ČR.

cooperated with the Phonogram Archives of Vienna, an institution focused on the production, collecting and keeping of audio recordings for scholarly use, especially in linguistics (Lechleitner 2008: 86). In his autobiography,⁷ years after, Pospíšil recalls that it was a Professor from Vienna University Vatroslav Jagić (1838–1923), a prominent Slavonic philologist, who helped him to cooperate with the Archives.

In his research into Slavonic dialects in Moravia, Pospíšil recorded narrations and singing of the last generation of Moravian Croats who still kept their native language,⁸ two narrations from the Haná community of Skaštice, and about thirty songs from the Slovácko villages of Ježov, Vlčnov, and Strání.⁹ It is estimated that there were other recordings by Pospíšil, including songs from other regions.¹⁰ Unfortunately, nothing else is known about it. Nevertheless, Pospíšil's Vienna recordings provide interesting evidence of his personal scholarly interest in folk singing, which stands out especially when compared to the recordings done by Zich and Janáček. These two collectors focused on what is understood by authentic folk music. In the case of Zich, it was

7. "...in Vienna, when he sent me to study with [...] Professor Exner at the Physiological Institute in aural phonetics, and when he opened the door for me at the Academy of Sciences in Vienna and their phonographic archives, where I deposited my philological treasures from Moravia later on (mainly south-Moravian dialects Chakavian and Croatian...)" The State District Archives in Kroměříž, František Pospíšil collections, *Confesio bulgarica*, [1937], 4/1.
8. See *Tondokumente aus dem Phonogrammarchiv, Gesamtausgabe der historischen Bestände 1899–1950. Series 11/1. Croatian Recordings 1901–1936*. Wien: ÖAW, 2009.
9. Das *Phonogrammarchiv* der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Pospíšil's recordings from Moravia, no. Ph1436 – Ph1450.
10. In a footnote to songs from the Hornácko region (communities of Nová Lhota and Vápenky) Pospíšil also comments on the conditions of the origin of his phonographic records. He says that he knew many singers from the previous years from his study journeys to the countryside, and from his native Haná region, where they were season workers, and where he would write down their songs as a grammar school pupil, with his sister. We also know that Pospíšil would use two different machines during his field research: one was a special phonograph for archival reasons from the Austrian Academy of Sciences, and the other was a phonograph combined with a Vindobona gramophone (Pospíšil 1911: 32, footnote 34), which Pospíšil reputedly gained directly from an inventor of the machine (see Axman 1911: no pag.).

the residual bagpipe music, and in the case of Janáček and his co-workers, they were songs with an archaic type of singing and/or a special type of instrumental performance. Pospíšil recorded songs accompanying the Shrovetide sword dance from the community of Strání, but apart from that, and mainly in his recordings from the Slovácko region, Pospíšil managed to capture the very young semi-popular song layer of broadside songs, and the repertoire which was spread by the increasingly popular brass bands. Some of the items can easily be included in what is called the national repertoire. It is evident that Pospíšil followed a different key than Janáček, who was 30 years his senior and who had linked his study of music folklore to patriotic and national ideas (accompanied by tendencies to aestheticize the songs), and who openly proclaimed his effort to preserve the precious evidence of folk culture for future generations. Janáček would perhaps never have used the expensive phonographic cylinders to record the same songs as Pospíšil, because Janáček, unlike Pospíšil, considered that type of songs as evidence of the decline of singing. This fact leads to a question regarding in which ways the social context influenced the personal approach of scholars to the material they observed. Pospíšil and Janáček knew each other; they met in the community of Strání due to their shared interest in the research of the sword dance *podšable* (Under the Sabres). Their surviving correspondence on this topic¹¹ says a lot about the attitudes and aims of both of them, but it also reveals the context of the field research focused on the manifestation of folklore, because it had already disappeared in its original form, and it was performed on request – remunerated¹²– only to fulfil the needs of outsiders. At that time, folk dance was performed on stage during ethnographic

11. Part of the correspondence between Janáček and Pospíšil was published by Ludvík Kunz (1988).

12. “I am willing to contribute to a production of Shrovetide. If there was any gain from it; continuous useable photographic pictures, and possibly songs.” See the letter from Janáček to Pospíšil from 2. 2. 1911 (Janáček in Kunz 1988: 158). More on the topic see in Procházková 2006: 279–283.

festivals (Pavlicová 2008: 69) or at a special occasion, such as taking pictures of carolling for study purposes. Using a camera for documenting the manifestation of folk dance was a shared moment for Janáček and Pospíšil; nevertheless, while it was the methodological peak for the former, it was an ordinary practice for the latter, due to the generation gap. The two men differed in their views on the object of their research as well. In 1911, when Pospíšil published his study “Mečový (zbrojný) tanec na slovanské půdě“ [The Sword (Weapon) Dance at Slavonic Soil], in which he presented his theory of the German origin of the *podšable* dance from Strání, Janáček rejected his conclusion in a letter dated April 9, 1911. He didn't tell Pospíšil the reasons for his rejection, but the meaning can be clearly perceived from the sentences which followed in the same letter: *“It will be the main aim of the working Committee¹³ to take care of the custom, which is obviously deeply rooted, to see that this beautiful ceremonial custom will be preserved here in Moravia as long as possible. It is necessary to keep the custom in Moravia as long as possible.”* (Janáček to Pospíšil, April 9, 1911)

Considering the above-mentioned facts, we should not be surprised that Pospíšil's reflection of folk singing in Moravia, as he captured it in his phonographic recordings, differs immensely from what we know from the recordings from the same period by Janáček and Zich. The generational difference is to be blamed to a certain extent, and connected to this is the distance of the young generation from the ideas which influenced ethnographic and other research of the 1880s and 1890s. Since the 19th century, the issue of the changing style and singing repertoire was commented on by most music folklorists and their effort to preserve the vanishing folk song were initiated especially by this fact; nevertheless, the field

13. The Working Committee for Czech Folk Song in Moravia and Silesia, established in 1905 as part of the project named “Folk Song in Austria” (“Das Volkslied in Österreich”), which focused on collecting and publishing folk songs of the nations of the Austrian monarchy. Janáček was the Committee's President.

research focused predominantly on archaic manifestations. In this light, Pospíšil's recordings are quite a surprise, because he managed to capture the real picture of the folk singing of the period.

Pospíšil's approach to the study of folk dance was not typical for his period either. As was mentioned above, in 1911 Pospíšil completed his study on (weapon) sword dances. It was published in *Národopisný věstník československý* [The Czecho-Slavonic National Gazette] in 1911. The gazette was edited by literary scholar and folklorist Jiří Polívka, who was – as mentioned above – an ardent supporter of the comparative method. Pospíšil's study was composed within the same ideas, and as such it was a distinct theoretical step of dance folkloristics, which in that period was focused on the field collecting of folk dances and its description.¹⁴ Pospíšil's study formed a draft for his dissertation, which he started to write in 1912, and which was defended under the same title with J. Polívka and J. Máchal in 1917 (Maloň 2016: 50). Pospíšil wrote his outline of European weapon dances, or specifically sword dances, also as a treatise on possible genetic connections of folk dance manifestations, which were preserved in his homeland area as well, with similar properties and dance structure. He used the community of Strání as a starting point, making several study visits there; he also worked with respondents from the Horňácko region and the Uherský Brod region, completing the work with comparative records of Czech, Moravian, and Slovak written sources.

František Pospíšil's approach was unique for a scholar of dance folkloristics not only in his homeland, but also internationally. His effort in understanding sword dances and the way he compared the dances within a very broad basis was accompanied with the use of film camera already in the early 1920s. He frequently travelled abroad, which meant that he was in touch with many scholars and personalities of cultural life in Europe. In 1927, he met the British

14. Pospíšil did his scholarly activities alongside his teaching profession. From 1910 he taught at schools of economy in Přerov and Olomouc, and in World War I from 1915 to 1917 he was called up to the armed forces.

scholar Maud Karpeles (1855–1976) while staying in Bayonne in the Basque Country, recording the sword dances of the Basques.¹⁵ Karpeles was a former collaborator of important British collector Cecil Sharp (1859–1924) and continued in collecting and teaching activities after his death. According to American ethnochoreologist Elsie I. Dunin, it was perhaps Pospíšil who influenced Karpeles with his method so much that she extended her interest in folk dances to areas outside of Britain. These new tendencies were reflected in the organizational work and contributed to the merging of two professional societies, the English Folk Dance Society (EFDS,) and the Folk-Song Society (FSS) into the English Folk Dance and Song Society (EFDSS) in 1932; the newsletter of the society began to accept foreign contributions and its content was extended in the international news (Dunin 2014: 198–199).

When František Pospíšil joined the Moravian Regional Museum in Brno, his international journeys increased considerably: *“In 1920 he visited Lapland, in 1923 Hungary (his previous visits in 1909 and 1911), in 1924 he went to the Balkans (previously in 1910 and 1913), in 1925 he visited the Kashubs in northern Poland), in 1926 he visited Albania (first in 1912), in 1927 he visited the Basque Country, in 1928 Scotland and England, and in 1929 Sicily and Luxembourg. And not to forget his journeys to the Ukraine, the Caucasus, Slovakia, and Germany.”* (Maloň 2016: 52) From October 1930 to June 1931, Pospíšil stayed in the USA. It was a study and promotional stay, and Pospíšil travelled with his wife. As he commented on it, the aim of the journey was *“to draw interest to the Czechoslovak ethnographic and choreographic science, and to study the remains of Indian*

15. The event in Bayonne was linked to the opening of the Basque Museum, and the French press reported that due to his enthusiasm, Pospíšil was impossible to neglect: *“We could not finish our work because of an ardent Czechoslovak ethnologist, who wanted to film the sword dance. Because he has presented many films from his country to us, we were obliged to fulfil his requirement, and we led him to a distant place near the river, to allow him to film our sword dance. Unfortunately, the crowd of people gathered early, and both the camera man and the onlookers were losing patience.”* (See Dvořáková 2008: 29)

[Native American]cultures“ (Pospíšil 1932: 7). After his return, he published the first (and only) of two planned volumes¹⁶ of an intended monograph on his American field research. It is evident that his work was influenced by the school of history and culture, with which he became acquainted during his studies in Vienna. Also, other surviving materials (such as an annotation to his lecture at the congress of Americanists in Hamburg in September 1930) give evidence that he was well informed on the concept of cultural anthropology and anthropological research of dance. He considered it essential to document Indian [Native American] dance culture in film, and knowing that financing it is expensive but crucial, he called upon institutions to support such research (Pospíšil 1930).

Observing Pospíšil’s activities in dance folklore in comparison with the period situation in the Czech (and Moravian) context, its international extension is quite evident. His interest in sword dances and weapon dances directed Pospíšil not only to various ethnic groups in (and out of) Europe, but also revealed to him the consequences in culture and society to an extraordinary measure. The knowledge he gained confirmed to him the similar status of traditional folk culture in Europe: a gradual decline of its older forms, especially with dances. Since he had to hire dancers to present folk dances in the Moravian community of Strání at the beginning of the 20th century, and since he captured a form which was not in everyday use,¹⁷ he wasn’t surprised to see this happening in other ethnic groups. In his London lecture in 1928 he says: “*In dances, it is easy to see the difference between dancers – professionals as it was in the case of two English groups, the sword dance dancers and Morris dancers, and the untrained peasant sons, who were*

16. *Ethnological material from the Southwest of the U.S.A. (An anthropological geographic evaluation of a study journey to the southwestern Indians, based in natural sciences)* (see Pospíšil 1932).

17. Towards the end of the 19th century, the Shrovetide procession with the *podšable* dance ceased to exist in the community of Strání, because it lost its original functions. There was nobody who would play music for the dancers; there was no fiddle player available in the community nor the surroundings (Kunz 1988: 155, 164).

difficult to gather. I went to a great deal of trouble to find ten adult dancers in the Basque Country. I was forced to ask the monks of the Capuchin [Franciscan] monastery in Lekaroz for help, and part of my Basque records was shot with their wards.“ (Pospíšil in Dvořáková 2008: 28) In a similar way, Pospíšil saw the cultures of indigenous ethnic groups in America, when he included a call in his Hamburg lecture for the need to capture the dances of Indians, who degenerate “under the influence of modern civilization, the interest of enthusiasts and tourists“ (Pospíšil 1930).

František Pospíšil did not hide the real status of folk dance tradition in any way, even if in his films he strived to capture the tradition in a way which provided typical features of functioning older forms. In today’s words, some of his treatment of dance material could be called a reconstruction, but in his days, it was based on the memory (sometimes passive) of the original interpreters/performers.¹⁸ He adumbrated the treatment which in the field of applied ethnology is valid even these days.

Focusing closely on František Pospíšil, we hoped to show how unexpected the meeting of individual aspirations and social contexts could be, and how the two aspects could condition not only scholarly journeys, but final interpretation of the topics studied as well. His personal devotion to modern research methods and obvious ambitions led the ethnologist from the traditional culture of his native Haná to the American Indians, and his work was cited by many great scholars of his days. Because of unhappy consequences of history, Pospíšil’s interesting views and findings were almost forgotten in the Czech context; his name is usually non-existent in works on the history of Czech and Slovak folkloristics and ethnology. Nevertheless, seeing Pospíšil’s work realistically, it is evident that it is always worth

18. Pospíšil’s film recordings represent thoughtful fruition, including the part about clothing.

It is interesting to read about the problems he faced while filming sword dances at the Croatian isle of Lastovo: “*It was difficult to provide even several people with costumes, because they were no longer in general use.*“ (Pospíšil in Dvořáková 2008: 29)

returning to older sources and literature and approaching them in an unbiased way. This is crucial especially while approaching traditional folk culture, which in the past was for many reasons and in many respects used (and misused). Handling this issue properly can help us move towards the factual knowledge and evaluation of tradition, which is an important basis for the study of many aspects of contemporary society too.

*The study was written with the institutional support of the Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, v. v. i., RVO: 68378076 and as the specific MUNI/A/0958/2016 research.

Resources:

The Institute of Ethnology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, v. v. i., Praha – Brno branch, collections and documentations, sign. B 3 / Pospíšil.
Phonogramarchiv der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Pospíšil's recordings from Moravia in 1910, no. Ph1436 – Ph1450.
The State District Archives in Kroměříž, František Pospíšil collection, *Confesio bulgarica* [1937].

Bibliography:

- AXMAN, Emil. 1911. Zachycování lidové písně fonografem [On recording of folk songs with a phonograph]. *Český svět* 7, no. 24: [no pag.].
- DUNIN, Elsie Ivancich. 2014. Emergence of Ethnochoreology Internationally: The Jankovič sisters, Maud Karpeles, and Gertrude Kurath. *Musicology* 17: 197–217.
- DVOŘÁKOVÁ, Hana. 2008. Zapomenutá osobnost Františka Pospíšila. In *Hanák na Pacifiku. Zapomenutá osobnost Františka Pospíšila / A man from Haná on the Pacific Coast. The forgotten figure of František Pospíšil*, edited by Hana Dvořáková, 7–50. Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum.
- DVOŘÁKOVÁ, Hana. 2013. String Games in František Pospíšil's Photo Documentation. *Národopisná revue / Journal of Ethnology* 23, no. 5: 68–75.
- JERÁBEK, Richard. 1991. Případ Melniková-Papoušková. *Národopisná revue* 1: 231–232.
- KUNZ, Ludvík. 1988. Komentář k Janáčkovu studiu mečového tance ze Strání [Commentary on Janáček's study of the sword dance from Strání]. *Slovácko* 30: 155–169.
- LECHLEITNER, Gerda. 2008. „Tenkrát na východě...“ – zvukové nahrávky Františka Pospíšila z roku 1910 a vídeňský Fonografický archiv / „Once upon a time...“ – František Pospíšil's sound recordings from 1910 and the Vienna Phonogram Archives. In *Hanák na Pacifiku. Zapomenutá osobnost Františka Pospíšila / A Man from Haná on the Pacific Coast. The forgotten figure of František Pospíšil*, edited by Hana Dvořáková, 85–97. Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum.
- MALONĚ, Lubor. 2016. Od Hanáků k indiánům jihozápadu USA [From the inhabitants of the Haná region to the Indians of the Southwest of the USA]. *KROK – Kulturní revue Olomouckého kraje* 13, no. 4: 50–53.

- PAVLICOVÁ, Martina. 2008. František Pospíšil a lidový tanec / František Pospíšil and folk dance. In: *Hanák na Pacifiku. Zapomenutá osobnost Františka Pospíšila / A Man from Haná on the Pacific Coast. The forgotten figure of František Pospíšil*, edited by Hana Dvořáková, 67–77. Brno: Moravské zemské muzeum.
- POLÍVKA, Jiří. 1906. Fonograf ve službě národopisu [Phonograph in the service of ethnography]. *Národopisný věstník československý* 1: 167–174.
- POLÍVKA, Jiří. 1910. Lidová píseň ve fonografu [Folk song by the phonograph]. *Národopisný věstník československý* 5: 233.
- POSPÍŠIL, František. 1911. Mečový (zbrojný) tanec na slovanské půdě [The Sword (Weapon) Dance at Slavonic Soil]. *Národopisný věstník československý* 6: 25–56.
- POSPÍŠIL, František. 1920. Lidové písně fonograficky na Moravě nasbírané [Folk songs collected in Moravia by the means of phonoautograph]. *Časopis vlastivědného spolku muzejního v Olomouci* 31: 27–42.
- POSPÍŠIL, František. 1930. The Present Condition of Choreographic Research in Northern, Central and Southern America. In: Sonderabdruck aus den Verhandlungen des XXIV. Internationalen Amerikanisten-Kongresses Hamburg – 7. bis 13. September 1930, 212–213.
- POSPÍŠIL, František. 1932. *Etnologické materiále z Jihozápadu U. S. A. (Anthropografické hodnocení studijní cesty k SW Indiánům na podkladě přírodovědeckém)*. Vol. I. [Ethnological material from the Southwest of the U.S.A. (An anthropological geographic evaluation of a study journey to the southwestern Indians, based in natural sciences)]. Brno: self-published.
- PROCHÁZKOVÁ, Jarmila. 2003. Janáčkovy snahy o fotografickou dokumentaci v rámci podniku Lidová píseň v Rakousku [Janáček's effort in the photographic documentation of The Folk Song in Austria project]. *Národopisná revue* 13, no. 4: 199–211.
- PROCHÁZKOVÁ, Jarmila. 2006. *Janáčkovy záznamy hudebního a tanečního folkloru I [Janáček's records of folk music and dances I]*. Brno: Doplněk.

Summary

František Pospíšil (1885–1958), a noted ethnologist from Brno, was one of the scholars whose research aims and interpretations of the topics which he studied were determined both by his individual interests as well as by social context. The paper attempts to demonstrate it. Pospíšil, who was interested in modern research methods (using phonograph, camera, and film camera) and was ambitious, stretched his research from his home region of Haná in Moravia to Native Americans (within his sword dance study and weapon dance study); his findings were quoted by many respected scholars of the period. Within the Czech environment, Pospíšil was one of the first scholars who used a phonograph to record folk singing; within the international context, Pospíšil was one of the first scholars who used a film camera to research dances. In fact, anything that Pospíšil did in the field of ethnology was unique; he covered a very broad range of themes and geographical areas, he also explored cultural phenomena which were on the margin of interest of others, and he employed an agile manager-like approach. Due to some unfavourable historical circumstances, Pospíšil's name was almost forgotten especially in the Czech context, and there is almost no mention of him in the texts on the history of Czech and Slovak folkloristics.

Key words: Folklore; folk dance; sword dance; dance and film; phonograph; František Pospíšil; Leoš Janáček.