
ANTHROPOLOGY OF EUROPE AND COMMUNITY RE-STUDIES: PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CONCERTED RESEARCH INITIATIVE

Peter Skalník, University of Pardubice

Community studies and re-studies have been a hallmark of sociocultural anthropology for several decades of the 20th century. They were, however, criticized for their lack of representativeness and low degree of comparability (Bell and Newby 1971; Maho 1974; Mihailescu 1977; Skalník 1982). This paper intends to rehabilitate the community studies with a special emphasis on re-studies because they appear to me as the best anthropology can offer to the understanding of Europe, both in the historical perspective and in the present time when the European Union expands towards the East and South-East of the continent. After a review of re-studies thus far undertaken in Europe and elsewhere, I shall characterize the intricacies of a particular re-study which a team of colleagues and students under my leadership undertook recently in eastern Bohemia in the Czech Republic (2002-2004). Then in the third part of the paper I argue for a sustained new wave of comparative re-studies which would reveal the trends of development in the European and non-European smaller settlements or urban areas at the beginning of the third millennium. To an extent this contribution reflects the general concern of anthropology with community as a theoretical problem, because we continue weighing the importance of approaches and wondering about the explanatory power of reflection in comparison with scientific analysis (cf. Bradfield 1973; Skalník 1981).

I. First, let us look at anthropology as a tool for a better understanding of the European continent (and the world at large). As anthropologists, we know that philosophers, historians, and sociologists have analyzed Europe from their respective methodological standpoints. Thus Europe seems to exist and work as an idea, as a function of various historical moments, or as a network of social characteristics (cf. articles from the journal *Ethnologia Europaea* collected in Niedermüller and Stocklund

2000). What is the point in multiplying the literature on Europe, this time by anthropologists? The answer is simple: anthropologists study themes and aspects that the related disciplines do not or cannot study. The anthropological method *par excellence*, i.e. long-term fieldwork, is usually not used by sociologists or historians unless they in fact turn into anthropologists. The legitimacy and authority of the contribution of the fieldwork approach is obvious.

Anthropologists gain reliable but also very rich data where the related disciplines come out only with too sober statistics or sources.

Rural sociology, a discipline that today seems to be dying out together with the peasant phenomenon (Mendras 1967), was for a while more active than anthropology. Under the influence of the Chicago School, sociologists worked in various northern American and European settings. Actually, the study of the peasantry in developing areas such as Latin America was at one time undertaken by both sociologists and anthropologists. Robert Redfield, who pioneered the folk-life studies along the rural-urban continuum, was appropriated by both sociologists and anthropologists. It was also Redfield who came first with a re-study of one of the villages he studied in Mexico in the 1930s (Redfield and Villa Rojas 1934, Redfield 1950)¹. A new aspect emerged when his first Mexican community study, of the Maya village of Tepoztlán (Redfield 1930), was critically re-studied by a younger colleague (Lewis 1951). It appeared that Redfield's

¹ Redfield, however, was not the very first to undertake a re-study of an American community. The Lynds who published their path-finding study of an American town (Lynd and Lynd 1929) returned soon to 'Middletown' and did their own re-study there (Lynd and Lynd 1937). Rightly, the authors of a book evaluating community studies wrote that "*Middletown* is for the sociologist of the community what Durkheim's *Suicide* is for sociology as a whole" (Bell and Newby 1971: 82).

image of Tepoztlán as an isolated, fairly homogeneous, and well-functioning village community contrasted with Lewis's portrait of a village full of individualism and tension combined with envy, fear, and lack of trust. Although Lewis quoted extensively from Redfield, he found Redfield's analysis 'schematic' and 'unreal.' The explanation of such incongruence is to be related to the personal factor so typical for social science research methodology. But it is also to be explained by Lewis's broader scope of research which included interpersonal relations, power structure, and land tenure questions. According to Wierzbicki, Redfield's folk-urban continuum (Redfield 1955) must have been responsible for his obsessive search for tradition and the failure to account for contrasts and conflicts in Tepoztlán (Wierzbicki 1982: 197; cf. Lewis 1953). Of course, the re-studies undertaken by a colleague from a generation or two later cannot be built along similar lines. The interests and emphases differ, and the task of contrasting the two social situations seems to be easier if one is primarily interested in methodology. Redfield's own re-study of Chan Kom had to struggle with the discrepancy of methodology. While the first monograph, written in the early 1930s, uses traditional ethnographic method including description of material and spiritual culture, the re-study, undertaken only 17 years later, concentrates on the mechanisms of change, explanation of their absorption by the villagers, and their view of the changes. Redfield used the same informants whom he knew in the 1930s, but he elaborates more on method and thereby in effect "corrects" inadequacies of the original study.

Malinowski's revolutionizing data collected in the Trobriand Islands in western Melanesia during World War I (Malinowski 1922) were submitted to re-studies many years after his death. One of the re-studies was carried out by Annette Weiner who found out that, not surprisingly, Malinowski suffered from a male-centered bias. She discovered that women and their activities were equally if not more important for the cohesion of the

Kiriwina society than the enterprising seafaring men described by Malinowski in his first monograph (Weiner 1976).

While for Redfield the main source of change in Mexico was coming from the cities, in the case of the historically first community re-study in the world, that of the southern Polish village of Maszkienice (then part of Austria), carried out by the ethnographer Franciszek Bujak (Bujak 1901, 1915), it was migration to America that brought about change. Of course, this influence is also of the urban kind because the level of development in the United States was accompanied by, if not due to, the higher level of urbanization there. Wierzbicki, who discussed both Polish and Mexican re-studies, shows that there is considerable similarity between the two rural and peasant situations (Wierzbicki 1982: 196). However, it seems that Mexican villagers, especially their pro-development leaders, felt the potential for the destruction of their 'traditional' way of life more than the Maszkienice peasants. Redfield's bias in favor of the 'little tradition' may have been responsible as well for the fear of spoiling the tradition. Therefore, he welcomed the incorporation of urban lifestyles into the value system and ethos inherited from the past. In Bujak's case, there emerged a cultural gap that could not be bridged: the have-been Poles from Maszkienice contrasted what they called 'American work' with 'Polish work' where the former was 'good for bulls' while the latter for peasant humans.

Wierzbicki cites three other monographic re-studies of Polish villages which all raised serious methodological problems. Let us look at two of them. The village of Dobrzeń Wielki, studied comprehensively by Nowakowski (1960) was soon studied again by Olszewska (1969). It could hardly be called a proper re-study because the time gap was too short and the scope too different. The re-study was dealing with only some aspects of the community and if the data from the original monograph were referred to it was done only to support the views of the re-studier. Wierzbicki calls this case "two complementary monographs" without seeing

in them really a re-study twin. Wierzbicki himself undertook a re-study of Żmija fifty years after Bujak worked there in the beginning of the 20th century (Bujak 1903; Wierzbicki 1963). Bujak was accused of a positivist approach because he wrote an inventory of village life. Therefore Wierzbicki concentrated on only two main problems of social change that occurred during the period just preceding his re-study: the growth of egalitarianism in interpersonal relations and the growth of national consciousness among the villagers. However, while these two processes guided the inquiry, Wierzbicki did not allow his monograph to become unrelated to Bujak's work. At the same time Wierzbicki used the up-to-date methodology without slavishly following the then-outdated methods of Bujak. The Żmija re-study remains till this very day one of the best examples of the method.

Another famous student of communities, this time in Ireland, was Conrad Arensberg, who considered himself a social anthropologist when executing his pioneering study of Irish countrymen in County Clare (Arensberg 1937). However he was labeled a sociologist for his comparative work on the research of communities in the same country and county which he executed with Solon Kimball at practically the same time (Arensberg and Kimball 1968, 2002). Arensberg was inspired by his teacher at Harvard, the social anthropologist W. Lloyd Warner whose first book was about the Australian Aborigines (Warner 1929) and later became famous for his study of what became dubbed as the Yankee City (Warner 1963). In effect it was a long-term and collective research project concerning Newburyport in New England, U.S.A. (Warner et al. 1941-1959) which still remains unsurpassed among community studies for its breadth and scope. Warner was eager to test his methods developed in Australia on European data. He chose Ireland, and after surveying all twenty-six Irish counties settled for County Clare on the central-western edge of the island. Warner and Arensberg started their research in 1932, but Warner, who had duties back home, was

soon replaced by Solon Kimball, who also worked with Warner in the Yankee City project. The two, Arensberg and Kimball, worked for two years in rural Clare and then moved to the capital of the county, Ennis. The Ennis study was never completed because of the outbreak of war, but the Ennis data were added to the rural research volume in the second edition of *Family and Community in Ireland* (Arensberg and Kimball 1968). This famous volume inspired the French anthropologist Robert Cresswell, who produced a large volume some thirty years after Arensberg and Kimball (Cresswell 1969). Still later, Fox did an original study of a small island off Donegal (Fox 1978).

Another study in a Celtic environment was carried out by Edgar Morin, in the Breton village of Plozévet which he dubbed Plodémet (Morin 1967). There he sparked off the establishment of a youth club and speculated that generation gap replaced class struggle. However, the myth of modernity versus tradition exploded once Morin left the village. His book was not well received; he and his creation of youth culture were not remembered (Maho 1982: 224). The same happened to Maho who also knew Plozévet from earlier times. When he arrived there after some years he was not recognized by the former informant in whose house he used to stay. Initially Maho also got friendly with one particular neighbor not realizing that another neighbor was a sworn enemy of the former. The entry into the village by way of particular informants may mar one's fieldwork irreparably. The researcher also may fail to recognize the social divisions if he or she happens to be friendly with the most willing villager. That villager may be the least suitable if he is rejected by all (i.e. a local vagrant or a local strongman whom many fear and hate).

The European Mediterranean has been the area most frequented by American, British, and Dutch anthropologists and sociologists, who worked in various communities known for their attractive landscape and climate. Some of them became anthropological classics. The first and perhaps most classical

has been Banfield's *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society* (1956). The south Italian village of Montegrano was presented as a case of 'amoral familism,' responsible for conservatism and poverty. There are no voluntary associations to speak of in the village, no *esprit de corps*. Nothing is done to resolve considerable community problems there. Banfield found the folk explanations: desperate poverty leading to non-action, ignorance, no collaboration between gentry and the peasants, disunity among the 'oppressed,' distrust of the state, fatalism. But in fact, according to Banfield, it is the concentration on family that should improve its position at the cost of the other families. Communal interests are thus ignored. The rather static and hopeless image of Montegrano has attracted criticism by other non-Italian Mediterraneanists, John Davis and Johan Galtung. They suggested that Banfield suffered from 'communocentrism,' believing that the path towards modernity leads via village associations. Instead, argues Galtung, it is regional cooperation that is needed. According to him, Montegrano is opposed to change because of 'amoral village-ism.' Actually, continued Galtung, the above-mentioned folk explanations were dismissed by Banfield too facily because they may be valid, for example the class antagonisms in the village. According to Davis, Banfield failed to study the long history of class relations in southern Italy (Davis 1970; Galtung 1971; cf. Silverman 1968). This was done properly by Lopreato in his research on the effects on emigration on the south Italian village of Franza around 1960 (Lopreato 1967). There were other well-known studies such as *People of the Sierra* (Pitt-Rivers 1954) or *Village in the Vaucluse* (Wylie 1957). The latter suffered from naivety and little insight of the researcher who came from a quite different cultural background. As Maho describes it, Wylie came to the locality Péage du Roussillon with the "American idea of the 'Community'" which "would welcome him with open arms" and provide him voluntarily with data about its social life. Then he returned 20 years later and was barely recognized and often rejected. When he

insisted, he was told to his astonishment that he was duped and lot of information about conflicts and divisions within community remained hidden from him. Therefore he decided not to do his intended re-study in the village (Maho 1982: 224).

There was also another school of rural sociology and ethnography in Europe, that of Romania. The school of Dimitrie Gusti and Henri Stahl managed to do re-studies of two villages, Rouncou and Drăguș (the latter even three times, cf. Stahl 1972). Both villages, studied before the war and after it when socialist influence prevailed, showed "the decisive influence of the global society" but also that "with each restudy one is faced with a quite different social 'problematique'" (Stahl 1982: 240). Stahl stresses that repeating the same analysis schema would be a mistake; rather it is important to understand "how the social changes that occurred are in fact a social solution of a problem with its roots going well beyond the village" (Stahl 1982: 240). Unfortunately, none of the studies undertaken by American anthropologists in Romania were re-studies (the team of John Cole and the research in Transylvania by Verdery). To an extent Salzmann's study of Czech-speaking villages in Romanian Banat (Salzmann 1983) could be viewed as a re-study of the research undertaken by a team of Czech ethnographers in the 1960s (Scheufler and Skalníková 1962; Skalníková and Scheufler 1963; Jech et al. 1992).

In East-Central Europe, with the major exception of Poland mentioned above, re-studies of communities have thus far been fairly rare. What is instead taking place are either repeated visits to the studied communities—thus adding new knowledge to the basic data from the major initial research (Salzmann and Scheufler 1974, 1986; Salzmann 1995; Skalník 1979, 1993)—or comparative research of communities in one or more regions (Kandert 1969, 2004; Skalník 1982, 1986). Skalník compared three pairs of communities, of which he personally studied four (two in Slovakia and two in the Caucasus) and used data on the remaining two, Tret and St-Felix in northern Italy,

contained in Cole and Wolf (1972). Salzmann did his research in the southern Bohemian community of Komárov intermittently during his teaching-free time, revised the data for the second edition, and finally went to the village after the "Velvet Revolution." Skalník worked in 1970-76 in the northern Slovak community of Šuňava comparing two neighboring villages which eventually merged and he came back repeatedly after 1990 (Skalník 2001). Kandert did his initial research of a central Slovak community of Sihla in the late 1960s and then returned in 1994 while also embarking upon comparative research in another two communities not far away. In Hungary, the initial research in Varsány by Bodrogi and his team, led in the field by Sárkány (Bodrogi 1978; Hollos and Maday 1983), paralleled by the study of Hann in Tázlár (Hann 1980) which is currently being repeated in both localities by the same researchers, this time in coordination (Sárkány 2005; Hann and Sárkány 2004).

II. When the re-study of Dolní Roveň in eastern Bohemia (120 kilometers east of Prague) began in 2002 I and my team had no intention of copying the 'analysis schema' of the pre-war monograph by the rural sociologist Karel Galla (Galla 1939). It was, however, evident that my choice to work in Dolní Roveň was not haphazard. By the year 2000 there were in the Czech Republic few villages studied in the past by either rural sociologists or anthropologists/nationographers (*národopisci*) as communities. Out of those very few, Dolní Roveň was closest to Pardubice, my new university. Besides, Galla's study was evidently the best as Dolní Roveň was studied by him in much detail, the size of the book exceeding 400 pages. The other community studies are of much smaller size and detail (Chotek 1912; Galla 1936 and 1937; Salzmann 1974, 1995).

When making the proposal to carry out this re-study, I wanted first of all to capture the village commune as it was or at least as it presented itself at the beginning of the 21st century to researchers who had been trained in completely different theoretical thinking (i.e.

in social anthropology) than in that prevailing in the 1930s, i.e. some 70 years earlier (rural sociology). The changes and the contrast with the fairly distant past would come out by themselves to those who would bother to read both Galla and books and articles by the members of our team. But of course some themes do occur in both the original research and in the re-study. By comparing data relating to these common themes one can grasp more explicitly the changes even if the very processes whereby they happened would not be easily visible or known. For example, Galla's monograph quite justifiably spent quite a few pages on the description of agriculture (90 pages out of 360 of the total text, i.e. one fourth). Dolní Roveň in the time of his research was a "predominantly agricultural village" in which 295 out of 577 economically active persons were engaged in agriculture (Galla 1939: 58).

Additional reasons for studying precisely Dolní Roveň were the facts that the village was studied by Galla because it was a stronghold of agrarianism of the Udržal family² and the village was considered successful evidence for the modernized traditional ideology that the basis of the nation is land and agriculture which feeds the whole population of the country. Dolní Roveň (the original village, much smaller than today's commune, which besides Dolní Roveň proper comprises Horní Roveň, Komárov and Litětín), was considered an exemplary village in the pre-WWII period, boasting all up to date public amenities (paved road,

² The Udržal family, landowners in Dolní Roveň for five hundred years, have given the community several generations of leaders, the most famous but also last being František Udržal 1866-1938 and Václav Udržal (1870-1938). The former was elected member of the Vienna Reichstag between 1897 and 1918, then member of the Czechoslovak parliament until his death. He was one of the leaders of the Agrarian party (founded 1904), in 1922 renamed as Republican party of the agricultural and smallholder people. This party was the strongest Czech-speaking party in pre-war Czechoslovakia. Udržal was Czechoslovak minister of defense during the 1920s and finally served as Prime Minister (1929-1932). His brother Václav was the founder of Czech cooperative movement.

electricity, telephone, pipe-borne water, modern schools, commune office, and Sokol gymnastics building).

Unlike Galla, for me the main motivation for the re-study at the turn of the 21st century has been the opposite: I wanted to study a commune in which the potential for agriculture ceases to be important and that has hardly kept any of the attributes of excellence that it enjoyed before WWII. In other words, the purpose of the present research is to reveal what has stepped into the place of agriculture as the leading *raison d'être* of rural existence and what keeps people living in the village today when there is nobody powerful keeping a protective eye over it. One could suppose that it would be fairly logical to live in a village if one has found employment there. But this is the case of a mere 30 percent of the economically active. A full two thirds of economically active Roveň residents have to travel outside of the village in order to earn their living. But they continue living in the village. If one continues searching for rational reasons for continued living in the village, one could put forward the ownership of a house and adjacent land inherited from ancestors. But that does not explain why people do not sell these and move to Pardubice, Holic, or more remote urban centers.

Actually there are two reasons behind the relative stability of residence, or even a very slow increase in Roveň population. One is the rural character of living combined with the availability of all modern amenities. The other is the relatively lower cost of living in the village even if one does not own a house and rents instead. That means that what is most important for people is the character of living in the countryside, which attracts them to residence in the village. The quantitative research showed that Roveň residents trust that their village has a reasonably good prospect for the future. This contrasts with the much less optimistic, almost gloomy, prospect the same people ascribe to the Czech Republic as a whole. However when people were asked what they do expect from membership in the European Union, their opinion was optimistic for the Czech Republic but less enthusiastic as

far as Roveň is concerned. Galla did not ask these questions in the 1930s. The age-old structure of land tenure and the decisively agricultural character of the community were not questioned at that time. Nobody could envisage expropriations, the egalitarian character of the post-war economic development, nor could Galla or his respondents predict the war and the post-war communist industrialization and the marginalization of Roveň in both the regional and national frameworks. If the Roveň inhabitants today believe in a political center-left orientation (the social democratic and socialist program is supported by almost 44 percent of them) it contrasts with Galla's finding a predominantly agrarian orientation of the villagers (cf. Šubrt 2004). The most influential political force in the village today is the People's Party also known as the Christian Democratic Union, which at the moment holds 8 out of 15 seats in the communal representation. This contrasts with the pre-war dominance of the Republican or Agrarian Party. As to national and regional politics, Roveň dwellers are much less politically motivated, which can be demonstrated by low election participation and if they go to the polls they appear undecided as to which party to support (cf. Řečková 2005).

Thus we have to face the fact of an enormous shift from an agricultural, highly productive but stratified pre-war community to a basically egalitarian post-war community with predominantly outside industrial employment. Another aspect that is quite different today from the pre-war era, when Galla carried out his rural sociological study, is the non-agricultural enterprise in the village. Whereas before the war, by far most employment within the community was assured by agriculture and related activities, it is petty production, repair, and wholesale and retail commerce that dominate today. Mutual help has diminished and is ever more of a monetary type (e.g. neighbors and friends helping out for remuneration during the planting of seedlings for a commercial vegetable farmer).

WWII and the forty years of communist rule that followed did not destroy the community ethos in Roveň; rather it seems that this ethos was strengthened through the collective self-help construction activities of the communist times. The voluntary firemen, at least in two composite parts of Roveň, intensified their cultural activities after the social regimentation of the communist period ended (cf. Šalanda 2004). Before WW II, this kind of intensity of communal life was almost entirely in the hands of those who organized theater and musical performances in the village (cf. Vaňková 2005). It would be unjust to dismiss the communal character of life in Dolní Roveň of the post-communist period, but one has to admit that the contents and form of the community have changed considerably. There are many more organized community activities than before the war, when it was more spontaneous and public. Today people spend far more time at home or in their garden and much less time with neighbors outdoors. The importance of the private sphere (house and garden) has increased and seems to be comparable with the meaning of privacy in the city (it is almost equally high). Only relatives and good friends or neighbors visit each other at home, the rest of unorganized contact is limited to the pub and daily errands.

III. The importance of comparative research of communities by way of re-studies is not easy to be overestimated. The detailed knowledge, which anthropologists and sociologists of communities gain through their particular research methods, serve their societies and the international sphere. For these studies reveal what is really happening on the ground, both institutionally and among the people of the studied community. In that sense they complement statistical and demographic knowledge, they are an indispensable supplement for macro-economic and macro-political analyses. The usual complaints that community studies are not representative of a region or country are weak because the wealth of detail, if replicated by a number of such studies per given territory, is not matched by any other

data sets. Besides, these studies are based on relationships rather than cool objectification. The point is that anthropologists generate their data from long-term residence with the researched collectivity and the testimonies from such prolonged rapport between the researcher and the researched guarantees a depth of information and its reliability. If complemented by quantitative data obtained from sociological questionnaires and interviews, the picture is indeed not only very detailed but also both inter-subjective and objective.

Re-studies, as they were thus far undertaken and as I tried to characterize them in Part I of this essay, are an even more welcome tool for gaining our knowledge of face-to-face communities, for they supply the decision makers and the broader public with time-depth perspective thus depicting various communities as they change while passing through various external economic, political, and cultural climates. The veracity of the data is enhanced by critical re-studies by other than the original researchers but also, if undertaken by the same researcher(s), as it was done by the Lynds, Redfield, or Sárkány. These re-studies can be critical by the virtue of the fact that the researcher(s) try to supplement the originally collected data, make up for the missing sections, etc.

For these obvious reasons, I would like to propose here an all-European and eventually worldwide concerted project of re-studies, starting from Central Europe where the first re-studies took place. As the new wave of re-studies would catch on, re-studies of some well-known anthropological monographs undertaken by American and British researchers in Europe should follow. Finally, but perhaps concurrently, some anthropologically or sociologically famous communities worldwide should be re-studied. This major initiative would bring in data that will not only be rich for each re-studied community but also provide us with comparative material for an all-European and worldwide explanation of processes that have happened as part of the transition from

agrarian isolation towards modernity, integration, and globalization.

In the Czech Republic, after the Dolní Roveň re-study come two communities: Sány and Komárov (the South Bohemian community, by chance carrying the same name as the Komárov village, since 1976 part of expanded Dolní Roveň). This does not mean that further monitoring of Dolní Roveň should be discontinued. On the contrary, the vicinity of the University of Pardubice which carried out the re-study of Dolní Roveň, makes possible continuous research of developments and changes in the village. However, Sány, also studied by Galla in the 1930s, is well suited for a re-study as it is a small village (450 inhabitants in 2001) some fifty kilometers to the west-northwest of Pardubice. Šalanda (2005), who carried out a preliminary survey there, registered a 50 percent drop in population in 70 years. From a prosperous, exemplary cooperative village of the 1930s, it has now lost momentum and its inhabitants are skeptical about prospects for the future. However, the economic and social influence of the presently-undertaken construction of motorway D 11 nearby might resuscitate this decaying community.

The southern Bohemian village of Komárov, on the other hand, had its heyday some 150 years ago when it was a prosperous farming village. During the communist era (1948-1989) when Salzmann (with Scheufler's library and archival inquiries) carried out his research there, the village was eventually economically incorporated into a larger unit and lost its official identity. The agricultural cooperative that was fairly successful during the 1970s and 1980s, survived the first wave of deregulations after the Velvet Revolution (Salzmann 1995). However, we have no idea about further developments in Komárov after most Czech cooperatives dissolved and were transformed into limited liability companies or had their property bought by private companies, some of them foreign. One wonders whether its decline continued in the later 1990s and beyond.

A bit more complicated is the case of Široký Důl which is situated on the Bohemian-Moravian divide near the town of Polička (some 50 km southeast of Pardubice). The founder of modern Czech nationography (*národopis*) Karel Chotek wrote a longer paper on this village (Chotek 1912). During the early 1970s a team of communist nationographers from the Institute of Ethnography and Folklore of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences returned to Široký Důl in order to study a 'socialist village.' However, their methods were antiquated as was most of the communist era *národopis* (cf. Lozoviuk 2005; Skalník 2005c), and they happened to study the pre-communist past (topics such as the ram-beheading festival, craft production, folklore awareness, the only quasi-anthropological theme being the selection of marriage partners). Moreover, this research was not completed. Starting from 2003, a new re-study is being undertaken by a team of Pardubice students of social anthropology under the leadership of Bohuslav Šalanda, the youngest member of the team of the 1970s. It is too early to draw any conclusions from this re-study. The Norwegian anthropologist Haldis Haukanes studied two Czech village communities (one South Bohemian and one South Moravian) during the process of post-communist transformation. To submit her study (Haukanes 2004) to the scrutiny of a follow-up re-study by a Czech researcher or a team could prove to be a thrilling enterprise.

In Slovakia the social worker Iva Šmakalová carried out an interesting monographic study of the Protestant gentry village of Horné Jaseno (today called Turčianské Jaseno since it was merged with Dolné Jaseno situated few hundred meters to the west). Unaware of the holistic functionalism of her days she called it presciently *Integral Village*, not knowing either about the comprehensive anthropological studies of communities in Europe that were then just started in Ireland by the Harvard team led by Lloyd Warner (Šmakalová 1936). I visited the village on Easter 2004 and discussed a future re-study with the village mayor and pastor (both

women, which is fascinating in this community of few hundred inhabitants). The Protestant (Lutheran) creed very much preserved village endogamy, and kinship strengthened by religion seems to continue to be the main organizing principle there.

My own research in Šuňava (originally the adjacent villages of Nižná Šuňava and Vyšná Šuňava) started during the politically uneasy first half of the 1970s (Skalník 1979) and continued after the fall of communism in the 1990s (Skalník 1993). Both villages with their agricultural cooperatives merged under the central Czechoslovak government's pressure in 1974, but the cooperative has survived under changed conditions to this very day, mainly thanks to a high degree of specialization. However, the post-1998 stringent economic measures of the central-right Slovak government have imprinted themselves in this village at the foot of the mountains with increasing acuteness. Much depends on the survival and development of nearby industries since specialized agriculture no longer offers employment to many. Whereas the first years of the demise of communist rule were marked by inertia, later years are likely to tell the story of adjustment to new conditions. But this will have to be studied in the field. In both the Czech and Slovak cases, accession to the European Union is bound to bring innovations, both in job creation and development of new branches (highly specialized industry employment, tourist services, and new vistas in agriculture as well).

Other possibilities for community re-studies in Slovakia could be the village of Sihla in central Slovakia studied by Kandert in the late 1960s (Kandert 2004) and perhaps Látky where he worked in the 1980s. Also suitable candidates for re-study are the two south-central villages of Sebechleby (studied by a team of nationographers of the socialist village — Pranda 1984; Kandert 1988), and Cerovo, studied by Chotek in a traditional way 100 years ago (Chotek 1906). Sihla, according to Kandert who returned to this village briefly in 1994 (2004: 246), lost most of its population within thirty years (from 435

in 1961 to some 150 in 1994) and it would be fascinating to find out what has caused such a demographic demise. Kandert (2004: 247) mentioned an impoverished cooperative (founded only in 1984!) and only one person interested in privatized agriculture. The reasons will perhaps be much more complex. Sebechleby was an 'exemplary' socialist cooperative village and it would be very interesting if inertia wins over rupture or the other way around.

In Poland, where several strings of ethnographic, anthropological, and sociological re-studies took place from the end of 19th century, new re-studies should bring a very rich harvest. The two above-mentioned quasi-parallel studies of Dobrzeń Wielki in the Opole region are an opportunity for tracing changes from the communist period until 'late post-communism.' If undertaken they could create a possibility for comparison with a nearby case study of Dziekanowice (Buchowski 1997) and research by British social anthropologists Hann and Pine in Little Poland (Malopolska). The famous re-study of the village of Żmiąca (Wierzbicki 1963) could be repeated after another 50 years.

I have already mentioned the current re-studies of Varsány and Tázlár in Hungary. However, the most famous community study of the *néprajz* type was that by Fél and Hofer in Atány carried out in the 1940s and early 1950s (Fél and Hofer 1969). I believe that a re-study of Atány could be a real challenge for the new generation of Hungarian social and cultural anthropologists.

Elsewhere in central Europe I would suggest that Obernberg am Brenner, studied by Pospíšil since the 1960s (Pospíšil 1995) is ripe for continuation. I discussed this possibility with Leopold Pospíšil some years ago when I visited him in the village and he welcomed the idea. Thus it is a question of deciding whether to study topics not touched by Pospíšil or to "check" those areas analyzed so meticulously in his two monographs. I do not doubt that other villages or urban communities studied earlier by overseas

anthropologists in Germany, Hungary, Serbia (cf. Halpern 1957), Romania (Cole 1977; Kideckel 1993; Verdery 1983), and Bulgaria (Sanders 1949) would be very suitable for re-studies. What I suggest here is to start with a few re-studies and gradually expand the scope all over Europe and beyond.

Beyond Central Europe there are several clusters of European communities with high potential for rewarding re-study. Some of them are famous monographs, others are case study handbooks published in the U.S. in uniform format by Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, and Waveland Press. I have mentioned above the Arensberg and Kimball research in the Irish county of Clare. Today, it seems highly appropriate to submit rural and urban Clare to another re-study which would show the booming Ireland far away from Dublin, there where rural life is not completely dead.³ Meanwhile the Introduction to the third edition of *Family and Community in Ireland* has raised questions of the methodology used by the Harvard team. There is a potential tension between the foreign-conceived original research and the future re-study, which should primarily be carried out by Irish anthropologists and sociologists.

The next region that had been studied fairly intensively by both anthropologists and sociologists is Great Britain (cf. Bell and Newby 1971: 137-146). There are classical studies such as Frankenberg's *Village on the Border* (Frankenberg 1957) or *Family and Kinship in East London* by Wilmot and Jones (1957) which both deserve to be re-studied. Further north we could name the monograph by Fox (1978) of the tiny island of Tory.

The most classical area of community studies mostly carried out by non-natives is the Mediterranean, from Spain to Greece. Starting from *People of the Sierra* by Pitt-Rivers and ending with Friedl's *Vassilika*, there is string

³ A fieldtrip that I undertook with a colleague in Clare in 2002 showed reasonable potential for such a restudy both because people who remembered pre-war Ireland were still around to render their reading of the changes, and some of their descendants continued in rural activities including farming.

of monographs that beg for re-study by native anthropologists (and sociologists). In meeting colleagues from these countries I have gained an impression that they were not altogether enthusiastic for the approaches and interpretations of foreign anthropologists. Therefore it would be intriguing to read findings by local anthropologists who have the advantage of life-long experience of living within the societies of which the re-studied communities form a part. This said, I trust it would be equally thrilling to carry out re-study of the classical community 'home sociology' by Lisón-Tolosana (1966) or Gross's study of Bonagente carried out in 1957-1958 (Gross 1974).

Portugal stands somewhat apart from this Mediterranean mosaic. Dias (1948), Cutileiro (1971), and Pina-Cabral (1986), to name the most important authors, were all native ethnographers who studied home communities. The latter two, however, were trained in the British social anthropological tradition. No doubt, enough time has elapsed since these studies were executed so that well-prepared re-studies⁴ would be an adequate response to the inquisitive queries about the changes that are supposed to have taken place since the country became member of the European Union almost twenty years ago.

Similarly, the Netherlands is a country with a long tradition of community studies, both sociological and anthropological, predominantly carried out by Dutch researchers themselves. However, foreign anthropologists produced good monographs, such as the Sassenheim social health study by Gadourek (1956) or other Dutch communities studied by Baron, Brunt, and Verrips. Perhaps

⁴ In 2001 I visited two sites in southern Alentejo where Jose Cutileiro worked in the 1960s. The idea was to check about the feasibility of a re-study with special emphasis on political culture. The romantic looking hill community of Reguengos de Monsaraz became a ghost town where nobody lives anymore and where people come to work to serve the tourists who come there to buy souvenirs, eat, or even spend a night in a hotel there. I was discouraged by this drastic change and finally decided to study a community that had not been studied before.

a through re-study of Sassenheim near Leiden after fifty years could prove rewarding.

Europe's northern and eastern regions were less studied holistically with the help of the community study method. The monographic study of workers of Nizhnyi Tagil carried out by a group of Soviet researchers in the 1960s (Krupianskaya 1968) could be a challenge for those modern Russian anthropologists who would attempt a re-study.

Conclusion

While urging early 21st-century anthropologists to give priority to make a new and concerted thrust towards community re-studies, I at the same time argue strongly for the decisive role of "native" researchers in this proposed new wave. The new re-studies should symbolize the repossession of the terrain by home ethnographers. Surely, foreign researchers could and should be involved in these re-studies as well, but I would contend that they should not dominate and especially should not impose their viewpoints as the only correct ones. The re-studies will create conditions for time-depth comparisons. Thus the often-repeated accusation of presentism in anthropological community studies would be removed.

Similarly, the thickening network of community studies and re-studies within Europe and elsewhere in the world should create conditions that would increase the representativeness of these studies. However, even if this does not satisfy the critics of community studies and if the methodology used by various researchers would not be unified and enhancing comparison, the very fact of rich detailed studies of social fields limited in size should make these studies an indispensable source of knowledge for all who want to know how people live or lived in face-to-face groups and what were their relations to the wider world beyond the intimate circle of community.

References Cited:

Arensberg, C.M. 1937. *The Irish Countryman. An Anthropological Study*. New York: American Museum of Natural History.

——— 1954. *The Community Study Method*. *American Journal of Sociology* 60(2): 109-124.

——— C.M. 1961. *The Community as Object and as Sample*. *American Anthropologist* 63: 241-263.

——— C.M. 1963. *The Old World Peoples: The Place of European Cultures in World Ethnography*. *Anthropological Quarterly* (Special Issue: "Europe and its Cultures"), 36(3): 75-99.

Arensberg, C.M. and Kimball, S.T. 1965. *Culture and Community*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

——— 1968 [1940]. *Family and Community in Ireland*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, London: Oxford University Press. 2nd edition.

——— 2002. *Family and Community in Ireland*. 3rd edition. Ennis: CLASP Press

Banfield, E.C. 1956. *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Barrera González, A. 2005. "Towards an Anthropology of Europe: Outline for a Teaching and Research Agenda. In: Skalník, P. (ed.), *Anthropology of Europe: Teaching and Research*. *Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology* 3. Prague: Set Out.

Bell, C. and Newby, H. 1971. *Community Studies. An Introduction to Sociology of the Local Community*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Bernot, L. and Blancard, R. 1953. *Nouvelle, un Village Français*. Paris: Institut d'ethnologie.

Bodrogi, T. (ed.) 1978. *Varsány. Tanulmányok egy Észak-Magyarországi Falu Társadalomnéprajzához*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Bradfield, R.M. 1973. *A Natural History of Associations. A Study in the Meaning of Community*. 2 vols. New York: International Universities Press.

- Buchowski, M. 1997. *Reluctant Capitalists: Class and Culture in a Local Community in Western Poland*. Berlin: Centre Marc Bloch.
- Bujak, F. 1901. *Maszkienice, wieś powiatu brzeskiego. Stosunki gospodarcze i społeczne*. Kraków.
- 1903. *Żmiąca, wieś powiatu limanowskiego*. Kraków.
- 1915. *Maszkienice, rozwój wsi od r. 1900 do 1911. Rozprawy PAU, ser.2, 3*.
- Chotek, K. 1906. Cerovo. *Národopisný věstník československý*, 1: 65-73, 97-102, 129-135, 161-167, 200-209, 225-234, 273-281.
- 1912. *Široký Důl. Národopisná monografie české vesnice*. Praha: Pražská akciová tiskárna.
- Cole, J. and Wolf, E. 1972. *The Hidden Frontier. Ecology and Ethnicity in an Alpine Valley*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cole, J. 1977. Anthropologists Come Part-Way Home: Community Studies in Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 6: 349-378.
- Cresswell, R. 1969. *Une communauté rurale de l'Irlande*. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie.
- Cutileiro, J. 1971. *A Portuguese Rural Society*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, J. 1970. Morals and Backwardness. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 12(3): 340-53.
- Dias, J. 1948. *Vilarinho da Furna. Uma Aldeia Comunitária in Temas Portugueses*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da moeda.
- Dube, S. 1961. *Indian Village*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Epstein, A.L. 1958. *Politics in an Urban African Community*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Fei, H. 1946. *Peasant Life in China*. New York: AMS Press.
- Fél, E. and Hofer, T. 1969. *Proper Peasants. Traditional Life in a Hungarian Village*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Fox, J. 1978. *The Tory Islanders. A People of the Celtic Fringe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frankenberg, R. 1957. *Village on the Border*. Hammondsworth: Penguin.
- Gadourek, Ivan. 1956. *A Dutch Community; Social and Cultural Structure and Process in a Bulb-Growing Region in the Netherlands*. Publications of the Netherlands' Institute of Preventive Medicine, 30. / Netherlands Instituut voor Praeventieve Geneeskunde TNO-Leiden. *Verhandelingen* ; 30. Leiden: Stenfert Kroese.
- Galla, Karel 1936. *Sociology of the Cooperative Movement in the Czechoslovak Village*. Praha: Spolek péče o blaho venkova.
- 1937. *Sány. Příspěvek k sociologii družstevnictví v československé vsi*. Praha: Spolek péče o blaho venkova.
- 1939. *Dolní Roveň. Sociologický obraz české vesnice*. Praha: Spolek péče o blaho venkova.
- Gallagher, A. Jr. 1961. *Plainville, 15 Years Later*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- 1964. *Plainville: The Twice Studied Town*. In: Vidich, A.J., Bensman, J. and Stein, M.R. (eds.), *Reflections on Community Studies*. New York and London: Wiley.
- Galtung, J. 1971. *Members of Two Worlds*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gross, F. 1974. *Il Paese. Values and Social Change in an Italian Village*. New York: New York University Press.
- Halpern, J. 1957. *A Serbian Village*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hann, C.M. 1980. *Tázlár. A Village in Hungary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hann, C. and Sárkány, M. 2003. The Great Transformation in Rural Hungary: Property, Life Strategies, and Living Standards. In: Chris Hann and the "Property Relations" Group. 2003. *The Post-Socialist Agrarian Question: Property Relations and the Rural Condition*. Pp: 117-141. Münster: Lit Verlag.

- Haukanes, H. 2004. Velká dramata – obyčejné životy. Postkomunistické zkušenosti českého venkova. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.
- Hollos, M. and Maday, B. (eds.) 1983. New Hungarian Peasants: An East-Central European Experience with Collectivization. New York: Brooklyn College Press.
- Humphrey, C. 1983. Karl Marx Collective. Economy, Society and Religion in a Siberian Collective Farm. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jech, J., Secká, M., Scheufler, V. and Skalníková, O. 1992. České vesnice v rumunském Banátě. Národopisná knižnice. Češi v cizině 5. Praha: Ústav etnografie a folkloristiky ČSAV.
- Kandert, J. 1969. Členství v totálních skupinách a chování jednotlivce. Unpublished CSc. dissertation. Praha: Ústav etnografie a folkloristiky ČSAV.
- 1988. Společenské vztahy. In: Botík, J. (ed.), Hont. Tradície ľudovej kultúry. (426-433). Martin: Osveta.
- 2004. Každodenní život vesničanů středního Slovenska v šedesátých až osmdesátých letech 20.století. Praha: Karolinum.
- Kenyatta, J. 1938. Facing Mount Kenya. The Life of the Gikuyu. London: Secker and Warburg.
- Kideckel, D.A. 1993. The Solitude of Collectivism: Romanian Villagers to the Revolution and Beyond. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Krupianskaya, V.J. (ed.). 1968. Etnograficheskoye izucheniye byta rabochikh. Moskva: Nauka.
- Leach, E. 1961. Pul Eliya. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, O. 1951. Life in a Mexican Village: Tepotzlán Restudied. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- 1953. Tepotzlán Restudied: A Critique of the Folk-Urban Conceptualization of Social Change. Rural Sociology 18.
- Lisón-Tolosana, C. 1966. Belmonte de los Caballeros: A Sociological Study of a Spanish Town. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lopreato, J. 1967. Peasants No More. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Lozoviuk, P. 2005. The Pervasive Continuities of Czech Národopis. In: Hann, C., Sárkány, M. and Skalník, P. (eds.), Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe, Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia 8. Münster: LIT.
- Lynd, R.S. and Lynd, H.M. 1929. Middletown. A Study in Contemporary American Culture. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- 1937. Middletown in Transition. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Maho, J. 1974. La comparaison et ses limites. In: Jollivet, M. (ed.), Sociétés paysannes ou lutte de classes au village. Paris: Armand Colin.
- 1982. Study and restudy of a village. In: Mendras, H. and Mihailescu, I. (eds.), Theories and Methods in Rural Community Studies, (223-234). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Malinowski, B. 1922. Argonauts of the Western Pacific. London: Routledge.
- Mayer, I. and P. 1961. Townsman and Tribesmen. Conservatism and the Process of Urbanization in a South African City. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Mead, M. 1956. New Lives for Old: Cultural Transformation – Manus, 1928-1953. New York: Morrow.
- Mendras, H. 1967. La fin des paysans. Paris: Futuribles.
- Mihailescu, I. 1977. Possibilités et limites de la recherche comparative transnationale. Social Science Information XVI (2): 213-229.
- Morin, E. 1967. Commune en France. La métamorphose de Plodémet. Paris: Fayard.
- Niedermüller, P. and Stocklund, B. (eds.) 2001. Europe. Cultural Construction and

- Reality. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Nowakowski, S. 1960. *Przeobrażenia społeczne wsi Opolskiej*. Poznań: Instytut Zachodni.
- Olszewska, A. 1969. *Wieś uprzemysłowiona: Studium społeczności lokalnej w powiecie opolskim*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Zakład narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Pendleton, W.C. 1974. *Katutura. A Place Where We Do Not Stay*. San Diego: San Diego State University Press.
- 1993. *Katutura. A Place Where We Stay. Life in Post-apartheid Township in Namibia*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan.
- Pi-Sunyer, O. 1973. *Zamora: Change and Continuity in a Mexican Town*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Pina-Cabral, J. de . 1986. *Sons of Adam, Daughters of Eve : The Peasant Worldview of the Alto Minho*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pitt-Rivers, J. 1954. *People of the Sierra*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson. (2nd edition Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.)
- Pospisil, L. 1995. *Obernberg. A Quantitative Analysis of a Tirolean Peasant Economy*. New Haven, CT: The Connecticut Academy of Art and Sciences.
- Powdermaker, H. 1933. *Life in Lesu. The Study of a Melanesian Society in New Ireland*. New York: Norton.
- Řechková, K. (2005. *Politická kultura a obecní politika v Dolní Rovni*. In: Skalník, P. (ed.), *Sociální antropologie obce Dolní Roveň*, (73-106). Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, Series C, Supplement 13. Pardubice: University of Pardubice.
- Redfield, R. 1930. *Tepotzlan, a Mexican Village: A Study of Folk Life*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- 1950. *A Village that Chose Progress: Chan Kom Revisited*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- 1953. *The Primitive World and Its Transformations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 1955. *The Little Community: Viewpoints for the Study of a Human Whole*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- 1956. *Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1960. *The Little Community and Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Redfield, R. and Villa Rojas, A. 1934. *Chan Kom: a Maya Village*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Šalanda, B. 2004. *Aspekty stability obce*. In: Skalník, P. (ed.), *Dolní Roveň: poločas výzkumu/Dolní Roveň: Research at Half-time*, (47-59). Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, Series C, Supplement 8. Pardubice: University of Pardubice.
- Salzmann, Zdenek. 1983. *Two Contributions to the Study of Czechs and Slovaks Settled in Romania*. University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Program in Soviet and East European Studies) no. 9. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- 1995. *Komárov po sametové revoluci*. *Český lid* 82 (2): 161 – 165.
- Salzmann, Z. and Scheufler, V. 1974. *Komárov: A Czech Farming Village*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 2nd revised edition 1986.
- Sanders, I.T. 1949. *Balkan Village*. Lexington: The University of Kentucky Press.
- 1975. *The Community*. 3rd ed. New York: Ronald.
- Sárkány, M. 2002. *Cultural and Social Anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe*. In: Kaase, M., Sparschuch, V. and Wenninger, A. (eds.), *Three Social Science Disciplines in Central and Eastern Europe: Handbook on Economics, Political Science and Sociology (1989–2001)*, Pp. 558–566. Berlin and Budapest: Social Science

Information Centre (IZ) and Collegium Budapest.

—— 2005. Re-study of Varsány: Entrepreneurs and Property in a Hungarian Village after 1989. *In: Skalník, P. (ed.), Anthropology of Europe: Teaching and Research. Prague Studies in Sociocultural Anthropology 3. Prague: Set Out.*

Scheufler, V. and Skalníková, O. 1962. Kultura rumunských Čechů. Hmotná a duchovní kultura. *Český lid* 49 (4): 145-184.

Shirokogoroff, M. 1935. *The Psychomental Complex of the Tungus*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Silverman, S. 1968. Agricultural Organization, Social Structures and Values in Italy: Amoral Familism Reconsidered. *American Anthropologist* 70(1): 1-20.

Skalník, P. 1979. Modernization of the Slovak Peasantry: Two Carpathian highland Communities. *In: Berdichewsky, B. (ed.) Anthropology and Social Change in Rural Areas*, Pp. 253-261. New York: Mouton

—— 1981. Community - Struggle for a Key Concept in Soviet Ethnography. *Dialectical Anthropology* 6(2): 183-191. Reprinted in Van de Velde, P. (ed.), *Evomatica*, (139-164). Leiden: ICA Publications.

Skalník, P. 1982. Community Studies and the Limits of Representativeness: A Socio-Ecological Discussion on Mountain Communities. *In: Mendras, H. and Mihailescu, I. (eds.), Theories and Methods in Rural Community Studies*, Pp. 169-189. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

—— 1986. Uneven Development in European mountain Communities. *Dialectical Anthropology* 10(3-4): 215-228.

—— 1993. 'Socialism is Dead' and Very Much Alive in Slovakia: Political Inertia in a Tatra Village. *In: Hann, C.M. (ed.), Socialism. Ideals, Ideology and Social Practice*, Pp. 218-226. London: Routledge.

—— 2001. Terénní výzkum v obci Šuňava (severní Slovensko) v letech 1970-1975 a 1991-2000. *Český lid* 88(4): 361-367.

—— 2004. Re-study of Dolní Roveň: A Combination of Anthropology and Sociology of Rural Bohemia at the Beginning of the Third Millennium. *In: Skalník, P. (ed.), Dolní Roveň: poločas výzkumu/Dolní Roveň: Research at Half-time*, Pp. 17-34. Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, Series C, Supplement 8. Pardubice: University of Pardubice.

—— (ed.) 2005a. Sociální antropologie obce Dolní Roveň. Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, Series C, Supplement 13. Pardubice: University of Pardubice.

—— 2005b. Czechoslovakia: From Národopis to Etnografie and Back. *In: Hann, C., Sárkány, M. and Skalník, P. (eds.), Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies: Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe. Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia 8. Münster: LIT.*

Skalníková, O. and Scheufler, V. 1963. Základy hmotné a duchovní kultury českých kovozemědělských obcí v rumunském Banátě. *Český lid* 50 (6): 332-342.

Šmakalová, I. 1936. Integrálna dedina. Štúdia slovenskej zemianskej dediny v Turci. Praha: Sociálny ústav ČSR.

Stahl, H.H. 1972. Satul Drăgus după 40 de ani. *Viitorul Social* 2: 517-528.

Šubrt, J. 2004. Dotazníkový výzkum v Dolní Rovni (první poznatky). *In: Skalník, P. (ed.), Dolní Roveň: poločas výzkumu/Dolní Roveň: research at half-time*, (61-82). Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, Series C, Supplement 8. Pardubice: University of Pardubice.

Van den Berghe, P. 1964. *Caneville. The Social Structure of a South African Town*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Vaňková, M. 2005. Volnočasové a kulturní aktivity obyvatel Dolní Rovně dříve a dnes. *In: Skalník, P. (ed.), Sociální antropologie obce Dolní Roveň*, Pp. 167- 235. Scientific Papers of the University of Pardubice, Series C, Supplement 13. Pardubice: University of Pardubice.

-
- Verdery, K. 1983. *Transylvanian Villagers: Three Centuries of Political, Economic and Ethnic Change*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Warner, W.L. 1937. *A Black Civilization. A Social Study of an Australian Tribe*. New York: Harper.
- 1963. *The Yankee City*. Abridged edition. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Warner, W.L. et al. 1941-1959. *The Social Life of a Modern Community; The Status System of a Modern Community; The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups; The Social System of a Modern Factory; The Living and the Dead (Yankee City Series 1-5)*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Weiner, A. 1976. *Women of Value, Men of Renown. New Perspectives in Trobriand Exchange*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- West, J. 1945. *Plainville, U.S.A.* New York: Columbia University Press.
- West, M. 1971. *Divided Community. A Study of Social Groups and Racial Attitudes in a South African Town*. Cape Town.
- 1987. *Apartheid in a South African Town, 1968-1985*. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies.
- White, C. 1980. *Patrons and Partisans. A Study in Politics in Two Southern Italian Comuni*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicki, Z.T. 1963. *Żmija w pół wieku później*. Wrocław: Zakład im. Ossolińskich.
- 1982. *Methodological Issues Concerning Restudies on Local Rural Communities*. In: Mendras, H. and Mihailescu, I. (eds.), *Theories and Methods in Rural Community Studies* Pp. 193-221. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Wilmott, P. and Young, M. 1957. *Family and Kinship in East London*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Wilson, M. and Mafeje, A. 1972. *Langa. A Study of Social Groups in an African Township*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Wylie, L. 1957. *Village in the Vaucluse*. London: Oxford University Press.