Dorian Jurić

"Josip Tomec, Collector": Class and Folklore Collection in Nineteenth-Century Croatia

An 1897 collecting guide for a Croatian folklore journal suggests literate peasants as highly privileged lay collectors. In reality, despite their advantageous access to the journal's quarry, difficulty in mastering practices of knowledge transmission and the privileged language of the journal's style regularly proved to be insurmountable impediments to their aspirations. The correspondence of peasant collectors reveals the ways they navigated engagement with nineteenth-century folklore collection projects and theoretical paradigms that valorized their social position while at the same time yoking them to it.

Keywords
AFS ETHNOGRAPHIC THESAURUS: Folklife, archives, collectors, editors, theory

> I have received your esteemed postal card. So, I have been deceived. We did not agree that he would correct my documents, only that our future collecting would be written together. . . . I have written him immediately telling him to return my work.
>
> —Tomec[1]

IN 1897, A PEASANT FARMER NAMED JOSIP TOMEC from the northern Croatian village of Virje requested a folklore collecting guide from the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts (Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, today the Croatian Academy) after seeing an advertisement calling for contributions to their new folklore journal in the August 5 edition of the interest paper *Friend of the Folk*. The Academy's promotional materials particularly noted literate peasants as excellent contributors given their native knowledge, and Tomec felt himself well-positioned to collect for his village. Indeed, the journal's editor and author of the collecting guide (1897), Antun Radić, was becoming well-known for his political writings on the foundational role and cultural importance of the peasant class. The guide was aimed at making a competent collector out of any untrained volunteer and, among other possible candidates, it cited literate peasant collectors as ready-made experts who need only take up pen and paper to spread their knowledge. And yet, in practice, this

DORIAN JURIĆ is a newly minted PhD in Anthropology from McMaster University, Canada

Journal of American Folklore 133(527):27–52

was seldom the case. By October of 1898, Josip Tomec's folklore materials had been given, against his wishes, to a young, learned collector for emendation. By 1900, his manuscript, like those of many other peasant collectors, had taken a permanent and unpublished position in the Academy's archive.

If peasant collectors were so well-positioned, why was their work often relegated to the storeroom or to the pen of another collector? Why would Antun Radić—populist ideologue, defender of the peasant class, father of Croatian ethnology, and editor of a folklore journal—give a peasant collector's manuscript to a cleric for emendation? In this article, I use the correspondence materials of peasant collectors housed in the archive of the Department of Ethnology at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts to reveal the ways that peasant collectors engaged with the process of folklore collection in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. I explore the way that peasant collectors' engagement in the project offered them hope for an advancement in social status, which was often hindered by the troubles they faced and insecurities they felt in their attempts to grasp the format of academic writing. This data reveals the competing conceptions of expertise that were at play in nineteenth-century folklore collection and the bias that ensured that the expertise of writing in academic genres would always supersede privileged access to the quarry of the science. I also explore the ways that peasant collectors inadvertently exposed some of the romantic, theory-driven misrecognitions and erasures that were common in folklore research of the time—often revealing their expertise in a manner that was not recognized contemporaneously but proves competent in retrospect. Particular attention is paid to the collector Josip Tomec, whose candid correspondence is highly enlightening in regard to his involvement with the Academy. By delving into this correspondence, I reveal the larger tensions of class difference and expertise that informed the experience of many peasant collectors in their relationship with these folklore projects—tensions predicated on a system of cultural theories informed by a class hierarchy that was reconstituted through the collectors' engagement.

Correspondence Materials

The archive in the Department of Ethnology at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts is home to a stunning wealth of folklore and folklife materials collected from the middle of the nineteenth century to the present day. The oldest materials represent an impressive array of professional- and amateur-collected manuscripts contributed to the editorial boards of two great projects—the Academy's ethnological journal on folklife, the *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena* (Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs, hereafter *Zbornik*), and the publishing house Matica hrvatska's (Matrix Croatia) collection of Croatian Folk Songs (Andrić 1909, 1914, 1929, 1939, 1940, 1942; Bosanac 1897; Broz and Bosanac 1896; Marjanović 1898, 1899). Beyond the vast amount of material collected throughout Austro-Hungary's South Slavic territories (mostly areas of contemporary Croatia, the Vojvodina in present-day Serbia and Hungary, and some of Bosnia and Herzegovina), the archive also contains a large store of correspondence to the editors in Zagreb from a number of the collectors of that material. This varied assortment of long-format quires

(*arci*), postal cards, telegrams, postcards, and random scraps of paper offers insight into both the collection process behind the materials and the personalities behind the manuscripts.

The majority of these letters outline the less interesting side of collecting folkloric and ethnographic data in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Most ask for clarification on various editing changes and unfamiliar terms, and especially include messages from collectors repeatedly asking, in various tones of plea or demand, when they might be remunerated for their efforts. The Academy regularly ran out of funds to support the increasing number of contributors, and the editors were often silent on matters of money, so these pleas are legion. The materials are written in variously legible hands, rife with dialect variation, and often contain random assortments of grammatical standards and orthographic practices, as these were still being debated and implemented variously in different regions at the time. Most of the letters do not denote to whom they are addressed. The standard practice was to write the name of the addressee on the envelope (which was discarded) and to open the letter with the salutation "Highly Learned Sir!" (*Veleučeni Gospodine*!) and other similar titles. Moreover, the majority of the letters in the archive are only those written *to* the editors and others at the Academy, and thus represent a mass of one-sided discussions whose topics are often difficult to parse or place into context. Despite these impediments, a small number of documents furnish impressive data about the collecting process for both the journal and the folk song volumes, making them essential reading for a thorough understanding of the archive, the deposition of its materials, and the general practice of folklore collection in Croatia at the time.

Of the various volunteer collectors who contributed to these projects, the most interesting and surprisingly informative are the peasant collectors who lived among, worked with, and epitomized their subjects of study. As lay, native ethnographers, who at times conducted autoethnography, these collectors found themselves in a liminal position between both subject and object—peasant informant and academic collector. For those early collectors contributing to the *Zbornik*, their correspondences are also significantly addressed to the person who encouraged their participation in the first place—one of the most important early social science scholars of the region, the father of Croatian ethnology, and editor of the journal from 1897 to 1902, Antun Radić.

Collecting Folklore and Folklife Materials in Croatia at the Turn of the Twentieth Century

After numerous false starts at creating a publishing regimen for folklore collection in Croatia, the administrative and editorial board of the Yugoslav Academy printed the first edition of their folklore journal, the *Zbornik*, in 1896, with material mostly drawn from a small number of manuscripts that had filtered in after a public call in 1895. The same year saw the publication of the first of 10 large volumes of folk songs collected by contributors to the publishing house Matica hrvatska throughout the previous century. Both publications marked the true beginning of Croatian anthropology, ethnology, and ethnography as products intimately tied to folklore research

(see Belaj 1998; Čapo Žmegač 1997; Halpern and Hammel 1969; Naumović 1998; Rihtman-Auguštin 2004).

The idea for the *Zbornik* was built upon a questionnaire model that was well-established in French, English, German, and Russian folklore methods of the time (Fox 2010; Knight 1998; Senn 1981:26), but only saw wider adoption throughout Europe in the interwar period (Wiegelmann and Cotter 1968:187; Niederer and Bucher 1968:237).[2] Based on a grassroots methodology, correspondent collectors volunteered to gather material in rural regions in return for a small monetary reward and recognition in print as collectors. Most submissions were produced by priests, teachers, and university professors in their free time, but some collectors ranged widely in their professions, including soldiers, farmers, and rural teachers drawn from the peasant class. The project aimed to chronicle a holistic overview of peasant lifeways in all regions that could qualify (no matter how contentiously) as belonging to the Croatian nation—to create an intellectual tapestry of knowledge on such topics as tool and plant names, kinship formations, work practices, beliefs, oral traditions, and more, in an effort to build an ethnographic map of the nation.

With publication of the second volume, the first editor, Ivan Milčetić, passed his position over to Antun Radić, who brought a tireless passion to the work. With the Academy's prompting, Radić created an expansive questionnaire, the "Osnova za sabiranje i proučavanje građe o narodnom životu" (Basics for the Collection and Study of Material on Folk Life, hereafter "Osnova"), which was published in the second edition of the *Zbornik* (Radić 1897:1–88) and was also made available in a cheaper format that could be ordered from the Academy. The document consisted of two large sections: the first, a treatise on the importance of understanding, cherishing, and chronicling folk culture; and the second, a topic-by-topic guide to help any person become a local ethnographer, including guidelines for collecting, transcribing, and submitting materials to the journal.

In the first section of the "Osnova," Radić outlined his famous "Two Cultures" theory as a theoretical framework and *raison d'être* for the project. Based heavily on the ideas of Rousseau, Herder, and Radić's main inspiration, Jules Michelet, the theory attempted to divide the modern European world, and particularly Croatia, into two strata: the Gentry (*gospoda*) and the Folk (*narod*) (Radić 1897:1–8). The piece opens in a parabolic vignette of a pristine past that follows early social groups of noble savages from their idyllic small-scale societies into Radić's present. As societies expand and social divisions arise based on competence and access to resources, the upper classes begin to look with disdain upon their peasants. The division within societies is mirrored in divisions between cultures. For powerful societies, the privileged elite retains pride in its own culture and disparages its neighbors (Radić uses as his example the ancient Greek pejorative *βάρβαρος* and mentions "proto-ethnologists" such as Herodotus and Tacitus). Unfortunately, in Radić's view, the upper classes of less powerful cultures inevitably adopt their neighbors' ill view of themselves and abandon their innate culture (reflected in their contemptible peasant class) for the culture of their powerful neighbors. The Croats are depicted as prime examples of this phenomenon, with the Croatian Church's abandonment of Slavic liturgy for Latin and the Croatian Gentry's adoption of Western clothing listed as clear indicators of their

cultural abandonment. The division (*jaz*) that grew between the Folk and the Gentry, in Radić's theoretical assessment, created unnecessary anger, disgust, and resentment between the classes, epitomized in the feudal system. What Radić titled Folk-science (*narodoznanstvo*)[3] served the purpose of reuniting the two groups through mutual respect. Although Radić scorned romanticized images of the folk, his vision of the peasant class as the true retainer of a national culture, long since abandoned by and imperative to a reformation of the upper classes, was exemplary romanticism.[4] These early exegeses on the role of the peasant later proved to be the foundation of Radić's populist politicking as the ideologue behind the Croatian People's Peasant Party (Hrvatska pučka seljačka stranka), which he cofounded with his younger brother Stjepan (see Perić 2002, 2003).

Radić worked passionately as editor of the journal, and his message about the importance of folk practices was well-received. The response to the Academy's call for material was overwhelming, flooding the offices with manuscripts from all regions of the Austro-Hungarian holdings in the Balkans. In less than 5 years (1897–1902), working in connection with the journal, Radić corresponded via letter, telegram, and postal card with over 700 collectors, academics, and others (Primorac 2010:19). This prodigious effort produced an abundance of material (both published and unpublished) from which local scholars have drawn anthropological and folkloric material into the present day. As an ethnographic experiment, a wealth of data, and a remarkably early example of participant observation research, the Academy's project is a treasure trove. In 1902, Radić lost his editorial position,[5] which fell to Dragutin Boranić (editor from 1902–1954). Boranić continued to run the journal on Radić's influential model and to publish material drawn from the manuscripts, in sections or sometimes in their entirety (see Ivanišević 1903, 1904, 1905; Lang 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914; Lovretić 1897, 1898, 1899, 1902a, 1902b, 1916, for examples) until around 1940, when he began to shift the aim of the journal to presenting only critical academic articles on topics of folklore and ethnology.

The process of editing documents from such a wide range of collectors and areas was a daunting task, but the genial and sometimes lively discussion between collectors and editors attests to the excitement and great effort that went into the collecting. Collectors and editors felt a drive to preserve what was perceived to be a dying heritage and to gain some esteem or acclaim for taking part in a movement of nation-building at a time when freedom and self-determination were asserted in terms of national distinction. Reading extensively through the archive, however, very quickly reveals that not all collecting relationships were created equally. The correspondence of peasant collectors exposes their unique relationships to the project, which are not reflected in the writings of other collectors.

Josip Tomec and Peasant Collectors: Self-Making in a New Commodity Market

On August 12, 1897, Josip Tomec sent a written request to the Academy to have a copy of the "Osnova" sent to his address, house number 714, Virje.[6] There remains no picture of Josip Tomec and no biography beyond the small anecdotes revealed in his

34 pieces of correspondence and his collection. In the guide to the archive's holdings created by a team of scholars working there in 2010 (Batina et al.), he is listed as "Josip Tomec, *seljak*" [peasant]. His engagement in the collecting process is testified only by his manuscript "Virje" (Tomec 1898–1903), housed in the Academy's archive under number 18 in the Old Collection (*Stara Zbirka*) and a small mass of postal cards and letters, written in his markedly legible and flowing cursive, sent to the editors and written on the large quires that the "Osnova" instructed collectors to use for their work (Radić 1897:74–5). Upon reception of the guide, Tomec began collecting rigorously, writing long passages of text in response to the questions outlined within it, both from his own experience and through interviews with fellow villagers. He approached the work with the zeal and drive that most collectors brought, but the project posed some impediments that uniquely affected those of his socioeconomic class.

Perhaps the most predictable obstacle to peasant collectors was the issue of monetary compensation. Collecting required a small expenditure of funds, both for materials[7] and to pay informants for songs, tales, and descriptions collected;[8] it also demanded substantial amounts of free time for collection, transcription, editing, and correcting. While all collectors were keen to receive payment for their work, those with more substantial incomes could often afford to wait for their remuneration and offset their collecting costs with their own funds. The majority of collectors reacted to the Academy's constant lack of funding (the journal was expensive to produce and did not sell well at the start [Perić 2002:107–8]) and the common silence of the editors regarding payment with tempered or calm pleading and occasional humorous appeals for mercy.[9] Some collectors willingly forwent their payments, asking only for the money to pay off their informants or co-collectors, or for copies of the publications in which their names appeared. Many suggest nonchalantly in their letters that they would leave judgment of their documents' worth and their right to reimbursement to the Academy's discretion.[10] Some of this reluctance to demand payment was surely feigned modesty and posturing, but, for many collectors, the true aim of engagement was the enticing social capital of being recognized in print as a contributor to the journal.[11] Those with secure incomes were afforded the freedom to defer monetary recompense in the pursuit of prestige.

Given the amount of time and energy put into producing these collections, it is little wonder that collectors felt a high degree of investment in them. Collecting was slow and laborious work. Even those collectors who worked in teams usually collected individually from their informants, trying to keep up with spoken or sung word while writing with nib pens and India ink (Lord 2000:124–8; Wilson 1970:169). Moreover, postal services were unreliable, and months' worth of work could be lost in transit. Editors were sometimes slow to correspond and always slow to send reimbursements, and there were no guarantees that one's work would even be chosen for publication. But there was a deeper level of connection to the material that manifested in the contributors to the journal. The monetary incentive was not enough to motivate such exhaustive work. Rather, collecting became an act of identity production. Reading the correspondences in the archive, one feels the energy and excitement of the collectors as they engaged in what was not only a popular movement throughout Europe at the time, but also a communal enterprise in cultural and national production.

At this time, the romantic theories of Herder and Rousseau still boasted their factory finish, and folklore materials were the pure evidence and descriptive banner of ethnic claims to political autonomy and territorial sovereignty. In the multi-ethnic Balkans, the collapsing Ottoman Empire opened numerous territories that both politicians and academics were eager to claim as belonging solely to their culture, people, and nation. For the Croatian people, the relatively recent political autonomy won by the Serbs from the Ottoman Turks provided hope that the Croats might soon remove themselves from Austro-Hungarian control. While politics and war led such shifts, it was the intellectuals trailing behind who defined the culture and forged the principles by which co-nationals could find inclusion in the project.

In this environment, academics in Zagreb represented a close-knit community who were often educated in a wide range of fields and well-read on theoretical work from throughout Europe. Regular correspondence with even one member of this group allowed one to appear as and feel like a proxy member. For collectors from every level of society, then, publication in the journal or song collections was a way to gain social capital in one's own community, and collecting for, corresponding with, and being published in the *Zbornik* became an act of self-making. By engaging in these projects, collectors brought national attention and fame to their humble, local regions while adopting a positive identity category that shaped them into proxy members of Zagreb's intellectual elite. In their small villages, collectors were seen as men and women of letters, educated enough to publish amongst the intelligentsia of Zagreb. Many collectors used their correspondence to engage in folklore discussions with the editors and to mention the recent publications they were reading or wished to order from the Academy or Matica hrvatska. Some collectors even cited their desire to move to Zagreb to be closer to the excitement.[12]

At the time, a number of competing orthographies were used in various regions of the Balkans,[13] based mostly on the teaching traditions in the area or the practices used in available texts. Interestingly, the letters of collectors who corresponded heavily (including Josip Tomec) often show a marked shift over time to mimic the writing and spelling standards of the editors. That is not to say that this desire for inclusion was a subconscious phenomenon; rather, collectors took pride in their participation in the projects and took full advantage of opportunities to flaunt it. In their earliest correspondence, collectors such as Rade Bosnić and Josip Tomec signed their letters with their work professions under their names, but, over time, this common practice was replaced with the self-adopted title "Collector." The collector Mile Obradović was perhaps most vocal of all in conveying the esteem that came with contributing to these projects. As he wrote to the editors at Matica hrvatska:

> I hope that you will describe my work to-date in some publication, just so that my enemies recognize that I am fully aware of my work, and that along with this little teacherly station I am assuming such a noble task.[14]

> If you would do me the loveliest turn that I could require of you, and that is to, at the least, only mention that I have done something for Matica, in "Perspective" [a long-standing political newspaper], since my will for the work will improve, and I will have more friends in Travnik than I have currently.[15]

The more impoverished collectors, however, could not afford prestige alone and were often very direct about their need for reimbursement. Moreover, many collectors actually looked upon the project itself as a source of side income, particularly those peasant farmers who would use winters and rainy days away from their field work to write out their monographs.[16] Some of these poorer collectors remained casual, mentioning their difficult financial positions in offhand ways,[17] while others would pepper their letters with constant reminders of their financial standing in hopes that they would elicit pity or guilt and thus aid from the editors. In a letter dated August 15, 1901, Grgo Petković, a young peasant from Budak, asked the editors to send him a copy of the *Zbornik* for free. In his rigid, yet tremulous and unsure hand, he pleaded for these

> as a gift because of my considerable peasant poverty and lack, like an exceptional reward to me for collecting material for the [journal]. Consequently [*sic*] that I am poor and unschooled, the '*Zbornik*' would aid me greatly. . . . Considering my poverty and my uncomplaining effort which I invest heartily with great diligence for the collecting of these things, I am convinced, thinking on your goodness, that you will commit yourself this once to my one volume each of the entire *Zbornik*, and send them regularly in advance, if it pleases you that this still young and inexperienced village-boy learns something. [This would be] a thing and commitment [which would be] no such and insignificant for the celebrated Academy, but will be of great use for me! (underlining in original).[18]

In letters of this type, peasant collectors regularly employ a tactic that, to varying degrees of success, tries to foreground their subordinate social position. This mix of personal modesty and shaming draws attention to the distinction between the interlocutors in hopes of eliciting beneficial patronage. Arjun Appadurai has termed this "coercive subordination," where praise and subordination are employed in an effort to ensnare superiors into obligations of generosity (1990:101). Josip Tomec was no stranger to these tactics. He often mentioned his financial problems and, at times, tried to use them to motivate payment or behavior from the editors by describing the poor yields of his crops; his inability to afford pens, paper, and postage; and in general because, in his words, "for a villager there is always a want of money."[19] The practice is quite common in class-discrepant interactions of the time in the region, although the state of the Academy's funds meant that contributors to the journal likely overestimated the Academy's resources and often had little success. Though many were sent small pre-payments of some dozen *forints*, the sums were usually taken out of their final payment calculations, and editors were careful to assess materials thoroughly to determine their relative value to the projects and their publishability.

The fact that peasant collectors saw their collections as streams of income also meant that they sometimes engaged in commodification practices with their own culture, treating their collections as goods to be bartered. The less savvy would demand that their collections be returned to them when they failed to be paid in a timely manner,[20] or would outline in grandiose terms the great material they were able to access in an effort to solicit money in advance payment for further collection.[21] Rural teachers and other educated members of the peasant class brought this cultural commodification

further by threatening to enter their goods into the academic market. In a trick as old as trading, these collectors would stress their active connections with other journals that were eager for their materials, such as Friedrich Krauss' folklore journals in Vienna, *Am Ur-Quell* or *Anthropophyteia*.[22] These letters often include statements about the collector's unwavering loyalty to the editors in Zagreb, the implication being that their loyalty might begin to waver should they not be reimbursed. This is particularly true of ethnic Serb collectors in Croatia who would always stress the pressure that they received from the Serbian intellectual community to send their materials to Belgrade rather than Zagreb.[23]

As peasant collectors caught on to this new commodity market and the dictates of selling its products, they were also prone to emphasising their unique access to their research subjects. Radić's divide between the "Folk" and the "Gentry" put peasant collectors in an advantageous position on the side of the division with the greatest access to material, and they were savvy in marketing this position as a mark of quality on their manuscripts:

> It would be a pity to me to get in an argument with you, not that I am boasting, but I am not ashamed of any collaborators you have that will go out amongst the folk as I do, and that will learn their life secrets. Because I live in the village amongst the villagers themselves, with whom I share joy and suffering. Villagers have some of their own secret customs just as they have public ones, those which aren't mentioned in Dr. Radić's Osnova.[24]

Josip Tomec used this claim to privileged access not only to market his collection but also to vouch for his peers:

> I have loaned the "Osnova" to my colleague Tomaš Jalžabetić, and told him that he could work for [the village of] Đurđevac; but I received a message from him yesterday that some jurist Kolar is working for Đurđevac. I think that it's a pity for Đurđevac, that the work isn't done for the folk by one who knows them better than a jurist. I can commend Tomaš Jalžabetić to you as a virtuous and assiduous villager, and I think that he could complete all the tasks more perfectly than even I.[25]

Yet, despite their unique access to collect from friends and neighbors who trusted them more than urban strangers weekending in the village, there was an element of bluff in these assertions aimed to obscure an insecurity. The theoretical climate of the time, including Radić's writings, celebrated peasant collectors for their social connections to the folk as well as their (presumed innate) expertise regarding vernacular knowledge and lived experience. Uneducated peasant collectors were acutely aware, however, that this access meant little if it could not be conveyed. These collectors stood at a marked disadvantage for recording, formatting, and organizing their materials by nature of their lack of formal education and many letters reveal the unique ways that the social and integrative aspects of folklore collecting could be equally exclusionary for those who did not collect properly. Undereducated collectors frequently requested prior copies of the journal so that they could read published examples, hoping to acquire a feel for how the work should read and what exactly should be collected.[26] Tomec

struggled often with the work. His letters contain regular requests for guidance regarding methods in collecting and feedback on the quality of his research and writing. The letters are rife with anxiety about the collecting, asking for precise guidance on what is most important to collect, how to avoid collecting misinformation, and how to respond to sections of Radić's guide that were not pertinent or referred to practices that did not exist in his region. He often fretted about the state of his materials, asking to have them sent back to him for review or requesting permission to come to Zagreb to edit the manuscript under the direct guidance of the editors.[27] Peasant collectors like Josip Tomec, who were not trained in the intellectual standards of scientific communication, could not utilize this cultural capital to distance themselves from their peers. The expertise of a peasant's lived experience and inclusion in the Folk posed an impediment to motivating the expertise that truly mattered to the project and offered little hope to peasant collectors for transcendence into the privileged status of a gentleman collector.

The Problem with Tomec's Manuscript

By the Fall of 1898, it became clear that the Academy found Tomec's manuscript deficient. In a postal card written on September 8, Tomec mentions a seminarian from Virje, Ivan Vlašiček, who had begun to collect folk customs in the region. This figure is Janko (Ivanko) Vlašićek (1879–1935), a priest and active intellectual from Virje who published a number of historical and lexicographical treatises in later life (Miholek 2016), but who, at the time, was a young village cleric of 19. Tomec explained that Vlašiček had mostly collected material on "magic spells, the people who are the oldest in the village, and occurrences, such as fires,"[28] and that Vlašiček had offered to combine his collected material with Tomec's. It is unclear exactly when and how Radić or others at the Academy inserted themselves into this relationship, but by October 14, their betrayal of Tomec's hopes for inclusion into their ranks was clear. In order to bring his manuscript to a publishable state, and despite Tomec's clear disapproval of the arrangement, the Academy decided to send all of his previously submitted work to Vlašiček to be reworked. When the decision was first struck upon in October 1898, he wrote:

> I have sent to the seminarian Ivan Vlašiček one folk tale, and conversations in the village at the time of the elections. I have written and allotted X (ten) discussions, but for the voting itself, Mister Vlašiček begged me and begged me that he alone write that, and I conceded, but I would like most to have finished it all myself. Same for the documents that are with you, Mister Vlašiček said that he would correct them all himself, and I was somewhat in agreement, but I thought about it later, that would be a shame and an insult to me. For all the pain and effort I had, then for someone to tear through my work. I wrote it; I will at least re-write it once more, if necessary, and arrange everything thus so, to that end. Let Mister Vlašiček fill in whatever is lacking,—and then we're in agreement.[29]

Tomec's indignation and declaration of ownership were quick to deflate, however, in the face of a process that continued in spite of his complaints and which he was

seemingly powerless to prevent. He made constant pleas with the Academy to retain control over his own intellectual properties, but in vain. On January 9, 1899, he wrote:

> One of these days I received a postal card from the seminarian Ivan Vlašiček, that he had taken my documents to work on. Somehow that just doesn't sit right with me, that another is going to take credit for my work.—But you know what you have to do. Because of that, I leave it to your discretion. . . . I admit that Mister I. Vlašiček is more skillful than I, and hope that, for all my effort, he won't give me the short end of the stick.[30]

Shortly after, on January 26, Tomec attempted to take a sterner tone against Radić:

> I have received your esteemed postal card. So, I have been deceived. We did not agree that he would correct my documents, only that our future collecting would be written together, under the condition that whoever collects what, would write his name underneath 'collected by N. N.' [generic collector initials]. I have written him immediately telling him to return my work.[31]

From his very first correspondence, Tomec had always signed his letters with the slightly euphemistic "Josip Tomec, landholder [*posjednik*]," but in this letter, in an effort to either plea for or assert his rights of ownership, he signed off "Josip Tomec, collector [*sabirać*]."

Tomec's fears for creative control over his manuscript continued to burden him in subsequent letters, and he constantly requested information on the amount and nature of Vlašiček's input on his manuscript:

> I have just collected folk church customs; I criticized a bit, but I couldn't do otherwise for this is a priest who doesn't deserve this place, and I just told the honest truth.
>
> Is Vlašiček doing anything? That man has always been suspicious to me, but what can you do? Such is the world.[32]

Although the exact context of the document is not clear, on August 14, 1899, the two collectors signed a formal statement wherein they agreed to begin collecting together and asked that the Academy destroy the materials that Tomec had submitted to date.[33] It is unknown who instigated this decision, whether the Academy was aware of it in advance, or whether the decision reflected an honest effort from Vlašiček or was only some pretention to formality to calm Tomec's concerns. Whatever the impetus, the Academy seems to have ignored this document and, at least in some part, moved forward with plans to have Vlašiček edit Tomec's collection.

Despite all of this, Tomec continued to collect for his manuscript, his correspondence retained its positive tone, and he remained on good terms with Antun Radić through the affair.[34] In a 1900 issue of Radić's peasant magazine, *Dom* (Home), the editor even included a question about banking from "*Dom*'s friend Josip Tomec of Virje" in his "Voices of the Folk" section (Radić 1900:367). Yet Tomec's concern with Vlašiček's input on his manuscript did not abate in the remainder of his correspondence up to 1904. What makes the case confusing, however, is that Tomec's manuscript

in the archive does not seem to contain any passages immediately identifiable as written in another hand, nor does the archive contain any manuscript or material from Ivan Vlašiček. It thus remains unclear exactly what happened among the three parties, and what decisions were made or why. Only Tomec's correspondence reveals the problem—and through hazy lenses. With so much context lacking, it is difficult to make definitive interpretations about much of Tomec's case. However, it is difficult *not* to read some bitter remorse and defeat in his letters when, starting in December of 1902, his common signatures as "landholder" and "collector" were replaced consistently with "Josip Tomec, peasant [*seljak*]."

Regardless of Vlašiček's edits and contributions (whatever came of them), none of Tomec's manuscript was ever published in the *Zbornik*.[35] An abundance of submitted material from a wide range of areas and a limited publishing budget easily explain Tomec's lack of inclusion in the ranks of those exceptional works that saw full publication; it is more difficult, however, to speculate on why no individual sections of his work were used, as a large number of submissions of equal quality were. A casual reading of his manuscript suggests that it was of a quality similar to others that represent the stronger submissions produced by peasant collectors, but there remains no record of why the monograph was not used, what the editors deemed deficient, or Tomec's ultimate understanding of the fate of his work.

In Tomec's final letters to Boranić in 1904, he seems to have still retained hope for his relationship with the editors of the *Zbornik*. In 1898, the idea struck Tomec that the Academy might want to publish his autobiography. Pitching the idea again in 1904, he tried to sell the prospect to Boranić, and mobilized Radić's theoretical terms to do so: "Would it be suitable if at the end I wrote my biography? If one is a villager, does he not have a life too, and not only a gentleman?"[36] In one of his last letters, the spark of hope seems to have returned enough that Tomec gave some reconsideration to his bitter appellation, signing off as "Josip Tomec, peasant and collector,"[37] but his attempts to dissemble his frustration did not aid his cause.

Peasant Collectors and Radić's "Two Cultures" Theory

Radić's "Two Cultures" theoretical formula was predicated on a binary that fomented simplistic practices of distinction and, in many ways, called on readers to decide to which side of the binary they belonged or had been relegated. Radić expressed contempt for the Gentry of Croatia as a breed who had cast off their national character for the adoption of foreign beliefs, fashions, and practices, while celebrating the Folk as the salvation of the nation. But the proposed outcome of his theory was a better Gentleman and an educated peasant, the former enlightened by the Folk about his cultural heritage, and the latter respected but still segregated by a devotion to his traditional practices. Such romanticism spoke little about the implication for economic standing in this divide, and no peasant of the time failed to recognize that, despite their special access to the "soul of the nation," there was little to envy in their own position. Despite the abolition of serfdom during the 1848–1849 revolution, the peasant class (the vast majority of the population) was still considered the *vulgus in populo*, and their lot had little improved. Poverty and famine were abundant, and

villages suffered often from illnesses and plague. Peasants were regularly disadvantaged in financial engagements, and, at the time, most did not hold the right to vote (Perić 2002:81, 117). All these problems were discussed in Radić's political work, but were absent from his ethnographic writings.

It is important to note that Radić himself was peasant born, but through his education, writing, and publishing had risen out of the ranks of the "Folk" and into those of the "Gentry." His pride in his rural heritage was the foundation of most of his life's work, but whatever linkages he felt to his roots, he stood as a clear example to the peasant class that education could be a ticket to "Gentlemandom." Such success stories epitomize what Edin Hajdarpasic has labeled the "patriot-scholar" subject-position—self-made ethnographic populists who collected and published folklore materials that cast them into a marketable third position on the nationalist stage between peasants and upper classes (2015:30).[38]

Radić was not blind to the appeal of the upper classes to the lower (Rihtman-Auguštin 2004:41), but, despite his utopian vision of an intelligent and respected Folk that need not become Gentlemen (*pogospoditi*) (Perić 2002:88), his own biography betrayed his convictions. Educated peasant correspondents such as Vladimir Ardalić and Stjepan Banović were intent on, and indeed succeeded at, following the same model as Radić by mastering a language that provided them with a unique vantage point from which to draw distinctions between themselves and their village mates and family members. However, this was not the case for literate but undereducated peasants who could not master the academic model. While Radić's theoretical writing praised the expertise of literate peasant collectors owing to their emic knowledge (Radić 1897:73), a second level of expertise, which fell along more traditional class lines, often extinguished the ambitions of peasant collectors.

No matter their efforts, uneducated peasant collectors like Josip Tomec stood at a disadvantage from their more educated peers in understanding expected methods of engagement with their research, as well as the stylistic model that the editors were hoping to receive in the collections. While Radić's "Two Cultures" theory celebrated the peasant class, and his collecting guide singled out peasant collectors as ideal collaborators (Radić 1897:73), the bitter reality was that, despite their often shrewd insights into their own cultural milieu, many peasant collectors lacked the crucial skills required to package their materials to a reading public who effectively sought peasant knowledge in translation. Because of this, their work was seldom selected for publication, and often only very small sections of their work ever saw inclusion in the journal. The ideological struggle that arises out of the experiences of peasant collectors reveals a tension of competing expertises that were ostensibly fought on cultural grounds, but surreptitiously defaulted to class divisions predicated on the cultural capital of education and familiarity with literary styles (cf. Bourdieu 1974).

E. Summerson Carr has argued that conceptions of expertise often rely upon privileged relationships to cultural objects (2010:20) rather than practices of engagement. Indeed, Radić's investment in a divide between the Folk and the Gentry supported the peasant class as experts given their intimate connection to cultural knowledge and practices that were commonly considered ancient cultural birthrights. Carr has also noted the critical role that performance and enactment play in establishing expert

status. As she writes, "people become experts not simply by forming familiar . . . relationships with people and things, but rather by learning to communicate that familiarity from an authoritative angle" (19). It is on this level that peasant collectors often saw their collections disenfranchised. Despite romantic ideals, the scholars of Zagreb foregrounded another model of expertise based on a privileged relationship to scholarly language, critical analysis, and models of representation. This expertise was the measure used by privileged gatekeepers to regulate dispensation and mark the difference between successful social transcendence or wasted time, energy, and money; peasant collectors were acutely aware of this. Those peasant collectors with some education could just pass this obstacle, probably with a modicum of anxiety, but those who could not remained in a precarious position of subordination, trying desperately to barter, haggle, and argue their material through.

Despite Radić's guide, Tomec was unable to intuit the true expectations of the editors in Zagreb for what a collector was expected to produce. This inevitably led to his work being submitted to Vlašiček for reworking. Though we do not know the exact problems with his manuscript that were noted by the editors, comparisons of various sections of other published works reveal a model that rests heavily on scholarly practice and that situates knowledge in a manner aimed at a learned readership.

If one focuses on the opening sections of those submissions that were published in full in the journal, one finds a number of generic literary and learned practices that most peasant collectors seldom engaged in. When Milan Lang introduced his town of Samobor, he did so with a lengthy historical exegesis on the role that the town had played in Croatian history (Lang 1911:3–4). Josip Lovretić of Otok opens his manuscript with an autobiographical passage outlining his impetus for taking up his collecting project and giving the names of his many informants and contributors. This passage is rife with legitimating exposition emphasizing time lived in the village, experiences of peasant tribulations, and authentic connections to the folk and their knowledge (Lovretić 1897:91–3). Frano Ivanišević evokes the generic tone of travelogues when he introduces the regions of his home, Poljica, in a literary tour modeled for a traveler headed south from the city of Split and encountering the village (Ivanišević 1903:185–8). These collectors present all recorded speech, anecdotes, tales, and songs in dialect (the thicker, the better), but keep their descriptive passages about the villages, their denizens, and their practices in literary standard, aiming to be as detailed and analytical as possible and to keep their tone (at least passably) academic. Local terminology always follows standard forms and is presented in a clear and explicit manner. Ivanišević actually strays from standard practice, presenting his submission in dialect throughout, but it is a mitigated form that is blended with literary standard to produce an accessible text with a rural flavor.

On the other hand, Tomec's manuscript is overwhelmed with untranslated local dialect and terminology. It opens situated in the village of Virje with a very basic discussion of its geographic location in relation to the nearest large towns in each of the cardinal directions (Tomec 1898–1903:6). Though he gives a fair overview of significant local topography, it does not resemble the staggering lists presented by the other collectors. Tomec also quaintly belies his vocation by spending a considerable portion of this section discussing the soil types found in most of his neighboring

regions (6). He reveals a recognition of the types of material that would interest common readers by discussing some of the folklore that constitutes locals' social mapping of regional topography (6–7), but all of these passages are very brief and feel out of place to an audience that knows that the "Osnova" has another section for such lore. At one point, he also attempts to situate Virje on a historical continuum by discussing an archaic and lofty structure that local peasants unwittingly unearthed while digging a ditch. However, this discussion, too, suffers under Tomec's lack of historical knowledge and remains a parochial anecdote of lay archaeology and peasant mishap (7–8). Throughout the text, a reader can sense that Tomec had intuited what folklore writing aimed to reveal through the examples he read, but this understanding is undermined by his lack of familiarity with the style required to convey it. Competent collectors, in a sense, performed an act of translation, mediating the transference of peasant knowledge to an unfamiliar, cosmopolitan readership. Peasant collectors who lacked these translation skills could only try their best to guess and mimic how the Gentlemen liked to read their peasant culture.

While Tomec exhibited a clear expertise in his connection to his region, it was likely an expertise that, in the eyes of the editors, relegated him more suitably to the role of informant than the role of collector or author. In sending his materials to a second, learned resident collector, the editors probably hoped that they might receive a polished product that clarified local content packaged in a way that would appeal to learned sensibilities. There was nothing nefarious in the actions Radić took, and one can understand his concerns. He was not blinded by or married to his theory or to the format of the *Zbornik*. He was aware of the realities of village life, even when his experience pulled him further away from his roots and into the world of the Gentry. The editor was simply presenting in the journal a model that had already been prefigured in similar Western European academic publications. I believe Radić would have been pleased to publish the work of Josip Tomec, if only to add another name to his testimonial list about the authentic and important role of the Folk in educating the Gentry about their roots. But materials were prioritized by quality for publication, and it just happened that the Folk were not particularly skilled at writing academic material, even with the guidance of the editors and the "Osnova."

If Tomec felt betrayal in the act, Radić would surely have assumed that the betrayal would have aided rather than harmed him—better to be a published co-collector than an unpublished single author. Indeed, there were other collectors who were paired with co-authors to make their collections more robust or to aid in their written quality. An empathetic reading of the situation, though, would suggest that the local milieu and Tomec's own pride would have played some part in his reservations. Were the document published in both his and Vlašiček's names, the residents of Virje would have made their own informed judgment on the division between the two contributors: the learned Gentleman cleric and his Folk informant—the former kind enough to allow the latter's name to grace the document. Furthermore, Vlašićek would have been somewhere around half the age of Tomec at the time, which certainly would have added more insult to Tomec's position in their engagement. Antun Radić, the defender of the peasant class, probably understood this, but Antun Radić, the editor, still needed to produce a readable journal.

The competing expertises of journal contributors reveal a contradiction in Radić's seemingly homogenous theoretical framework that boasted an unceasing support for the peasant class at all levels. His "Two Cultures" theory was predicated on an investment in the distinction between the Folk and Gentry that saw the two positions as monolithic and impregnable, but also necessary and important to sustain. Radić embodied this distinction and the ability to cross the boundary it posed. And yet, while his political writings sought to diminish the differences between the relative importance of these classes (and his position within them) to garner peasant support, his academic editing contested this notion by setting the true marker of expertise—the expertise of the written format—on the Gentleman's side, often to the exclusion of the peasant class.

Peasant Collectors in Riposte to Cultural Theory

What makes this correspondence informative is not only the perspective it provides on the ways that peasant collectors experienced engagement with the editors of these projects, but also the ways in which it reveals how peasant collectors navigated their engagement with a cultural theory that simultaneously valorized and limited them. Despite their shortcomings, there are ways in which peasant collectors' misunderstanding of academic frameworks still placed them in a position to provide a better ethnographic reading of their villages than their more literate peers, in a sense retroactively vindicating their work. On rare occasions, peasant collectors asked more critical questions because they were outside the matrix of familiarity of form and unimpeded by theoretical bias. Many of their observations proved prescient of future understandings of the dynamics of culture and change and contextualized their data rather than idealizing it. While a drive for authenticity was the zeitgeist of the period (Bendix 1997), folklore theories often romanticized material away from authenticity and into nostalgic fantasy. In these cases, peasant collectors not only revealed some of the flaws in contemporaneous theories, such as those of Radić, but also proved themselves better ethnographers and anthropologists through their familiarity with their subjects and their ability to question normative prescriptions in the face of everyday practice (Burawoy 1998:5).

Tomec's correspondence in the archive includes a string of letters that quite deftly mobilize Radić's own theories against him in an effort to point out the flaws in his romantic depiction of peasant life. Tomec also had a very marked temper, and when he felt slighted by the editors of the *Zbornik*, he regularly responded back in Radić's language. It is unclear whether or not Tomec was aware of Radić's peasant roots,[39] but he was firm in his rebukes, categorizing Radić clearly as a Gentleman and holding him to his expectations of a Gentleman's conduct. On January 2, 1898, he wrote a message to an unknown person at the Academy, regarding Radić:

> Highly Learned Sir!
>
> See this postal card from Mr. Dr. Radić on which he replied to me when I sent him 3 example quires and asked is it good. He says it's good, just fix that and that.
>
> Therefore, later I sent 17 quires and corrected what there was to correct: Well, what did I get? "Reproach." And what more, on an open postal card; that is my thanks.

> And why? Because I told the truth. The question came up in the "Osnova," how does the government act toward the folk, I wrote the truth; how the government treat the folk, last year in that swine epidemic and now in these elections. With that I offended Dr. Radić, such that my two letters don't even deserve a response from him.
>
> The Osnova of the *Zbornik*, which Dr. Radić himself wrote, explains why there is a divide between the gentlemen and the folk. And look, he himself creates a divide from the folk.
>
> I am insulted by him since he doesn't respect the peasant class. . . . He is a gentleman, I am a villager, but I take pride in being an honourable villager, let him be an upstanding gentleman, then there won't be a divide between us.[40]

Tomec grasped the inadequacies of Radić's "Two Cultures" theory not only on grounds of principle, but also for the failings of its romantic message in depicting reality. Though the theory made good political propaganda and was easily digested by the Gentry in their excitement for oral traditions and rural customs, it also asked the peasant class to pride themselves on a social standing and lived experience that few would envy. On October 14, 1898, Tomec wrote a morose letter to Radić that focused on the unenviable lot of a farmer. He opens the letter with a poetic vignette about the hope and promise that accompanies spring planting and the bleak realities faced in the autumn when the crops fall short of expectations. His message, however, is a clear refutation of Radić's romanticism, once more packaged in the scholar's own paradigm:

> There, you see, dear sir, the hopes of a farmer. You will say, "I know; but why are you bringing this all up? First to you, then to them. I can't help everyone." No sir, nor do I seek it from you. I only mentioned it since those words of yours always ring in my head. Why would one be a gentleman, that there are too many gentlemen. But my dear sir, a gentleman is nevertheless a gentleman, he never lacks his monthly pay. There is no frost, drought, flood, mildew, or epidemics with him. That's why, you see my dear sir, every job undertaken at least comes to some pay. It's easier to get by than it is for a farmer. No one has so many enemies against his hopes like a farmer has.[41]

Though this translation grasps the meaning of the message, it lacks the subtlety of the original in that the word "sir" here is also *gospon* (gentleman). The constant repetition of "my dear sir/gentleman" seems expressly repeated as a reminder to Radić. Despite his roots and his respect for the peasantry, Radić was a Gentleman, and to be a Gentleman is finer than to be a member of the Folk. But Tomec's insights and critiques extended beyond Radić's theories and into the methodological practices and romantic filters that obfuscated the realities of village life and folklore collection.

Radić's theory posited the Folk as retainers of the pure spirit of the nation. It envisioned a world where a newfound respect for the Folk by the Gentry would find the former passing the national spirit on to the latter, who had long lost their cultural inheritance. This romantic image was not only simplistic but utopian. Radić was aware of the dangers of romanticizing folklore collection and included very empathetic instructions in his "Osnova," warning collectors not to travel to unfamiliar territories, not to attempt to lie to or fool their informants, and not to try to elicit material from them without first establishing rapport (Radić 1897:72–4). But the idea of a Folk who happily divulge all of their songs and tales to unknown Gentlemen was as romantic

a concept as any other Radić presented, even if he aimed to instill respect and fair treatment into his collectors. Despite Radić's empathetic guidance, the reality was that peasant informants were often difficult to collect from, suspicious of unfamiliar visitors to their communities, and had little time to leave their work to sit for hours or days singing songs, telling tales, or explaining folkways for the pen of urban collectors.[42] The letters of Gentlemen collectors are full of comments about their difficulties in collecting from the Folk, their secret tactics for eavesdropping to collect material (Lukić 1890–1955:9–11), and the unromantic, practical reality that the best way to get material from peasants was to pay them:

> I dare again to beg the celebrated and highly educated board of "Matica" if they might accordingly deign to allow me to ask for at least some amount of remuneration. I would rather not seek anything for my effort, but with full discretion I confess that I have spent a sum of my own funds. I have had to overcome that in-born reticence of our maidens and lads in the face of any kind of intelligent individual to get them to sing.[43]

> Last year in this season I began to collect songs, and I saw that it is a difficult enough job. The most difficult is to ask a man to tell a song; on that particular note the folk are deceiving and deceitful in a hundred ways from gentlemen. They shy away from any overcoat [i.e., person dressed in nice clothes]; the poor devils don't trust even in themselves. (Stipac 1879:332–3)

The practical realities of peasant life were the lived experience of peasant collectors. They recognized folk knowledge as a valuable resource, but had no romantic misconceptions about their peers, nor shame in admitting the best techniques for collecting material. On February 10, 1898, Tomec wrote to Antun Radić:

> From the gypsies I can't correct anything further [that is, make corrections to material he had already submitted; likely he was pursuing follow-up questions posed by Radić]. They wanted cigarettes from me, so I bought them some. Well! Now they would like to drink, so I bought them a liter of rakija [fruit brandy] and let them bring it into the tent. Now they start drinking and gypsy-singing once they had drunk all the rakija, then they gypsy-quarreled over something and began to strike and swear at each other. Well, I fled, so I don't get caught in it too. Then I remembered that one folk [saying] of ours.
>
> To be amongst gypsies celebrating.
> Or amongst horses trumpeting,
> Both are equal to endure.[44]

A crucial aim of the *Zbornik* was to present localized vernacular customs and practices in the traditional dialects of the regions in which they were collected. Contributors were informed in the "Osnova" and personally that "everything must be noted exactly as the folk say it" (Radić 1897:73) and that collected material must be presented in local dialect.[45] But the fallout of the Industrial Revolution—the impetus for the frantic

collection of rural peasant customs on the brink of extinction throughout Europe—had already changed the realities of rural life and, in some cases, the dialect-laden submissions to the journal were in some measure fabricated to obfuscate the realities of dynamic language use among rural villagers. In a letter to Radić dated October 16, 1897, Tomec's ignorance of the format of folklore collection once more laid bare the romantic trappings of the journal's form:

> Highly Learned Sir!
>
> I have received your esteemed "postal card" of 16/10 1897 and have well understood everything that you have written to me. You say that all would be well, except that I mix [aspects of dialect], and that it would be easiest for me to write as the folk speak. It is really in this that I am struggling most; I do not know which should be kept. Should I retain how the old people of 70–80 years speak or a younger generation, for instance of my age, 40–50 years old? The younger generation speaks completely differently than the old folks, since children diligently attend school, and improve there. Soldiers come every year from their service, and of those 30–40 [soldiers], not one will speak other than how they learn in soldiership. Also, here they read newspapers, nearly every house subscribes to some paper: "Friend of the Folk," "True Friend of the Folk," "Croatian Folk," society papers, "Gentleman's Newspaper," "The Rural Economist." And thus, the kajkavian tongue disappears, or rather the literary replaces it. Those same school children correct the old people's speech, and they mock them. I have a 70-year-old mother. Well, when it slips out of her, that "Whatd'ya say?" ["kaj veliš?," in the Kajkavian dialect] then my children laugh at her and goad her, "whatd'ya, whatd'ya!" And say, "Granny, one doesn't say 'whatd'ya say?' but rather, 'what did you say?'" ["šta kažeš?," in Shtokavian and, nearly, literary standard]. Then my old mother shrugs her shoulders and says, "Well, easy for you, since you know how to read." Hence, with this I err, wishing most to write my collecting for the "Zbornik" in literary [standard], but [thus written] every person in Virje would understand it; or shall I stick to the old people's language?[46]

Acquainted with the realities rather than the theory of the village, Tomec viewed the influence of public schools and the rates of readership of print media in the rural areas exactly as most peasants would have. Though he shows sympathy for the older generation and the changing dynamics of village life, he describes rising literacy rates in the village as a positive sign that the younger generations were "improving" themselves through education and opportunities that were not available to the older generations. Moreover, for Tomec, the most logical way to write his manuscript would have been to use the literary standard. Doing so would have allowed his material to be read by the widest possible audience and would have reflected positively upon him as a modern man of letters. All of these views stand in stark contrast to the Gentleman folklorist's perspective, whose theories come packaged with an intrinsic category distinction between the Gentry and the Folk. Radić saw these categories in exclusive terms and held that cultural transmission could only be positive in one direction. For the theories of folklorists, the village was a pristine ecosystem being polluted by the destructive forces of education and print media, all *a priori* negative offal of the Gentlemen class. A model that races against time to preserve pure, regional

idioms from cultural change must inherently enforce the differences that make its quarry unique, leading inevitably to linguistic erasure and essentialization (Irvine and Gal 2000:38–9). Learned collectors familiar with the model understood the logic of presenting the material in this fashion, even when it represented an imagined past world that no longer obtained and denigrated those positive influences from the upper classes on peasant life. Though Tomec was genuinely perplexed by the varied use of idiom in the manuscript and seems even to have overcompensated with his use of local dialect, his desires regarding wider readership suggest that, for peasant collectors who yearned for inclusion in the ranks of the intelligentsia, reverting to dying idioms not only felt counterproductive for their personal aims but also seemed disingenuous as ethnography. And, truly, a modern folklorist or anthropologist would agree with Tomec.

Conclusion

Folklorists have long commented on the great assistance that amateur and untrained investigators and collectors can offer (Seeger 1949), and anthropologists increasingly turn to their informants for aid in co-producing their analyses (Cruickshank 1990). Native ethnographers and informants, however, have a history of being deemed untrustworthy regarding their own perspectives on their culture—an issue that has been seriously taken up only in recent discourse (Narayan 1993; Passaro 1997). While peasant collectors might not have always produced publishable folklore manuscripts, by speaking from the past out of the archive, they can provide historical folklorists and anthropologists with important information about some of the processes and theories that influenced the scholarship of their time.

Scholars such as Nicholas Dirks (2002) have stressed the importance of conducting an ethnography of the archives one works with and, indeed, much is to be gleaned from the unpublished insights that build piecemeal contexts for the lives of collections. The correspondence of collectors in the Croatian Academy's ethnological archive is most often employed in a manuscript-by-manuscript basis, offering biographical information and small hints of the personalities of individual collectors as they reflect on their manuscripts. Yet, when these materials are read *en masse* for their own sake, scholars can glean historical facts and broad contexts about the collecting project itself and the ways that individual actors engaged with it.

The correspondence of Josip Tomec and his peers reveals the competing expertises that were at play in collecting for the *Zbornik*. It reveals the desirable social capital that was associated with collecting for folklore projects, and the obstacles that peasant collectors faced in seeing their work published despite their familiarity with and proximity to their own field sites. Peasant collectors' difficulty at grasping the academic language and format of scholarly work meant that their collections were often deemed less worthy for publication; however, these same difficulties provided them, at times, with a better position from which to chronicle the realities of village life and the collection process itself.

The correspondence of peasant collectors reveals some of the theoretical blind spots of academic collecting at the turn of the twentieth century. It reveals the minor ways

in which reality was simplified and obscured to retain the romantic vision that the *Zbornik* set out to present, but also the largest omission—the many ways in which a manuscript destined for the *Zbornik* could only be written by a Gentleman, and seldom by the Folk. For the contributors to these projects, the divide between the Folk and the Gentleman, aspersion and respect, derived not from occupation, clothing, or the other markers that Radić outlined in his "Osnova," but rather in the education that he was more prone to recognize in his political writings (Perić 2002:88). The nineteenth century in Europe is well-known for the marked rise of an intellectual class whose members used their historical, folkloric, and philological publications as cultural capital in efforts to better their social (and sometimes political) standing (Anderson 2006:67–78; Greenfeld 1992:323; Leerssen 2012:11). The letters of peasant collectors in the archive at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts stand as a testament to the strong appeal that such a transformation held, to the satisfaction produced by even minimal inclusion in intellectual circles, and to the suffering of those who tried and failed to find admittance.

Acknowledgments

This article is a revised version of a paper delivered at the Canadian Anthropological Society's annual meeting in Santiago de Cuba, May 16, 2018. It has been greatly improved by the input and constructive comments of Andrew Gilbert, Naomi McPherson, John Colarusso, David Mandić, Ellen Badone, Klementina Batina, and Luka Šešo, as well as the two anonymous reviewers and Marina Jurić. I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to the Department of Ethnology at HAZU for providing access to their archive. This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and McMaster University.

Notes

1. Josip Tomec, postal card dated January 26, 1899 [sign. K.SZ.773/24], correspondence in the archive of the Department of Ethnology, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb (hereafter cited as Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU).

2. Folklore research in Croatia and Serbia in the nineteenth century was notably innovative. The Serbian language reformer and folklorist, Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, had set the bar high for standards of collection earlier in the century (Wilson 1970:319–23; Foley 1995:70), at a time when most folklore in Europe was still being heavily altered and adapted for publication, and seldom derived from "the folk" (Atkinson 2012; Dundes 1989). His deployment in practice of methods only theorized in other countries created a legacy that kept folklore research in the region on the "cutting edge" for some time afterward.

3. This is taken directly from the German *Volkskunde*. Radić coined this particular translation in Croatian but it never caught on in scientific parlance (Rihtman-Auguštin 2004:viii).

4. Much of this is built on the theoretical assertions made earlier in the century by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić (Stefanović Karadžić 1849:13–4). These conceptions also mirror similar Mediterranean folklore studies of the time that would serve as the foundation for writing such as Gramsci's (cf. 1985:188–91).

5. Stretched thin between the various duties involved with the editorial position (reviewing and editing submissions, preparing materials for print, travel, photography, hefty correspondence, etc.), Antun Radić became adamant that he deserved a pay raise. He also began to demand that the Academy cease delaying payments to contributors to alleviate the burden of incessant pleas for funds. Radić had also made personal enemies of some of the Academy's members, most importantly the scholar Tomislav (Tomo) Maretić (1854–1938) who held a particularly influential position on the "Committee for the Collection of Monuments of Traditional Literature" under whose auspices the *Zbornik* belonged. Radić

had written a number of scathing reviews of Maretić's *Grammar and Stylistics of the Croatian or Serbian Literary Language* (1899), and the senior scholar made his disapproval known in the Academy's inner circles (see Radić 1937:7–53). Under internal and external pressure and feeling underappreciated in his position, Radić slowly ceased his editorial duties leading up to his contract renewal in the winter of 1901 and quit under a formal ultimatum the following February (see Perić 2002:112–3).

6. Tomec, letter dated August 12, 1897 [sign. K.SZ.773/2], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

7. Banović, Stipe, letter dated February 14, 1919, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.024], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Tomec, letter dated August 18, 1897, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.773/3], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

8. Josip Ciganović, letter dated May 20, 1885, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.MH.17/2], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Grlimir (Grgo) Petković, letter dated May 17, 1904 [sign. K.SZ.606/6], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

9. Krsto Marković, letter dated April 30, 1893 [sign. K.MH.56/1], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

10. Mirko Šestić, letter dated November 26, 1887, p. 2 [sign. K.MH.88/1], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Matija Tentor, postal card dated December 12, 1897 [sign. K.SZ.761], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Pavlina Bogdan-Bijelić, letters dated February 23, 1901, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.055/4]; March 16, 1901, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.055/6], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

11. Mile Obradović, letters dated January 19, 1887, p. 3 [sign. K.MH.66/7]; June 1, 1887, p. 2 [sign. K.MH.66/10], both at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Bogdan-Bijelić, letters dated February 23, 1901, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.055/4]; March 16, 1901, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.055/6], both at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

12. Banović, letter dated November 12, 1919, pp. 3–4 [sign. K.SZ.024], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

13. Dobroslav O. Nedić, letter dated March 8, 1898 [sign. K.MH.65], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

14. Obradović, letter dated January 19, 1887, p. 3 [sign. K.MH.66/7], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

15. Obradović, letter dated June 1, 1887, p. 2 [sign. K.MH.66/10], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

16. Nikola Novaković, letters dated April 25, 1903, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.554], April 16, 1905, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.554], both at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Tomec, letters dated October 5, 1897, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.773/5], March 5, 1898, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.773/16], both at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

17. Kata Jančir, letter dated March 28, 1932 [sign. K.SZ.269/9], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Olga Jerman, postal card stamped October 19, 1898 [sign. K.SZ.280/5], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

18. Petković, letter dated August 15, 1901 [sign. K.SZ.606/3], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU. See also Petković, letter dated May 17, 1904 [sign. K.SZ.606/6]. Note that all translations are my own. I have not tried to reflect dialect in translation since examples are not commensurate and such attempts often prove ungainly. I have, however, attempted to capture the balance of formal and informal language in the translations so that the tone is represented. This is not always straightforward, and I will leave it to those familiar with the documents to judge my success.

19. Tomec, letters dated October 14, 1898, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.SZ.773/21]; August 18, 1897, p.2 [sign. K.SZ.773/3]; January 10, 1897, p. 3 [sign, K.SZ.773/1], all at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

20. Vladimir Ardalić, letter dated April 3, 1903, p. 3 [sign. K.SZ.011], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Rade Bosnić, letter dated June 23, 1911 [sign. K.SZ.066/10], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Tomec, letter dated January 2, 1898, p. 3 [sign. K.SZ.773/7], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

21. Petković, letter dated May 17, 1904 [sign. K.SZ.606/6], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

22. Ardalić, letters dated June 17, 1910, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.011]; July 9, 1910, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.SZ.011], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Bogdan-Bijelić, letter dated March 16, 1901 [sign. K.SZ.055/6], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Klotilda K. Kučera, letters dated April 9, 1885 [sign. K.MH.45/1]; April 27, 1885 [sign. K.MH.45/2], both at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

23. Ardalić, letters dated May 25, 1900, p. 7 [sign. K.SZ.011]; April 3, 1903, p. 4 [sign. K.SZ.011]; June 17, 1910, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.011], all at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Bosnić, letter dated June 23, 1911, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.066/10], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

24. Ardalić, letter dated July 9, 1910, pp. 2–3 [sign. K.SZ.011], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

25. Tomec, letter dated March 5, 1898, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.773/16], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU. Radić followed up on Tomec's suggestion and had Jalžabetić do some collecting for Đurđevac. The novice collector, however, fairly quickly lost interest in the project. His work is archived in Tomo Jalžabetić, Gjurgjevac: Narodni život i običaji [Đurđevac: Folk Life and Customs] 1898–1899 [sign. SZ 54], manuscript, Department of Ethnology, HAZU, and some biographical information as well as a photo can be found at Miholek (2018).

26. Petković, letters dated August 23, 1900 [sign. K.SZ.606/2]; August 15, 1901 [sign. K.SZ.606/3]; May 17, 1904 [sign. K.SZ.606/6], all at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU; Obradović, letter dated 1887, p. 1 [sign. K.MH.66/4]; n.d. (undated letter), p. 1 [sign. MH 13], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

27. Tomec, letters dated October 16, 1897 [sign. K.SZ.773/6]; February 10, 1898, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.773/11]; August 18, 1897, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.773/3]; October 16, 1897, pp. 3–4 [sign. K.SZ.773/6]; February 10, 1898, p. 1 [sign. K.SZ.773/11]; October 16, 1897, p. 3 [sign. K.SZ.773/6]; May 2, 1898, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.SZ.773/18]; postal cards dated October 11, 1903 [sign. K.SZ.773/29]; October 25, 1903 [sign. K.SZ.773/30], all at Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

28. Tomec, postal card dated September 8, 1898 [sign K.SZ.773/20], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

29. Tomec, letter dated October 14, 1898, p. 4 [sign. K.SZ.773/21], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

30. Tomec, letter dated January 9, 1899, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.SZ.773/23], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

31. Tomec, postal card dated January 26, 1899 [sign. K.SZ.773/24], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

32. Tomec, letter dated April 24, 1899, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.773/25], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

33. Tomec, Settlement [Nagodba] dated day before the Assumption (August 14), 1899 [sign. K.SZ.773/26], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

34. Tomec, postal cards dated January 30, 1900 [sign. K.SZ.773/27]; October 25, 1903 [sign. K.SZ.773/30], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

35. To my knowledge, the only document that Tomec ever had published was a short article on the local Roma population in Virje's newspaper *Podravac* (Tomec 1899).

36. Tomec, postal card dated January 9, 1904 [sign. K.SZ.773/31], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

37. Tomec, letter dated December 31, 1904 [sign. K.SZ.773/34]], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

38. Hajdarpasic uses this to describe the set of practices established in the region by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić and later employed by many other figures. The first chapter of his book does a fine job of outlining the establishment and dissemination of this academic and political role and includes some discussion of Radić.

39. Tomec, postal card dated January 30, 1900 [sign. K.SZ.773/27], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

40. Tomec, letter dated January 2, 1898, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.773/7], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

41. Tomec, letter dated October 14, 1898, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.773/21], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

42. Pero Marković, letter dated November 16, 1886, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.MH.57/1], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

43. Josip Ciganović, letter dated May 20, 1885, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.MH.17/2], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

44. Tomec, letter dated February 10, 1898, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.SZ.773/11], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

45. Nikola Novaković, letter dated May 12, 1907, p. 2 [sign. K.SZ.554], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

46. Tomec, letter dated October 16, 1897, pp. 1–2 [sign. K.SZ.773/6], Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

References Cited

Anderson, Benedict. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (revised edition). London: Verso.

Andrić, Nikola, ed. 1909. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*, Knj. 5, od. 2, *Ženske pjesme*. Sv. 1 (*Romance i balade*) [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 5, sec. 2, Women's Songs. Vol. 1 (Romances and Ballads)]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

———. 1914. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*, Knj. 6, od. 2, *Ženske pjesme*. Sv. 2 (*Pričalice i lakrdije*) [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 6, sec. 2, Women's Songs. Vol. 2 (Story-Songs and Farces)]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

———. 1929. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 7, od. 2, *Ženske pjesme*, Sv. 3 (*Ljubavne pjesme*) [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 7, sec. 2, Women's Songs. Vol. 3 (Love Songs)]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

———. 1939. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 8, od. 1, *Junačke pjesme*, Sv. 5 (*Uskočke i hajdučke pjesme*) [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 8, sec. 1, Heroic Songs. Vol. 5 (*Uskok* and *Hajduk* Songs)]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

———. 1940. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 9, od. 1, *Junačke pjesme*, Sv. 6 (*Historijske, krajiške i uskočke pjesme*) [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 9, sec. 1, Heroic Songs. Vol. 6 (Historical, Borderland and *Uskok* Songs)]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

———. 1942. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 10, od. 2, *Ženske pjesme, sv. 4 (Haremske pričalice i Bunjevačke groktalice)* [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 10, sec. 2, Women's Songs. Vol. 4 (Harem Story-Songs and Bunjevac *Groktalica*s)]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. Topographies of the Self: Praise and Emotion in Hindu India. In *Language and the Politics of Emotion*, ed. Catherine A. Lutz and Lila Abu-Lughod, pp. 92–112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Atkinson, David. 2012. The Ballad Revival and National Literature: Textual Authority and the Invention of Tradition. In *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe during the Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Timothy Baycroft and David Hopkin, pp. 275–300. Leiden: Brill.

Batina, Klementina, Jelena Marković, Ivana Polonijo, Jakša Primorac, and Luka Šešo. 2010. Dokumentacijski pregled arhivskog gradiva Odsjeka za etnologiju Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti [Documentary Review of the Archival Materials in the Department of Ethnology at the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje* [Review on Folk Life and Customs] 55:45–466.

Belaj, Vitomir. 1998. Povijest etnološke misli u Hrvata [The History of Ethnological Thought amongst the Croats]. In *Etnografija: Svagdan i blagdan hrvatskoga puka* [Ethnography: The Everyday and Holiday of the Croatian Folk], ed. Vitomir Belaj, Jasna Čapo-Žmegač, Jadranka Grbić, Aleksandra Muraj, and Zorica Vitez, pp. 337–57. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Bendix, Regina. 1997. *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bosanac, Stjepan, ed. 1897. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 2, od. 1, *Junačke pjesme*, Knj. 2. [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 2, sec. 1, Heroic Songs. Vol. 2]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1974. The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities. In *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education*, ed. John Eggleston, pp. 32–46. London: Methuen.

Broz, Ivan, and Stjepan Bosanac, eds. 1896. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 1, od. 1, *Junačke pjesme*. Knj. 1 [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 1, sec. 1, Heroic Songs. Vol. 1]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Burawoy, Michael. 1998. The Extended Case Method. *Sociological Theory* 16(1):4–33.

Carr, E. Summerson. 2010. Enactments of Expertise. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39:17–32.

Cruikshank, Julie. 1990. *Life Lived Like a Story: Life Stories of Three Yukon Elders*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Čapo-Žmegac, Jasna. 1997. Antun Radić i suvremena etnološka istraživanja [Antun Radić and Contemporary Ethnological Research]. *Narodna Umjetnost: Croatian Journal of Ethnology and Folklore Research* 34(2):9–33.

Dirks, Nicholas. 2002. Annals of the Archive: Ethnographic Notes on the Sources of History. In *From the Margins: Historical Anthropology and Its Futures*, ed. Brian Keith Axel, pp. 47–65. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Dundes, Alan. 1989. The Fabrication of Fakelore. In *Folklore Matters*, pp. 40–56. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

Foley, John Miles. 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Fox, Adam. 2010. Printed Questionnaires, Research Networks, and the Discovery of the British Isles, 1650–1800. *Historical Journal* 53(3):593–621.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1985. *Selections from Cultural Writings*, ed. David Forgacs and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith, trans. William Boelhower. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenfeld, Leah. 1992. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hajdarpasic, Edin. 2015. *Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840–1914*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Halpern, Joel, and E. A. Hammel. 1969. Observations on the Intellectual History of Ethnology and Other Social Sciences in Yugoslavia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 11(1):17–26.

Irvine, Judith T., and Susan Gal. 2000. Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*, ed. Paul V. Kroskrity, pp. 35–84. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Ivanišević, Frano. 1903. Poļica: Narodni život i običaji [Poljica: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 8(2):183–336.

———. 1904. Poļica: Narodni život i običaji [Poljica: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 9:23–144.

———. 1905. Poļica: Narodni život i običaji [Poljica: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 10(2):181–307.

Knight, Nathaniel. 1998. Science, Empire, and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1855. In *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel, pp. 108–41. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lang, Milan. 1911. Samobor: Narodni život i običaji [Samobor: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 16(1):1–128.

———. 1912. Samobor: Narodni život i običaji [Samobor: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 17(1):1–150.

———. 1913. Samobor: Narodni život i običaji [Samobor: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 18(1):235–372.

———. 1914. Samobor: Narodni život i običaji [Samobor: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 19(1):39–152.

Leerssen, Joep. 2012. Oral Epic: The Nation Finds a Voice. In *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe during the Long Nineteenth Century*, ed. Timothy Baycroft and David Hopkin, pp. 11–26. Leiden: Brill.

Lord, Albert Bates. 2000. *The Singer of Tales* (2nd edition), ed. Stephen Mitchell and Gregory Nagy. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lovretić, Josip. 1897. Otok: Narodni život i običaji [Otok: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 2:91–459.

———. 1898. Otok: Narodni život i običaji [Otok: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 3:26–45.

———. 1899. Otok: Narodni život i običaji [Otok: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 4:45–112.

———. 1902a. J. Lovretić: Pozlatinski vezovi u mojim sobama [J. Lovretić: *Pozlatinski* Embroidery in My Rooms]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 7(2):354–68.

———. 1902b. Otok: Narodni život i običaji [Otok: Folk Life and Customs]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 7(1):57–206.

———. 1916. Biļe. (Otok u Slavoniji) [Plants (Otok in Slavonia)]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 21(1):152–7.

Lukić, Luka. 1890–1955. Narodne popijevke iz okolice Slavonskog Broda, I. sv. (od br. 1 do br. 186) (s notnim zapisima) [Lyric Folk Songs from Slavonski Brod Region. Vol. I (from no. 1 to no. 186) (with musical notation)] [sign. NZ 5a]. Manuscript in the archive of the Department of Ethnology, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb.

Marjanović, Luka, ed. 1898. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 3, od. 1, *Junačke pjesme (Muhamedovske)*. Knj. 3 [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 3, sec. 1, Heroic Songs (Mohammedan). Vol. 3]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

———. 1899. *Hrvatske narodne pjesme*. Knj. 4, od. 1, *Junačke pjesme (Muhamedovske)*. Knj. 4 [Croatian Folk Songs, Bk. 4, sec. 1, Heroic Songs (Mohammedan). Vol. 4]. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.

Miholek, Vladimir. 2016. Janko (Ivanko) Vlašićek—svećenik, pisac i leksikograf (1879–1935) [Janko (Ivanko) Vlašićek—priest, writer and lexicographer]. *Podravske širine* [Expanses of the Podravina]. Electronic document, https://podravske-sirine.com.hr/arhiva/3133 (accessed June 5, 2018).

———. 2018. Etnografski rad Tome Jalžabetića iz 1898. Godine [The Ethnographic Work of Tomo Jalžabetić from 1898]. *Podravske širine* [Expanses of the Podravina]. Electronic document, https://podravske-sirine.com.hr/arhiva/8216 (accessed December 30, 2018).

Narayan, Kirin. 1993. How Native Is the Native Anthropologist? *American Anthropologist* 95(3):671–86.

Naumović, Slobodan. 1998. Romanticists or Double Insiders? An Essay on the Origins of Ideologised Discourses in Balkan Ethnology. *Ethnologia Balkanica* 2:101–20.

Niederer, Arnold, and John Bucher. 1968. Folklore Studies in Switzerland. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 2(2–3):236–40.

Passaro, Joanne. 1997. "You Can't Take the Subway into the Field!": "Village" Epistemologies in the Global Village. In *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*, ed. Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson, pp. 147–62. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Perić, Ivo. 2002. *Antun Radić: 1868–1919: Etnograf, Književnik, Političar* [Antun Radić (1868–1919): Ethnographer, Man of Letters, Politician]. Zagreb: Dom i svijet.

———. 2003. *Stjepan Radić: 1871–1928*. Zagreb: Dom i svijet.

Primorac, Jakša. 2010. Arhivska građa Odsjeka za Etnologiju HAZU [Archival Material of the Department of Ethnology at HAZU]. In *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje* [Review on Folk Life and Customs] 55, ed. Tanja Perić-Polonijo, pp. 9–37. Zagreb: Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti.

Radić, Antun. 1897. Osnova za sabirańe i proučavańe građe o narodnom životu [Basics for the Collection and Study of Material on Folk Life]. *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje južnih Slavena* [Review on Folk Life and Customs of the South Slavs] 2:1–88.

———. 1900. *Dom* [Home] 1(23), November 23.

———. 1937. *Sabrana djela* [Collected Works] 15. Zagreb: Seljačka sloga.

Rihtman-Auguštin, Dunja. 2004. *Ethnology, Myth and Politics: Anthropologizing Croatian Ethnology*, ed. Jasna Čapo-Žmegac. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Seeger, Charles. 1949. Professionalism and Amateurism in the Study of Folk Music. *Journal of American Folklore* 62(244):107–13.

Senn, Harry. 1981. Folklore Beginnings in France, the Académie Celtique: 1804–1813. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 18(1):23–33.

Stefanović Karadžić, Vuk. 1849. *Kovčežić za istoriju, jezik i običaje Srba sva tri zakona* [Little Treasure Chest for the History, Language, and Customs of the Serbs of All Three Faiths]. Vienna: Štamparija jermenskoga monastira.

Stipac, Ivan. 1879. Letter dated "before Corpus Christi, 1879." In Zbornik Ivana Stipca iz Smiljana [The Collection of Ivan Stipac from Smiljan] [sign. MH 186. III]. Manuscript in the archive of the Department of Ethnology, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Zagreb.

Tomec, Josip. 1898–1903. Virje [sign. SZ 18]. Manuscript in the archive of the Dept. of Ethnology, HAZU.

———. 1899. U položajstvu pod ciganskim šatorom [Positioned under a Gypsy Tent]. *Podravac* 2(15–1):2.

Wiegelmann, Günter, and Joan L. Cotter. 1968. The Atlas *des deutschen Volkskunde* and the Geographical Research Method. *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 5(2–3):187–97.

Wilson, Duncan. 1970. *The Life and Times of Vuk Stefanović Karadzić, 1787–1864: Literacy, Literature, and National Independence in Serbia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.