

## ANTUN RADIĆ AND ETHNOLOGICAL RESEARCH OF CLOTHING AND TEXTILES IN CROATIA: 1896 TO 1919

**VJERA BONIFAČIĆ**

Department of Human Ecology  
University of Alberta  
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6G 2M8

**UDK 391.001 "1896/1919"**

Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Original scientific paper  
Priljeno: 21. 11. 1995.

*The author discusses the initial framework that Antun Radić proposed for the study of rural culture, with a focus on sections of Radić's questionnaire dealing with clothing and textiles. While Radić proposed to separate the study of folk culture from that of the elite culture in order to evaluate it within the parameters of its own historical circumstances, this paper argues that Radić did not conceive of folk culture as functioning in isolation. On the contrary, in the area of clothing and textiles, Radić inquired about the ways that larger socio-cultural processes affected rural culture in Croatia at the turn of the century. The author also comments on the relevance of Radić's work, and of the ethnographic data based on his questionnaire, for contemporary research of cloth dynamics on the territory of Croatia during the late 19th and early 20th century.*

### **Acknowledgements**

This paper is part of my doctoral thesis, *Ethnological Research and Canonization of Autochthonous Folk Textiles in Croatia, 1896 to 1940: A Polysystem Study*, and was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Doctoral Fellowship.

### **Introduction**

The beginnings of ethnological research in Croatia were marked by the work of Antun Radić and his questionnaire for collecting ethnographic data about folk culture of South Slavs. From the 1980s onwards, in the wave of publications concerned with theoretical/methodological issues, Croatian ethnologists have often discussed Radić's initial design for Croatian ethnology from various perspectives (see, for example, Belaj, 1989; Čapo, 1991; Čapo-Žmegač, 1994, 1995; Muraj, 1989; Rihtman-Auguštin, 1987; Supek, 1988). Among them, several publications commented on Radić's conception of culture and folk culture. Rihtman-Auguštin (1987) wrote about Radić's two-tiered model of culture, and about the need to replace the conception of folk culture and elite culture as two separate, closed systems with contemporary models of all cultures as open systems. Muraj (1989) evaluated Radić as anticipating the contemporary

concerns of ethnology with people rather than cultural objects, as sensing that folk culture was a dynamic phenomenon, and as having created an open design for ethnological research in which methodologies can be shaped in response to specifically posed research questions. Following Kremensek (1984), however, Muraj echoed Rihtman-Auguštin in suggesting that Radić's weakest point as an ethnologist was his view of the subject matter of ethnology. "By limiting the subject matter of ethnological research to peasant culture", Muraj writes, "Radić lost the possibility of grasping the unity of culture, of the functioning of all its mechanisms and their intertwining. In this way he severed connections between "folk" life and the totality of the evolving socio-historical process." (Muraj, 1989, p. 15)

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

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

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

In the opening paragraph, Radić clearly delineated what was to be the subject matter and general aims of ethnological study in Croatia: "1) to collect everything possible about folk life of South Slavs; and 2) to scientifically interpret the collected materials" (p. 1). Radić then provided an explanation of the key words in his opening statement: *folk*, *folk life*, and *scientific method*. He stated that the term *folk* did not signify the whole of a nation, such as Croatian, Serbian, Slovene, or Bulgarian, but only the larger part of each nation which was characterized by *folk culture*, as opposed to the *elite culture* of the same nation. He then defined *culture* as "a way of life" (p. 1).

Radić viewed *folk culture*, namely folk life, customs, feelings, knowledge, and beliefs, as different from *elite culture*, the latter being based on a Graeco-Roman-Christian legacy. However, these were not the only differences that separated folk culture from elite culture. According to Radić, the traditional hierarchy between the two cultures, namely, the assumed superiority of elite culture over folk culture, further deepened the gulf between them.

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

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

*Toward 1850, civilization (and culture) moved from the singular to the plural... Civilizations and cultures in the plural imply the renunciation of a civilization defined as an ideal, or rather as the ideal....The triumphant plural of the nineteenth century is undeniably a sign of new ideas, new ways of thinking - in short, new times.*

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

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

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

Where Radić did distinguish himself as an independent thinker, was in his keen understanding of the scientific method for studying cultural phenomena, and in his (not unrelated) grasp of the appropriate theoretical/methodological approaches for studying European rural cultures.

Radić explicitly stated that the initial stage of collecting data using his questionnaire was not yet a science, and was only a necessary step that would allow scientific interpretation at a later stage. He proposed this stage of scientific interpretation of data as the aim of Croatian ethnology, more specifically to interpret the spiritual life of people in relation to the material circumstances in which they live, and to further "compare life, customs, and beliefs of all peoples, and to find general laws according to which people live and think...(as well as) find causes of such laws" (1897, p. 10).

Radić distinguished between scientific endeavor and engagement in society, and stated that ethnology as a science should not serve either religious (1897, p. 9) or political ideologies (1896, p. 362). In a review article in the same issue of the journal, Radić (1896) repeated in more detail that scientific research should not have a direct pragmatic purpose, either philanthropic, political, or economic, but must be detached and satisfied with the answers to the questions as to *how* and *why* (pp. 319-320). Only in the long run did Radić hope that results of scientific research would bring about leveling of cultures (1897, p 10).

When it comes to theories and methodologies for studying and interpreting folk culture, Radić understood that ethnology was not simply another specialized discipline,

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

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

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

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

social positions (which incidentally at later times included ethnologists) on either moral, economic, ideological, or aesthetic grounds. Nevertheless, changes in clothing and textiles and their functions continued to take place, and they are some of the most visible indicators of the transformations of rural communities in Croatia throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Clothing and Footwear" (pp. 22-23). It is made even more explicit by additional questions he placed in the appendix to this section:

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

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

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

The consistency and the manner of questioning about changes in cloth production, exchange, and consumption, indicate that Radić considered such information important and indicative of the realities of rural life, rather than a negative phenomenon that was destroying the "true" traditional folk culture. The answers that different authors provided to such questions varied, of course, both in terms of quantity and quality. The monograph on Otok, by Josip Lovretić (1990/1897-1918), stands out as particularly rich in materials on clothing and textiles and their changes. It was also the first monograph that was published in installments between 1897 and 1918 in the newly founded journal, the *Journal of Folk Life and Customs of South Slavs*. The surviving correspondence between Lovretić and Radić shows that Lovretić collected most of the data on Otok prior to the publication of Radić's questionnaire, and later only arranged them to correspond to the questionnaire for the publication. Svirac (1984) suggested that Radić formulated some of his questions on the basis of materials that Lovretić already prepared for his monograph. This is particularly likely in the area of clothing and textiles where Radić's questions and Lovretić's answers indeed correspond rather closely. Josip Lovretić was insightful in engaging his mother and other women as informants in the domain of textiles. As well, as a priest, he had ample insight into how clothing functioned in rural life, and considerable power to set the rules on dress codes for various church ceremonies. Later correspondence by Lovretić suggests, however, that while he was well aware of changes in clothing styles, he disapproved of them and actively tried to enforce what he considered to be "traditional" handmade folk costumes for use at least in church ceremonies (Svirac, 1984, p. 121). Radić, on the contrary, asked questions about the changes in rural textiles, as well as the mechanisms of those changes, in a much more detached and deliberate way. I tend to think that Radić considered changes in the production, exchange and consumption patterns of clothing

and textiles to be indicators of change in local life of communities and useful for future comparisons among different regions, namely as important data indicative of the mechanisms of transformation of "folk" or rural culture at the turn of the century. The answers that selected authors provided to such questions will be analyzed in the next section.

### **Nine Monographs Based on Radić's Questionnaire:**

#### **Textile Dynamics in Croatia at the Turn of the 20th Century**

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

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

Radić required that only local people who were either born or lived for a long time in the community or region collect data about local life. Since they obviously needed to be literate, all of the authors except Kata Jajnčerova, the sister of Antun Radić, were men. None of them had any training as ethnologist, and their professions differed: Jajnčerova and Arđalić were peasants; Žic, Lukić, and Lang were teachers; Rožić was a professor; and Lovretić, Ivanišević, and Kotarski were priests. Their profession quite obviously influenced the manner in which they responded to Radić's questionnaire. In the sections dealing with textiles, for example, Jajnčerova, a literate but unschooled woman, gave a fascinating subjective account of an insider very much aware of interpersonal conflicts and pressures regarding clothing in a very closed community and family life, but did not offer more general or objective observations. The male teachers responded in the opposite way: they answered in a clear and objective manner about the material, technical, and visual characteristics of textile



objects, and recorded general observations about textile trade, but commented much less on how textiles functioned in local life. The priests were by far the most informed and perceptive about importance of textiles in the social organization of local life, but had the point of view of an insider in a more powerful social position within the community. As I mentioned earlier, this comes as no surprise since priests had the power to set dress codes for many vital social rituals and ceremonies, and could try to impose standards of appropriate clothing for women on moral, economic, or even aesthetic grounds. Thus the monograph on Otok by Josip Lovretić, and on Polica by Frano Ivanišević stand out as the most valuable in that particular aspect. Kotarski, although a priest, had a style of writing that was sparse and therefore less informative. It must also be mentioned that both Lovretić and Ivanišević were the two authors who made the most consistent use of other informants in their communities, including their mothers and other women whom they consulted regarding information on textiles.

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

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

In his monograph on the Slavonian village Otok, Lovretić (1897-1918/1990) writes that due to the lack of available wool, as well as the time consuming process of dyeing wool at home, women turned to buying woolen yarn or having their own wool dyed by professional dyers in bright aniline colours (p. 103). State regulations regarding soaking of hemp and flax, and the lack of needed time, Lovretić writes, forced women to switch to using industrial cotton yarn to weave certain parts of women's and men's clothing and domestic textiles (p. 104). It is also obvious from the

descriptions of clothing that women in Otok and the surrounding villages bought industrially woven silk, cotton, flax, and woolen cloth to make different parts or types of clothing, as well as golden, white, or coloured yarns for decorating their clothing with various types of embroidery (pp. 69-90). Lovretić reports that female school teachers did not teach new embroidery techniques since "every peasant girl knows ten times better how to embroider than any village teacher" but he adds that they teach children how to "knit socks, macramé, crocheting, and all kinds of similar work....that is of no use to children" (107). Lukić (1919) describes a very similar picture in Varoš, another village in Slavonia, where women were still making some fibers, yarns, and woven cloth on their own, but were increasingly replacing them with purchased handwoven cloth or industrially made materials. Consequently, young girls devoted most of their time to decorate clothing and domestic textiles with post-loom types of decorations such as embroideries and crocheting. Both Lovretić and Lukić report that girls and older women in Otok and Varoš knew how to sew needed clothing, but local and town seamstresses were also used, especially for more fashionable types of outfits. Some parts of male clothing were made by women at home, but others such as hats, scarves, and decorated sheepskin vests and coats, were purchased from local or town craftsmen (Lukić, 1919, pp. 84-87).

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

In the north-western part of Croatia, Kotarski and Rožić offer a different picture for their respective regions of Lobar and Prigorje. Their monographs suggest that, in these regions, both men's and women's clothing was simpler in decorative elaboration, as well as in terms of variety of different outfits used for different occasions. Both Kotarski and Rožić report that men were largely wearing town-style clothing made from industrial cloth that was either sewn by tailors, or purchased second hand in nearby towns (Kotarski, 1915, p. 84; Rožić, 1907, 109-112). In contrast to Slavonia and Posavina where women wore markedly different outfits depending on their age, Kotarski and Rožić report that in their parishes women of all ages wore the same outfits

except for the way they covered their heads, marking in this minimal manner their status as a young girl, a marriageable girl, a young married woman, or an old woman past the childbearing age. For festive clothing, women wore simple white outfits made from either homegrown flax, homegrown hemp, or purchased white cotton cloth which they decorated with white embroidery, while their daily clothing was even simpler (Kotarski, 1915, p.83; Rožić, 1907, pp. 112-115). This is how Rožić describes women from Prigorje in festive clothing:

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

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

The monograph by Milan Lang on Samobor offers interesting information about textile dynamics within a rural town, along with its interaction with the surrounding villages. Samobor was a small rural town in 1900 with a population of 2,783. It was an old trading center dating back to the 1200s with a long tradition of textile craft production in small, family type workshops. When describing clothing and textiles used in the town itself, Lang refers mostly to the non-elite part of population. He distinguishes between white clothing [rublje] and outer clothing [oprava]. White clothing was made out of flax, cotton, or more rarely hemp cloth which women in Samobor had previously made on their own, but which at the turn of the century was exclusively purchased in stores or from professional weavers. Clothing made from white cloth "is all cut and sewn at home; if that is not possible then it is given to a seamstress, or a seamstress comes to individual homes to sew what is needed" (Lang, 1911, p. 161). About decorative techniques used to decorate white clothing Lang (1912) writes:

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

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

*"[Outer clothing] is cut and sewn by tailors, women seamstresses or furriers. Not long ago there were no seamstresses, instead tailors made women's and men's coats. Today there are all kinds of better or poorer quality seamstresses who sew women's clothing. Better seamstresses sew for ladies, and poorer ones sew for simpler*

*folk. Still, girls and women sew some of their own simpler clothing. If some of them do not know how to cut, they give it to a seamstress or a neighbor to cut, and then sew it by themselves. Sewing is mostly done by hand, but also by machine.” (p.162)*

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

The situation along the Adriatic coast and among the islands was again markedly different. It should be mentioned here that in the continental parts of Croatia at the turn of the century many rural households still had weaving looms, and women had weaving skills even if they no longer wove all of the needed cloth. Along the coast, however, purchasing woven cloth for the needs of individual households had been practiced much longer. By the turn of the century, relatively few professional weavers still had looms and they made woolen cloth on commission for others in the community. Otherwise, individual households no longer had looms. Increasingly, industrially made cloth was purchased in stores. In the rural town of Vrbnik on the island of Krk, Žic (1901) describes how women even now made some of their own woolen yarn, but purchased all other industrially made textile yarns and woven cloth for making clothing and domestic textiles. Žic does not mention who tailored men's or women's clothing.

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

Ivanišević (1903) writes that further south along the coast, in Polica, some wool was yet processed, handspun, and woven at home, but increasingly industrially woven cloth was purchased in stores in the nearby towns of Split and Sinj (p. 336). Much of the sewing and decoration of clothing were done in individual households. When it comes to decorations on women's clothing, Ivanišević writes that female teachers in elementary schools “started to introduce new types of embroidery and jewelry, so that some local women want to dress like the elite” (p. 336). On the whole, he writes, “almost all of the women cut, sew and decorate their clothing, which they learn from each other at home, or while tending sheep, and lately in elementary schools” (p. 336).

In some villages nearer the coast, Ivanišević writes that women adopted "...new fashion that came from the town of Split....On holidays they dress up only in new fashion, and for everyday clothing they mix old and new type of clothing" (Ivanišević, 1903, p. 326). When it comes to the tailoring of men's clothing, specialized production of professionally crafted men's vests and jackets adorned with metal decorations and decoratively applied silk cords was declining due to the high cost of such items and changing fashions. Instead, Ivanišević writes that "both everyday and festive clothing is made by tailors in towns, although there are local tailors who also know how to cut and sew [men's clothing]" (p. 333). In some villages, "...as in Jesenice, tailors from outside come to the village and sew in villagers homes" (p.336).

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

These changes in patterns of textile production and exchange were obviously related to larger social and economic transformations that were taking place in Croatia and Dalmatia at the time. At the turn of the century, Croatia and Dalmatia were poor and underdeveloped provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Most of the rural regions were only beginning to transform from what Fernand Braudel (1977) called the "material life" of self-sufficiency and elementary forms of local market exchange, to "economic life" of international market exchange. This transformation began earlier in the 19th century in those regions of Croatia which became open to forest and mineral exploitation, and through export of grain surpluses in Slavonia and shipbuilding and wine trade along the Dalmatian coast (Foretić, 1969; Matković, 1964). This process gradually spread to other regions after the dissolution of the feudal order in 1854, which further resulted in the gradual breakup of extended family households, partitioning of land, and changes in family economy and family division of labour (Despalatović, 1981).

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

deserves further research. For example, Supek (in press) recently suggested that this work was varied and significant in Slavonia:

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

As well, patterns of textile consumption were changing in rural Croatia at the turn of the century. For some regions, most notably Slavonia, the social and economic transformation resulted in a certain measure of prosperity and subsequent increase in conspicuous consumption of textiles, as can be discerned from monographs on Otok and Varoš in Slavonia by Lovretić and Lukić. The conspicuous consumption of textiles was especially pronounced among girls of marriageable age, and Supek (in press) suggests that mothers invested most of their earnings from their entrepreneurial activities into preparations for their young daughters' dresses and textiles in dowry, in order to improve their marriage prospects. At the turn of the century, it was a community regulated custom in many parts of Slavonia for young girls to display costly and elaborately decorated clothing during the years before marriage.

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

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

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

*"But the new priest, Stručić, helped the folk costume in Komletinci as nobody has done so far. He collected over sixty samples of folk embroideries from...[other villages] that Komletinci did not even previously have...and he ordered that the first time girls dress up they...must have the top embroidered with such red and blue ornaments....Now that folk costume is in decline, it is simply miraculous what a single word by that priest could achieve in no time at all, in two years."* (p. 108)

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

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

*"That folk clothing is in decline is often the fault of women married to professional craftsmen in the village. Then, there are those ladies that used to be peasants. Some of them want to behave like the elite, and they are ashamed to even mention they were once peasants....If they have among their relatives a girl who does not want to marry a peasant, she prepares clothing that she will need later on, and makes only as much of folk clothing as she has to wear in order to hide her intentions in public. This is why the wealthiest girls in the village are likely to be the worst dressed....A peasant girl is happy to listen to such women knowing that she, too, was once a peasant girl...and this is the beginning of decline in use of folk costume."* (pp. 106-107).

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

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

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

In many regions the change to market economy also resulted in emigration of men and young people from villages to towns and cities. For example, poorer men who went to towns seeking seasonal employment or young girls who went to serve as servants, often brought town styles of clothing back to the village. On the other hand, for village or rural town shopkeepers and their wives, new styles of clothing became a symbol of social status. For the case of Polica in Dalmatia, Ivanišević (1903) writes:

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

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

### **Conclusion**

Radić's questionnaire and the data that were collected on its basis in nine monographs between 1896 and 1919, offer much insight and information about changes in clothing and textile styles and functions during that period; certainly more so than they do about changes in other manifestations of folk culture, such as dance, music, or literature. Paradoxically, in the past few decades, Croatian folklorists and ethnologists who focused on literature, dance and music began to explore changes in the types and styles of dance, music, and literature, in relation to changes in their social functions during the 19th and 20th century. On the other hand, in the research of folk textiles, the diffusionist research model gradually began to prevail from the 1930's onwards, and it remained the dominant model in Croatian ethnological study of textiles to this day. This model asked a completely different set of questions - diffusionists inquired about origins and transmission of cultural forms that were evident in older, largely handmade, textiles. However, as Wolf (1982) noted, diffusionists "omitted any interest in the ecological, economic, social, political, and ideological matrix within which the cultural forms were being transmitted in time and space" (p.15). Of course, many Croatian publications, too numerous to cite here, continued to document certain historical aspects of production, exchange, and consumption of clothing and textiles, including their change. But the inquiry into the processes and mechanisms of the aforementioned change has not yet begun as a larger program and collective effort in Croatian ethnological research of clothing and textiles.

I consider that Radić and the authors of early monographs prepared a solid basis and a valuable source of information for inquiries into cloth dynamics in rural Croatia during the late 19th and early 20th century. For example, these monographs identified several macro—phenomena that need to be taken into account for the whole territory of Croatia, these being various forms of textile trade, and the introduction of schools in rural areas, through which new textile materials, technologies, techniques, decorative designs, and types of tailoring were introduced to local communities. On the local