

ETHNOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRES: AFTER METHOD, AFTER QUESTIONS

DANI SCHRIRE

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

In the history of folklore studies, ethnographic questionnaires played a major role even before the concept of ‘folklore’ was coined. Dan Ben-Amos (1989) mentions the questionnaire of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden from 1630, which can be seen as a prefiguration of later questionnaires. Some begin the history of folkloristic questionnaires in 1807 with the questionnaire of Jacques-Antoine Dalaure, a French scholar in the Académie Celtique who, according to Harry Senn (1981), inspired Jacob Grimm’s own work. Nevertheless, sooner or later questionnaires became an essential component of the study of folklore in many countries and contexts – e.g. in the 19th-century work of Willhelm Mannhardt across Europe (see Dundes 1999: 15–19), in the mid-19th-century Russian Empire (Knight 1998), in the Atlas of German folklore (Schmoll 2009), in the work of the Irish Folklore Commission (Briody 2007), and so on.¹ Although questionnaires were in use for much of the 20th century, the growth of self-reflection in ethnographic disciplines in general has resulted in their replacement by ethnographic methods, which allow greater subjectivity to informants and researchers alike.

If we adopt the differentiation between methodologies and methods offered by Sonja Peterson-Lewis in the present volume, then it can be claimed that as a method, questionnaires highlight the methodologies of researchers. Despite the abundance of question-marks that adorn such questionnaires, many of their biases can easily be exposed. Precisely because such shortcomings are so transparent, ethnographic questionnaires offer an excellent point of departure for anyone interested in folklore methods in general. Evidently *such question-*

¹ A detailed survey of folklore questionnaires was offered by Fein Reishtein (1968), who considered them a “fieldwork technique”.

naires prescribe the knowledge they seek to document; they are clearly not lenses or procedures that help us to get to know the lore of the folk ‘out there’.

In what follows, I review various questionnaires that were used in the study of Jewish folklore, demonstrating the way such questionnaires constructed different ‘lores’ and different ‘folks’. I point to some problems that arise from questionnaires by examining a single historical controversy about one of them. Finally, I use this historical examination to consider broader questions concerning the nature of folkloristic methods, questioning assumptions of a single (folkloric) reality.

There is no single definition of what a questionnaire is (or a survey as it is also known); they have appeared in journals asking readers to tell of specific traditions and customs they know about, typically according to specific themes; alternatively, questionnaires were distributed among specific people; in other cases they were used in specific institutions, guiding scholars who ventured to remote places, facilitating their inquiries into the peculiar customs and traditions that they encountered. Despite their name, many questionnaires are not made up of questions, but rather they offer a certain taxonomy that organizes the collection of data.

While Jewish folklore *per se* was institutionalized by Max Grunwald, who in 1896 sent an ethnographic questionnaire to a number of Jewish newspapers, it is worthwhile to begin with the work of Friedrich S. Krauss, whose work has been discussed by several scholars (Burt 1990; Daxelmüller 1994; Warneken 2001). Krauss was one of the key folklorists in the German-speaking sphere. His folkloristic project was manifested in the journals he edited in the 1890s in Vienna – *Am Urquell* (or: *Der Urquell*). Although Krauss grew up in a Jewish family (in Požega, today in Croatia), his folkloristic enterprise was based on universalistic ideals; that is, Krauss was not interested in harnessing folklore to Jewish (or other) national projects. Instead, Krauss published many articles he received from various parts of Europe and beyond, which he presented in a comparative manner. Among them, numerous articles referred to certain genres of folklore documented among Jews (e.g. proverbs of Jews from Galizia). Krauss’ ‘global folklore’ was especially well established in his comparative questionnaires (*Umfrage*). Since these were not comprehensive in any way, they directed his readers to restricted cultural domains. Thus, his first published survey related to “secret languages” (*Geheime Sprachweisen*). After explaining the use of such languages and noting that he himself had already collected a number of examples from Germans and “South-Slavs”, Krauss called on his readers to contribute further examples of secret languages. Indeed, many readers responded with

answers that were published periodically in the journal volumes. By publishing a number of examples sent by different scholars from various geographical contexts *together*, Krauss de-emphasized the specificity of each case. In this context, when Benjamin Bonyhady from Budapest mentioned a secret language that had been in use sixty years previously in the *Talmud Tora* (religious-Jewish primary school) of his hometown, Bonyhád (published in *Am Urquell* 2 [1892]: 23), folklore of Jews appeared alongside the folklore of many other groups. This served Krauss' agenda of denying Jewish folklore (or for that matter any other regional or national folklore) a place as a *separate* subject-matter that should or could be studied individually.

The first questionnaire in the history of Jewish folklore should be examined with the backdrop of Krauss' many specific *Umfragen*. Jewish folklore was constructed for the first time in a questionnaire-form by Rabbi Dr. Max Grunwald, who established Das Comité Henry-Jones Loge für jüdische Volkskunde in Hamburg. Grunwald's questionnaire (*Fragebogen*) was the first step in the establishment of a scholarly enterprise devoted to Jewish folklore.² In the introduction to this questionnaire, modernity was viewed by him as a threat to the individuality of folklore (*Volkstum*). Grunwald's call to collect objects and to answer questions was presented as an attempt to salvage Jewish folklore by collecting *data*. His questionnaire did not include any questions. Instead, Grunwald sketched a map of the newly formed field by introducing categories that Jewish folklore collectors should work with as they collected and sent material back to the folkloristic 'headquarters' in Hamburg. His primary categorization included: 'onomastics and dialect', 'literature', 'belief and legend', 'tradition and custom', 'augury, magic and folk-medicine', 'house-building and folk-costume'; each of these categories was divided into detailed sub-categories, e.g. the category of 'literature' included children's rhymes, songs connected with the annual cycle, wedding-songs, tales, anecdotes, riddles, epigrams, epigraphs on houses, and so on. Much of the material sent to Grunwald appeared in the first issues of the *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für jüdische Volkskunde*, which he edited himself almost without interruption until 1929. When his newly formed society for Jewish folklore was better established and his network of scholars stabilized, his editorial orientation changed: instead of relying on 'raw' material that was sent by people who reacted to his questionnaire (in a similar fashion to Krauss' work, with the small and important difference that all such data was

² Grunwald's scholarly oeuvre was discussed especially in some of the works of Christopher Daxelmüller (see Daxelmüller 2010 and works there cited), as well as by other authors (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1989; Schatz 2004; Staudinger 2010).

marked as Jewish), Grunwald collected complete articles from experts in the various sub-fields that he defined in his original questionnaire.

The differences between Grunwald's engagement with Jewish identity and those of Krauss's universalistic enterprise are manifested in the different ways in which they used questionnaires: while Grunwald addressed Jews by constructing a comprehensive questionnaire that could guide them in their first steps in the world of folklore, Krauss addressed folklore-enthusiasts everywhere, guiding them to new issues and themes that cut-across diverse people from different regions.

Other folkloristic questionnaires that engaged with Jewish folklore were soon established in other places. Many followed Grunwald in their emphasis of scientific categorization, although they offered different criteria and emphases. The closest to Grunwald's taxonomy was the questionnaire of the Jewish section of the Swiss Folklore Society from 1917 (see Guggenheim-Grünberg 1964).

Much more influential than the Swiss folklorists was the group of leading Zionists and Hebrew revivalists that were active in Odessa (Russia) – Alter Druyanow, Haim Nahman Bialik and Yehushua Hanna Ravnitski. They set forth a folkloristic agenda of their own. Although different in content, their questionnaire of 1914 was formulated in a similar way to that of Grunwald's in its emphasis on genres and its lack of question-marks. As in Grunwald's case (in the first volumes of the *Mitteilungen*) the Hebrew questionnaire was a chain in the process of *publication* (in volumes titled *Reshumot*). Here again the actual publication was hardly connected to raw material sent to the editors according to the questionnaire. The main reason for that was the extremely selective agenda of the Hebrew editors, who could not follow their own program for documenting Jewish folk-life in all its manifestations. The Hebrew revivalist choice meant that raw material in vernacular Jewish languages such as Yiddish or Ladino had to be filtered and translated (typically into extremely poetic Hebrew) to meet their over-arching political purpose. This stands in sharp contrast to the most important questionnaire of the inter-war period, the one formulated by the Yiddish Institute of Science (YIVO, founded in Vilnius in 1925), which, as in the case of the questionnaires by Grunwald, the Swiss Folklore Society and the Hebraists, was also concerned with genres. This questionnaire addressed collectors across what I. N. Gottesman called (2003) "the Yiddish Nation". YIVO's folkloristic work constructed a folkloristic depository that was based on data sent by enthusiastic collectors whose main knowledge of what folklore might be was based on the questionnaire itself. YIVO's ideology emphasized the vitality of the Yiddish vernacular and so the collection of every piece of *data* fulfilled

their goals. For them, the questionnaire was particularly fruitful, as *Zamlers* ['collectors'] all around the Yiddish speaking world could send in folkloristic material that was then stored in YIVO's archives in Vilnius until the Nazi occupation of the city. (Parts of these archives were later transferred to New York.)

One can meticulously point to the different categories established by Grunwald, the Swiss initiative, the Hebraists of Odessa and the Yiddishists of YIVO. Clearly, ideological differences concerning Jewish modernity are reflected in such categorizations. Despite such important differences, it is important to note that they all shared the logic of following *scientific* categories.

In contrast to such folkloristic efforts, the most extraordinary questionnaire to be conceived in the context of Jewish folklore was undoubtedly Sh. Ansky's "Jewish Ethnographic Program" which was the focus of a recently published book-length study (Deutsch 2011). The "Program" was comprised of a whole volume that related to the Jewish life-cycle – from birth-rites to death-rites. It included 2,087 questions that were written by the members of the ethnographic expedition that Ansky led to the Jewish towns of Podolya and Vohlyna in the Pale of Settlement of the Russian Empire between 1912 and 1914.³ It was eventually compiled by Ansky and the well-known Russian anthropologist, Leo Shternberg, with the intention of distributing it throughout the Pale. Many of the questions were formulated as 'yes'/'no' questions or referred to very specific phenomena, which did not leave much room for imagination: e.g. "Is there a belief that eating 'nut-twins' leads to the birth of twins?"; "What is said when a child yawns?". Indeed as Nathaniel Deutsch notes, the Program "is one of the most detailed and revealing portraits of Jewish personhood in Eastern Europe that we possess from the early twentieth century" (Deutsch 2011: 72). With the outbreak of the war, it was never distributed and its questions remained unanswered, yet since its compilation paralleled the expedition, many of the questions guided its work, and the outcomes of the expedition cannot be separated from the long process of its composition.

It is important to note that whereas the taxonomy of the previous questionnaires echoed different views of the *science* of folklore by relating to genres or types of folklore, Ansky's questions *prima facie* followed the logic of Jewish life

³ Ansky's expedition, which included a painter, a musical recorder, and a photographer, was launched in 1912–13. Ansky himself began as a 'Narodnik' and was an active member of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party in Russia. His work has been discussed by a number of scholars (Roskies 1992; Safran & Zipperstein 2006; Spinner 2010) and his biography was recently published by Safran (2010). As Noy has already noted (1982), the ethnographic questionnaire was composed by Leo Shternberg, one of the fathers of Russian anthropology. Ansky's questionnaire appeared recently in translation with annotations alongside a detailed account of the context of its composition (Deutsch 2011).

per se; his categorization did not necessitate much folkloristic knowledge, but rather an intimate knowledge of Jewish life. Notably, Ansky's questions related to customs by mixing genres to the point that scientific categories and genres were blurred.

Before going any further, it may be fruitful to pause and reflect on the aforementioned questionnaires. So far, I have referred briefly to six different questionnaires:

- Krauss
- Grunwald and the Hamburg Society
- The Jewish section of the SGV
- The Hebrew revivalists of Odessa
- The Yiddishists of YIVO in Vilnius
- Ansky's expedition

It is possible to think of these questionnaires as a folkloristic method that ran out of scientific prestige, yet what does it mean to consider them a method? Is it a kind of method that helps one to arrive at a certain truth that is out there? If it is so, should one expect to find a 'good' method and a 'bad' one? At least this is what one typically implies in discussions of methods – the former would arrive at better 'results' than the latter. In other words, a good folkloristic survey would help representing the folklore one is after. However, despite the brevity of my presentation of some examples of questionnaires from the beginning of the 20th century in the area of Jewish folklore, evidently it is very hard to relate to them as methods in such a manner. Following John Law's radical critique of methods in social science (and in science in general) it is clear that the "in-there-ness" of folkloristic procedure is connected to the "out-there-ness" of Jewish folklore (Law 2004). It seems quite obvious that the type of Jewish folklore documented by Grunwald or Ansky did not precede their own activities. It is possible to consider some questions as biased or criticize the shortcomings of each of the taxonomies, but this direction hardly advances our understanding of method. I would like to argue that once such questionnaires are examined in relation to the *material procedure* that involves them, it becomes clear that they shape what they document. One can follow Ansky's expedition to 'the field' as they visited small towns in the fringe of the Russian Empire, asking some informants about nuts and twins, writing the answers in a notebook and finally returning to Petersburg claiming to have found 'Jewish folklore'. To be sure, this specific Jewish folklore that Ansky 'found' was to a great extent also *made*

by his own questions, just as much as the folklore ‘discovered’ by Grunwald or by the YIVO folklorists was a product of their respective questionnaires and the material procedures that were connected to them. Indeed, according to Law:

The argument is no longer that methods *discover* and depict realities. Instead, it is that they participate in the *enactment* of those realities. It is also that method is not just a more or less complicated set of procedures or rules, but rather a bundled hinterland. This stretches through skills, instruments and statements (in-here enactments of previous methods) through the out-there realities so described, into a ramifying and indefinite set of relations, places and assumptions that disappear from view. (Law 2004: 45, original emphasis.)

It is important to note that this argument concerning method that I follow, which in itself is based on numerous works and insights drawn from scholars in Science and Technology Studies (STS), does not deny a sense of reality.⁴ That is, I am not trying to claim that Jewish folklore is made up in the *minds* of a Grunwald or an Ansky. Rather, my argument is that their questionnaires take part in the realities they describe. A folkloristic method, as it is understood here, is bundled with different realities, which one typically (and wrongly, I think) views separately – the lore of the folk(lorists) and the lore of the (Jewish) folk:

Method always works not simply by detecting but also by amplifying a reality. The absent hinterlands of the real are re-crafted – and then they are there, patterned and patterning, resonating for the next enactment of the real. (Law 2004: 116, original emphasis.)

Such a claim can be better understood by examining one last questionnaire from the history of Jewish folklore. In this case, controversies concerning the realities that questionnaires partake in are clearly visible.

Bernhard Heller was an important folklorist active in Europe in the 1920s–1930s. As a student in the rabbinical seminary of Budapest (adjunct to the university), he was a scholar of Jewish Studies and Oriental Studies (notably, he studied under one of the most important Orientalists of his day, Ignaz Goldziher). His folkloristic passion, which was related to his teachers’ influence, is manifested in his participation in one of the better known works of comparative folkloristics, the *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm*, which was edited by Johannes Bolte and Jiří Polívka.⁵ It was this reputation of Heller’s that may explain why he was approached by the Palestine Historical and Ethnographical Society (PHES), who asked him to

⁴ This is a claim that is sometimes leveled at STS scholars as it is described by Bruno Latour, perhaps the major spokesperson of Actor-Network-Theory (together with John Law and Michel Callon). In fact, Latour was approached by a friend who asked him if he believed in reality, which Latour answered in a whole book that provides answers to the kind of reality Latour believes in (Latour 1999). This was also discussed in his later work (Latour 2005).

⁵ For more about Heller as a folklorist, see Hasan-Rokem 2011.

contribute an article on the study of Jewish folklore. His programmatic essay, "The Duties of Jewish Folklore and Ethnography in General and in the Holy Land Specifically" was published in this society's journal in Hebrew in 1930. In it, Heller tried to transfer folkloristic methods from Europe to Palestine, translating territorial notions that were common in Europe, making them available to folklorists in Palestine. The article consisted of a comprehensive questionnaire which was explicitly based on a draft of a questionnaire that was composed as part of the *Atlas der deutschen Volkskunde* (provided to Heller by his friend Bolte). Thus, some of the detailed questions in Heller's questionnaire related to the house's furniture, jewelry, clothes, crafts and so forth, topics that at the time did not take a central place in the study of Jewish folklore. Indeed, this questionnaire was not seen favourably by some folklorists: Shlomo Shapira, a folklorist in these circles, wrote the PHES a letter in which he criticized Heller's work: "the classification of the author is not suitable for a Jewish questionnaire as our folk's creativity is spiritual and not material".⁶ Instead, Shapira suggested using Ansky's questionnaire, adapting it with the aid of the YIVO questionnaire and the one Grunwald had composed many years before. Evidently, Shapira was particularly influenced by Ansky's work, which shared the same view of the spiritual essence of the Jewish folk.⁷

This specific controversy on what one typically considers a folkloristic method is important for the present discussion because it makes the connection between *in-there* realities and *out-there* realities manifest: what was Shapira criticizing? Was Heller to blame for not using a method correctly? Alternatively, was Shapira to blame for misunderstanding the role of the ethnographic questionnaires? Was it a controversy on the nature of Jewish folklore? I think one can safely claim that Heller and Shapira referred to very different 'realities'. The source of the controversy in this case was not methodological (in the way one typically understands method – that is, as a way to bring us to a certain truth). Heller did not view 'the Jewish folk' in the same way Shapira did. For Heller, the type of furniture one used in day-to-day life was part of Jewish folk-culture; his questionnaire helped him construct the reality he was interested in. With his questionnaire, Heller attempted to make some realities present, but at the same time, as Shapira was quick to grasp, Heller enacted absent realities – notably his emphasis on furniture – and provincialized spiritual realities that, for Shapira, were crucial in a discussion of Jewish folklore. As many scholars who focused

⁶ Undated letter: The Israeli Historical Society Archives, IHS/40a.

⁷ See Ansky's text on "Jewish Ethnopoetics" which appeared in English with notes and remarks by Bar-Itzhak (2010).

on the history of folklore show there are various meta-narratives that underlie the way folklore as a subject-matter has been constructed: devolutionary or evolutionary assumptions (Dundes 1969; Wilson 1976), a commitment to notions of authenticity (Bendix 1997) and the preference of certain voices over others (Bauman & Briggs 2003). All of these discussions demonstrate the commitment of folklore scholarship to a metaphysical model of singularity: in the present case, the idea that there is *one true* version of a Jewish folk and that 'Jewish folklore' marks a *single reality*, an idea that must have been assumed by Heller and Shapira. Importantly, this controversy does not revolve around the *way* to arrive at a singular reality. By relating to the multiple realities that Heller and Shapira sought after, I do not want to suggest that their realities were set apart like two islands that do not share their respective relative worlds. This is a point that was emphasized by Law:

If we attend to practice we tend to discover multiplicity ... We discover multiplicity, *but not pluralism*. ... It does not imply that reality is fragmented. Instead it implies that the different realities *overlap and interfere with one another*. (Law 2004: 61.)

According to Law, the insistence on singularity is taken for granted in Euro-American metaphysics. Since I live in Jerusalem, I would question such a stable geographical marking, but with this reservation in mind, I suggest thinking of metaphysical assumptions in discussion of methods. When it comes to folkloristic practices, it may be advisable to investigate *what we do* and *how we do it* in relation to Euro-American metaphysics. What kind of metaphysical assumptions become involved in a discussion of folkloristic methods? Again, I am not referring here to 'biases' (national, racial, gender or others) that 'distort' our quest for reality, but rather I would like to scrutinize reality itself: what do we mean when we think of 'reality'? More modestly, what do we mean when we think of folklore as a reality? What happens after we 'clean' our 'folkloristic machine' and get rid of all such distortions; let us say, after we find the 'best methods' to help us in our *representations* of folklore, then what? Are we committed to a sense of a folkloric singularity? If we think the answer to such a question is positive, then indeed sound folkloristic methods are our cure and perhaps we should devote much time and space to methodological debates. However, I have (metaphysical) doubts concerning the belief that folklore marks a certain (singular) real phenomenon 'out there'. If – as I tried to show – what we do as folklorists 'interferes' with the realities we describe in our accounts, then I don't see any reason to assume that reality is singular. A similar approach was recently offered by Charles Briggs (2012), who emphasizes multiple 'communicable' models and

cartographies that claim to chart cultural forms of production, circulation, and reception. I tried to examine ethnographic questionnaires, a format which used to be considered as a reasonable folkloristic method, because they can help us reflect on this point. I still believe questionnaires can help us in the construction of certain realities, though I have doubts if such realities are *desired*, but in that sense they are not that different from any other ‘novel’ folkloristic method. My purpose here was not to deconstruct them as a reasonable method in folklore studies, but rather to discuss them because they reflect the kind of metaphysical baggage we carry when we think of ‘folkloristic method’ more broadly. John Law’s work on method can help elucidate what we do and can offer a certain perspective on what we *should* do. Law referred to “ontological politics”; instead of method he suggested what he called “method-assemblage” – “the continuing process of *crafting and enacting necessary boundaries between presence, manifest absence and Otherness*” (Law 2004: 144).

Folklore may craft worlds we would like to share with others, but at the same time, as chapters in the history of the discipline show, it may make our world unbearable. Thus, when it comes to choices between folkloristic methods, choices regarding what we should do and how, such choices are between different realities.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Regina Bendix, Galit Hasan-Rokem and Amos Noy, who offered many fruitful suggestions when I discussed some ideas for this paper with them. In addition, important comments were offered to me by the editors and reviewers of this publication.

Works Cited

- BAR-ITZHAK, H. 2010. *Pioneers of Jewish Ethnography and Folkloristics in Eastern Europe*. Trans. L. Schramm. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC.
- BAUMAN, R. & C. L. BRIGGS 2003. *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BEN-AMOS, D. 1989. “Foreword”. In *Nordic Folklore: Recent Studies*. R. Kvideland & H. K. Sehmsdorf. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. Pp. vii–x.
- BENDIX, R. 1997. *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- BRIGGS, C. 2012. “What We Should Have Learned from Américo Paredes: The Politics of Communicability and the Making of Folkloristics”. *Journal of American Folklore* 125: 91–110.
- BRIODY, M. 2007. *The Irish Folklore Commission 1935–1970: History, Ideology, Methodology*. Studia Fennica Folkloristica 17. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

- BURT, R. L. 1990. *Friedrich Salomo Krauss (1859–1938): Selbstzeugnisse und Materialien zur Bibliographie des Volkskundlers, Literaten und Sexualforschers mit einem Nachlassverzeichnis*. Wien: Verlag der Oesterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- DAXELMÜLLER, C. 1994. "Friedrich Salomo Krauss (Salomon Friedrich Kraus[s]) (1859–1938)". In *Völkische Wissenschaft: Gestalten und Tendenzen der deutschen und österreichischen Volkskunde in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Ed. Wolfgang Jacobeit, Hannjost Lixfeld & Olaf Bockhora. Wien: Böhlau. Pp. 87–114.
- 2010. "Hamburg, Wien Jerusalem: Max Grunwald und die Entwicklung der jüdische Volkskunde zur Kulturwissenschaft 1898 bis 1938". *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 113: 375–393.
- DEUTSCH, N. 2011. *The Jewish Dark Continent: Life and Death in the Russian Pale of Settlement*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- DUNDES, A. 1969. "The Devolutionary Premise in Folklore Theory". *Journal of the Folklore Institute* 6(1): 5–19.
- 1999. *International Folkloristics: Classic Contributions by the Founders of Folklore*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- FEIN REISSTEIN, E. 1968. "Bibliography on Questionnaires as a Folklife Fieldwork Technique". *Keystone Folklore Quarterly* 13: 45–69, 121–166, 219–232.
- GOTTESMAN, I. N. 2003. *Defining the Yiddish Nation: The Jewish Folklorists of Poland*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- GUGGENHEIM-GRÜNBERG, F. 1964. "Eduard Hoffman-Krayer und die jüdische Volkskunde". *Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde* 60: 133–140.
- HASAN-ROKEM, G. 2011. "Ancient Jewish Folk Literature: The Legends of the Jews and Comparative Folklore Studies at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century". *Jewish Studies* 70: 57–75.
- KIRSHENBLATT-GIMBLETT, B. 1989. "Problems in the Early History of Jewish Folkloristics". In *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Jerusalem. Pp. 21–32.
- KNIGHT, N. 1998. "Science, Empire and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845–1855". In *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*. Ed. J. Burbank & D. L. Ransel. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- LATOUR, B. 1999. *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LAW, J. 2004. *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- NOY, D. 1982. "The Place of Sh. Ansky in Jewish Folkloristics". *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore* 2: 94–107.
- ROSKIES, D. 1992. "S. Ansky and the Paradigm of Return". In *The Uses of Tradition: Jewish Continuity in the Modern Era*. Ed. J. Wertheimer. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Pp. 243–260.
- SAFRAN, G. 2010. *Wandering Soul: The Dybbuk's Creator, S. An-sky*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- SAFRAN, G. & S. J. ZIPPERSTEIN (eds.) 2006. *The Worlds of S. An-sky: A Russian Jewish Intellectual at the Turn of the Century*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- SCHATZ, C. 2004. "'Angewandte Volkskunde': Die 'Gesellschaft für jüdische Volkskunde' in Hamburg". *Vokus: Volkskundlich-Kulturwissenschaftliche Schriften* 14(1–2): 121–134.