KOSMAS

N° 21.2

by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU)

KOSMAS ISSN 1056-005X

Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal
(Formerly *Kosmas: Journal of Czechoslovak and Central European Studies*, Vols. 1-7, 1982-88, and *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal*, Vols. 8-11, 1989-93).

Kosmas is a peer-reviewed, multidisciplinary journal that focuses on Czech, Slovak, and Central European Studies. It is published bi-annually by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (SVU).

Subscription orders and inquiries and address changes should be sent to Frank Safertal, Subscriptions Editor, at 5529 Whitley Park Terrace, Bethesda, MD 20814, USA Tel: 301-564-9081 Fax: 301-564-9069, E-mail address: <ojsafertal@comcast.net>. Checks should be made out to "SVU." In the US and Canada, an individual one-year subscription to Kosmas is $27.00 ($22.00 for current members of the SVU, $33.00 for libraries and other institutions). In Europe, the rates are $30.00 ($25.00 for SVU members, $36.00 for institutions). For other international subscribers, the rates are $32.00, $27.00, and $35.00, respectively.

Manuscript submissions, books for review, and correspondence concerning editorial matters should be sent to Clinton Machann, Editor, *Kosmas*, Department of English, 4227 TAMU, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4227, USA. E-mail address: <c-machann @tamu.edu>. Fax: 979-862-2292. Requirements and stylistic guidelines for manuscript submissions are given on the inside back cover. Please send manuscripts for book reviews or suggestions for books to be reviewed to Mary Hrabík Šámal, Book Review Editor, *Kosmas*, 2130 Babcock, Troy, MI 48084. E-mail address: <maruska@earthlink.net>.

Kosmas website: http://www-english.tamu.edu/pubs/kosmas

Printed by Tops Printing, 2023 S. Texas Avenue, Bryan, TX 77802

CONTENTS

Editor's Notes

International scholars with an interest in Czech research in various fields within the sciences and humanities often have questions about the prestigious Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and its relationship to the former Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. We believe that our opening article by Václav Pačes, who has been President of the Academy since 2005, will be welcomed by many readers who want to know more about the history and the current organization and activities of this important institution. In addition to his leadership and executive roles through the years, the author's own contributions to science in the field of genetics are indeed noteworthy, and readers are encouraged to take a look at his short but remarkable biographical sketch in the "Contributors" section at the back of this volume.

Following the Academy article, we offer a cluster of four historical articles related to various aspects of religion. The Queen María in the title of Joseph F. Patrouch's article on "The Coronations of Queen María" was in turn Queen of Bohemia, Queen of the Romans, and Queen of Hungary in the sixteenth century, and her various positions and "bodies," according to Patrouch, "helped reach beyond the religious divisions of Bohemia, providing ties to her relatively tolerant realms in the Holy Roman Empire and Hungary and providing symbolic unity for the kingdom, a court, and patronage." Moving forward in history, Pavel Marek's article on the "Eastern Orthodox Crisis" in the newly -formed Czechoslovak Church in the 1920s focuses on the complicated career of Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd, a priest in the Catholic Modernist Movement who became involved in controversies in the Czechoslovak Church and eventually emerged as bishop of the Czech Orthodox Church. Next comes Charles S. Kraszewski's study of the modern Czech Catholic poet Rio Preisner, who died in Indianola, Pennsylvania, in 2007. Kraszewski, who studied under Preisner at Pennsylvania State University and has translated many of his poems, focuses on the religious poet's sense of real, historical time as reflected in his works. The fourth and final article in this group is Theresie M. West's study of the Unity of the Brethren Church that carries on the tradition of the Czech Brethren in the State of Texas. Founded in 1903 when representatives from eleven independent Texas Czech Protestant congregations decided to unify, the new denomination emphasized its ties to the past by arranging for services to be held in the Czech mother tongue. As a group these articles in our Spring 2008 issue remind us of the sometimes tragic but always complex and interesting religious history of the Czechs and Slovaks.

The first of our three essays is Tracy Burns's discussion of the three-part Slovak novel *The Year of the Frog* by Martin M. Šimečka. Burns points out the different forms of love that enable Milan, the protagonist, to survive a difficult time in this autobiographical novel set in Communist Czechoslovakia in the 1980s. Next is a personal essay composed of anecdotes ("American adventures") by Zdenek Salzmann, illustrating his own process of acculturation after he immigrated to the US from Prague in 1947 and began a new life that would lead him to a career as an American professor of anthropology. Finally, John Tomeček describes an ambitious new program at the University of Texas at Austin designed to study the Czech language as preserved among the dwindling number of native speakers in the state. I know that many readers of our journal will join me in appreciating the enthusiastic efforts of a young scholar

who follows in the footsteps of previous researchers such as Svatava Jakobsonová as he organizes this Texas Czech Dialect Project.

We are pleased to include reviews of books on a variety of topics. Among those reviewed by Jan Klinka, Mary Šámal, Stjepan Mestrovic, Míla Šašková-Pierce, and William Menz in this issue are works by the following authors and editors: Bohuslava Bradbrook, Melissa Feinberg, Paul Robert Magosci, Janoušek Hroznata, Jiří Seidl, Marie Štermberková, Světlana Hanušová, and Petr Najvar.

ARTICLES

The Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic

Václav Pačes

The Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic was established by State Act No. 283/1992 Coll., and began functioning on December 31, 1992, as the Czech successor of the former Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. Currently, the Academy is a network of 53 Institutes based on proven principles of extra-university scientific research. These Institutes have approximately 7,000 employees, more than half of whom are scientists.

The primary mission of the Academy is to carry out, through its Institutes, basic research across a wide range of the natural, technical and social sciences, and the humanities. This research, whether highly specialised or interdisciplinary in nature, aims to advance developments in scientific knowledge at the international level, while also taking into account the specific needs of both Czech society and the national culture. Scientists are also engaged in science education, especially by participating in doctoral study programmes, and in research training of students and postdoctoral fellows, and also by science teaching at institutions of higher learning and at universities. The Academy also collaborates with targeted research and industry. The integration of Czech science into the international context is being promoted by means of numerous joint international research projects and through the exchange of scientists with institutions abroad.

From a historical point of view, the Academy continues to develop the research activities not only of the former Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences but also of a number of its predecessors. The oldest, longest lasting learned society in this country was the Royal Bohemian Learned Society (1784–1952) comprised of the humanities and science. Among its founders were philologist Josef Dobrovský, historian Gelasius Dobner and mathematician and founder of the Prague University Observatory, Josef Stepling. Later, the Learned Society was headed by František Palacký, a historian and prominent public figure on the Czech cultural scene. As early as 1861, Jan Evangelista Purkyně proposed, in his treatise, *Akademia,* the establishment of an autonomous non-university scientific institution encompassing research Institutes representing the main fields of science of that period. This vision of an institution engaged in interdisciplinary research, innovative for his time, was very close to the concept and structure of the present-day Academy.

By the end of the 19th century, nationally differentiated scientific institutions were founded in this country, such as the Czech Academy of Sciences and the Arts (1890–1952) and the Society for Support of German Science, Arts and Literature in Bohemia (1891–1945) and were established nearly simultaneously. The Czech Academy of Sciences and the Arts was founded due to the extraordinary financial donation provided by the Czech architect and builder, Josef Hlávka, who became its first President. The purpose of this institution was to promote Czech science and literature, and to further Czech arts. The most significant achievement of this Academy was its publication enterprises. It also provided scholarships and financial support and, at its instigation, smaller research units arose as well. Its foreign members included D. I. Mendeleev

and M. Curie-Skłodowska.

After an independent Czechoslovak Republic was founded in 1918, other scientific institutions were also established, such as the Masaryk Academy of Labour as well as autonomous state Institutes, such as the Institute of Slavonic Studies, Oriental Institute and the Institute of Archaeology. Extensive international co-operation by Czech research institutions was culminated when they became members of the International Union of Academies and the International Research Council.

The Nazi occupation of Czechoslovakia and World War II (1939–1945) brought a heavy human toll in Czech science and institutions of higher learning, especially universities, in addition to material losses which had long-lasting devastating consequences for their further development in this country.

After the Communist totalitarian regime came to power in Czechoslovakia in 1948, all existing main scientific non-university institutions and learned societies were dissolved and instead the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences was founded (1953–1992) comprising both a complex of research Institutes and a learned society. Although it was subjected to heavy ideological pressure until the fall of this regime in 1989, Czech science was nevertheless able to maintain its creative energy in a number of areas. In addition it was able to find its way in the world scientific community (although there were disparities in the various fields of science at different periods of the regime). This fact, among others, was demonstrated by awarding the Nobel Prize for chemistry to Jaroslav Heyrovský in 1959 and by the worldwide recognition attained by Otto Wichterle for his discovery of contact lenses. Worthy of singular mention, among other outstanding representatives of Czech science who worked at the Academy in the past, are mathematician Eduard Čech, theoretical physicist Václav Votruba, geophysicist Vít Kárník, physiologist Vilém Laufberger, and philosopher and co-author of Charter 77, Jan Patočka.

The Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic today (http://www.cas.cz, http://www.avcr.cz) is the result of a series of transformational steps and structural changes. The first radical changes started immediately after November 1989. The Academy was freed from state regimentation of its research activity. By dissolving the corps of academicians, the Academy also relinquished its function as a learned society and, consequently, concentrated more properly on its research work. The internal democratisation also brought about a complete change of directors of individual Institutes. At present, Institute directors are appointed on the basis of a search procedure. The thematic and methodological direction of research was considerably changed in scientific disciplines which were earlier strongly warped ideologically. The research staffs of the Academy were substantially reduced through the release of almost half of its employees and by abolishing a number of Institutes.

The Academy was the first institution in the Czech Republic to establish its own grant agency, thus introducing the principle of competition for the financial support of individual research projects. The new character of the Academy was reflected in the Act on the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic of May 1992 and also in the first Statutes of the Academy approved by the Government in August 1993.

The structure of the Academy (http://www.cas.cz/en/structure.php) and its Institutes takes into account changes resulting from recently adopted acts, the most important of which is Act No. 341/2005 Coll., on public research

institutions and the full version of the Act on the Academy of Sciences announced in the Collection of Acts of the Czech Republic under No. 420/2005 Coll. These Acts are reflected also in the new Statutes of the Academy approved by the Government of the Czech Republic in May 2006 (resolution of the Government No. 614) and in a collection of legal, organizational and economic measures ensuring the transformation of the legal status of Academy Institutes from the state contributory organisation to public research institutions.

The most important results of the process of transformational changes in the structure of the Academy are summarized as follows:

- There is a rigorous separation of functions and responsibilities of the Academy bodies, of which the Academy Assembly is the ASCR's highest self-governing body, whereas the Academy Council discharges the governing and executive duties and the Council for Sciences is responsible for conceptual responsibilities. The Supervisory Committee is an independent control body engaged in the evaluation of research results. Representatives of science from universities and from other areas of public life (except the Academy Council) are also extensively involved in all these bodies.
- Research Institutes of the Academy achieved the status of basic scientific and organizational units endowed with legal subjectivity, internal autonomy and the responsibility for setting and implementing their research objectives. Since 1 January 2007, this position has been considerably strengthened by the transformation of Academy Institutes into public research institutions which better enables them to accomplish research tasks and the needs of cooperation in research and development at both the national level, especially co-operation with universities, and also at the international level.
- The structure of the Academy has been completed; the Academy Institutes are grouped into nine scientific sections according to their research programmes. The sections do not form an integral organizational interlink but they participate in the formation of concepts of individual scientific disciplines and in the coordination of activities of the Academy Institutes aimed at strengthening their interdisciplinary cooperation.
- On the basis of the first evaluation made from 1992–1993, 18 research institutes and four service institutes were terminated. In 2006, further restructuralisation measures reduced the number from the original 88 Institutes to 53. The number of employees of the Academy has also been reduced to a little more than half the number on staff in 1989.
- Regular qualification audits of all creative research workers were introduced at the Academy Institutes. Due to this measure, 80% of these workers obtained a working contract for a maximum of 5 years. Positions of creative research workers are filled only on the basis of a selection procedure.
- The Academy has introduced qualitatively new and internationally proven methods for the evaluation of Institutes, first by an independent Academy Evaluation Committee, later by three commissions for

assessment of research objectives involving reviewers invited from abroad. All research Institutes of the Academy are regularly subject to this evaluation procedure and the outcome of the evaluation serves as a basis for structural and thematic changes in the Institutes. Within the Academy framework they are used in the allocation of financial means and for conceptual considerations. In 2005, the evaluation was performed of research objectives pursued in 1999–2004. Above all, the evaluation commissions reported that the results of these research objectives were excellent and on an international level, and recommended that financing of all proposed research objectives be continued. In 2005, implementation of 63 new research objectives for the period ending 2010 began.

The activity of the Academy is governed by the concept of advancing research and development based on the principle of scientific freedom and responsibility applied both at individual Institutes and throughout the entire Academy. The criterion of the world proves that free competition of researchers to attain a priority in research in a given discipline motivates their efforts incalculably and leads to the best outcome. The purpose of this free competition is to support top level research, facilitate the formation of new research directions, and influence the structure of research disciplines. This concept is related to institutional financing and sophisticated changes in the structure of Institutes.

The Academy also plays a role in the management of research and education by means of the membership of its researchers in domestic and foreign learned societies, editorial boards of international journals, various governmental committees, off-Academy scientific committees, scientific boards of universities and evaluation committees.

In 2006, the Academy established a new tool for support of scientific excellence at the Academy, namely, the Praemium Academiae, its purpose being to support outstanding scientists working at the top research level, and reflecting favourably on the Academy and Czech science.

The concept for the advancement of research and development in the ASCR is regularly updated. The currently valid conceptual document defines the thematic profile of research in the Academy and, at the same time, it establishes mechanisms for its continuous improvement. It stems from documents relating to national science policies (*see National Research and Development Policy in the Czech Republic for the Years 2004–2008, The Czech Republic's National Innovation Policy for the Years 2005–2010*) and other documents approved by the government and concerning research and development in this country or resulting from the Czech Republic's membership in the European Union. Within the framework of these documents, the *National Research Programme* is currently being implemented. The Academy announces competition for the programmes *Information Society* and the *Support Programmes*, the implementation of Academy Assembly resolutions and the observance of the approved budget of the Academy.

Bodies of the Academy are elected always for a four-year term. A significant position in the Academy bodies is assumed by the President of the Academy who is authorized to act on behalf of the Academy in all matters relating to the Academy. Pursuant to the new Statutes, the President, following

his/her election by members of the Academy Assembly and deliberation thereupon by the government, shall be appointed to his/her position by the President of the Czech Republic.

The Academy Assembly is the supreme self-governing body of the Academy; its composition is replaced every four years and it meets at least twice a year. Two-thirds of its membership is comprised of representatives of the entire Academy Institutes, and the remaining one-third is formed by representatives of universities, the state administration and by other outstanding public figures. The Assembly takes decisions on fundamental issues of the structure and activities of the Academy, adopts the Statutes of the Academy, approves the budget and the distribution of funds, discusses and approves the closing accounts and the annual report on the activities of the Academy, approves the establishment, merger, integration, partition and dissolution of Academy Institutes. It adopts a proposal to appoint the President of the Academy, elects members of the Council for Sciences and determines the basic conceptual directions of the activities of these bodies. The Supervisory Committee of the Academy Assembly reviews and checks the activities of the Academy and its governing bodies; it oversees compliance with the Statutes of the Academy, the implementation of the Academy Assembly resolutions and the observance of the approved budget of the Academy.

The Academy Council is the executive body of the Academy that submits to the Academy Assembly reports and proposals, and implements its resolutions. In addition, it manages the day-to-day activities of the Academy and establishes direction for its international cooperation. For individual specialized areas of its activities, the Academy Council establishes numerous auxiliary and advisory bodies composed of experienced scientific and scientific-organizational workers.

The Council for Sciences encompasses outstanding scientists of Academy Institutes, universities and other research institutions and deals in particular with matters pertaining to formulating and implementing the science policy of the Academy, expresses opinions on conceptual matters of research work and awards the scientific degree "Doctor of Science" (DSc.). The Committee for Scientific Integrity in the Academy performs its work within the framework of the Council for Sciences; it is composed of renowned scientists who demonstrate high moral standards, and has developed the Code of Ethics for Researchers of the Academy, on the basis of which it resolves individual cases of the breach of ethical rules.

The profound transformational changes performed in the Academy have also affected the economic area. The activity of the Academy is financed primarily from institutional and targeted funds of the state budget of the Czech Republic, and, to a lesser extent, from extra budgetary resources (i.e., from grants and projects of international and private organizations and from the income generated by its own economic activities). Money obtained from the state budget represents approximately 81% of the Academy funds (about 67% come from its own separate budget, about 14% are from the other resources). The remaining 19% are obtained from extra budgetary resources.

The Academy Institutes are financed in accordance with respective laws and regulations of the internal financial and salary policies of the Academy, and in compliance with the National Research and Development Policy and the Concept of Research and Development of the Academy.

A prevailing amount (about 76%) of subsidies received from the state budget is institutional funds, of which 81% are non-investment funds for financing institutional research objectives and assure the research and development infrastructure. Results of an independent evaluation of the Institutes are the main tool for the differentiated distribution to Academy Institutes. Investment institutional funds for instrument equipment, reconstruction and construction of objects are allotted to Institutes predominantly on the basis of internal competition between Institutes seeking the effective use of the still insufficient funds.

Targeted funds from the state budget are obtained by Institutes through public competition for support of grant research projects dealing with basic research (the Czech Science Foundation and the Grant Agency of the ASCR) and for support of projects of specialised programmes usually focused on a certain area of oriented research.

Although the amount of money from the state budget of the Czech Republic for support of research and development has increased year by year, its relative share in the gross domestic product has, however, been stagnating at a level of 0.55% for several years. This determines the level of the funding of the Academy to the research expenditure of which approximately one-quarter of this amount is apportioned.

During the process of these changes, the Academy has considerably extended its cooperation with universities. More than a third of the creative scientists of the Academy are engaged in science teaching at institutions of higher learning and universities. Young people aspiring to be researchers participate in research training carried out by Academy Institutes that are accredited for doctoral study programmes. Annually more than 2,000 students are engaged in doctoral study programmes at Academy Institutes, and about 250 foreign students are also scientifically trained here. The number of joint research units established between the Academy and universities continues to increase; at present, there are more than 50 of them. Of great importance is the cooperation of Academy Institutes with universities in solving research projects supported by joint grants. Currently, these represent one-third of all grant projects undertaken at Academy Institutes. All these activities are considered to be the most important tasks of the Academy, facilitating it to rejuvenate its scientific staffs and enhance the level of study, for example, at newly established universities located outside Prague.

In accordance with the adopted concept, the Academy devotes a great deal of attention to the fostering and the professional preparation of youth studying to be researchers also through the Junior Programme of the Academy, initiated in 2002. The Junior Programme involves numerous activities focusing on the support of promising young researchers and on creating better conditions for their work. In the first place, this Programme involves public competition for junior research grant projects announced by the Academy's Grant Agency. This programme is aimed at researchers to age 35, the conditions of which are adapted to the possibilities of and designed for the needs of young research workers. A short-term internal support of the "starting projects" helps assure financial support covering the initial period of research activities which are exceptional because of their time urgency, innovative contents or social significance. The main target group of the support is young research workers who are completing their doctoral studies or return from professional practice

abroad and who, during this interim period, need help until they have applied for a standard research grant or for other common forms of financial support of research. Within the Junior Programme, those young researchers who have achieved remarkable scientific results are awarded the Otto Wichterle Premium; in 2004, this Programme has been extended to include the J. E. Purkyně Fellowship for excellent promising research workers. The purpose of these measures is to attract to the Academy top-ranking creative scientists from abroad and to maintain them by creating better or above standard conditions.

A substantial promise of great importance for the future is construction of Academy "starting flats" for young prospective research workers geared to their needs and for improving their life situations.

Although the research activity of the Academy is directed predominantly to basic research, technologically progressive innovative results are also achieved. For this reason, the Academy cooperates with important industrial enterprises and the entrepreneurial sector. Since 1995, the Technology Centre of the ASCR together with other Academy Institutes has supported small-sized innovation firms involved in research programmes of the Academy.

Cooperation of the Academy with regions and the state administration has produced positive results. One example is the cooperation with the Regional Association of Municipalities in the region of Orlice or with the Pardubice District which has made a considerable contribution to both research and to direct utilization of the results of this joint effort for the needs of the region. Every year, Academy Institutes prepare several hundred expert opinions and analyses determined for the user sector including the state and territorial self-governing bodies as well as administration institutions of the EU. Academy Institutes engaged in the social sciences and the humanities also participate extensively in these activities.

For popularisation of science results, the Academy uses all available forms of media and its own Internet pages, through its Council for Science Popularisation (http://press.avcr.cz). The Academy presents its activities also in its monthly Academy Bulletin. The "Week of Science and Technology" is arranged every year within the framework of the "European Science Week" and attracts unusually keen interest in the general public. Within its scope, lectures are delivered for students and the public as a whole. Exhibitions are arranged as well as presentations of new publications and scientific cafes with researchers of the Academy and from abroad. An important part of this event is "Days of Open Doors" of individual Institutes of the Academy, which are very popular with the public. On "Researchers' Night," which is a science popularisation event, announced by the European Commission, Czech researchers acquaint the public also with their extra-scientific activities at briefings, presentations and exhibitions. An event no less interesting is "Science in the Streets," when Institutes of the Academy and scientists themselves demonstrate the results of their investigations and studies directly in the streets of the nation's cities. A project of the Academy and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs of the Czech Republic, called "Open Science," is co-funded by the European Social Fund, the Czech state budget and the budget of the capital Prague. It is directed toward the further education of teachers, and aimed especially at stimulating the interest of high school students in science. The Academy also participates in the project of the EU´s Framework Programme, "Academic Internet Television Network Showcases the Best of Good Practice Activities" (ATVN-

EU-GP). The main goal of this project is, among other things, the creation of an Internet portal for dissemination of information about suitable national projects supported by European programs.

Scientists publish the results of their research activities in international journals and also in 80 scientific journals issued by individual Academy Institutes. Many of them are published in English and are available at the Internet website of the Main Library (http://www.lib.cas.cz). These publications have, in many cases, a long publishing history. The Czech Academy of Sciences and the Arts, for instance, began publishing *Rozpravy České akademie Františka Josefa pro vědy, slovesnost a umění* in 1893. Some academic journals are now accessible in electronic form; however this addresses only a small portion of the published work which at present is not available in a central database. Even very old results are relevant and important for research in a number of disciplines. Enabling quicker access widens immediate accessible choices and facilitates the search for the required information; this is a worldwide trend.

The Academy also has its own publishing house, Academia, (http://www.academia.cz) issuing scientific and popular scientific literature, belles-lettres, original literary productions and also translations.

The Coronations of Queen María: Reaching Beyond Religious Divisions in Prague, Frankfurt am Main, and Bratislava, 1562-1563[1]

Joseph F. Patrouch

The particular place of the king in the early modern and medieval political constellations of western Europe was famously discussed by the historian Ernst Kantorowicz fifty years ago in his book *The King's Two Bodies*.[2] Kantorowicz pointed to the dual nature of western Europeans' kings: they represented both themselves and the body politic. More recently, attention by historians such as Regina Schulte and Clarissa Campbell Orr (along with many others) has turned to queens and their related but different roles on the early modern scene.[3] My article will discuss the coronation of María of Habsburg (born 1528, died 1603) as Queen of Bohemia which occurred in St. Vitus Cathedral in Prague in 1562.[4] It will then go on to briefly describe the coronations of her husband, King Maximilian of Bohemia (ruled 1562-1576) as King of the Romans in Frankfurt am Main two months later and then María's coronation as Queen of Hungary in Bratislava in September, 1563, the day after the coronation of her husband.[5]

Far from having simply two bodies, Queen María can be said to have possessed an array of them. For example, her physical body produced a host of fifteen children, nine of whom reached adulthood. Two of María's sons, Rudolf and Matthias, went on to become Kings of Bohemia and Hungary and Holy Roman Emperors.[6] Two of María's daughters became queens: Anna, of Spain, and Elizabeth, of France.[7] María was a central European representative of her parents' Iberian families. Her mother was the Portuguese princess Empress-Queen Isabela and her father was the Emperor-King Charles V/Carlos I.[8]

María became in turn Queen of Bohemia, Queen of the Romans, and Queen of Hungary. (In July, 1564 she became Holy Roman Empress upon the death of her father-in-law Emperor Ferdinand I.) I will argue that Queen María's positions and "bodies" helped reach beyond the religious divisions of Bohemia, providing ties to her relatively tolerant realms in the Holy Roman Empire and Hungary and providing symbolic unity for the kingdom, a court, and patronage. María's fourteen-year reign in Prague (1562-1576) followed fifteen years of an empty queen's throne there. Her predecessor on the Bohemian and Hungarian queens' throne, the Franco-Bohemian princess Queen Anne Jagiellon, had died in 1547 after a reign of over two decades.[9]

The interregnum in Prague between Queen Anne and Queen María was a rather peculiar one for Bohemian women's courts: even though her husband was the nominal heir to the throne, María's eighteen-year-old brother-in-law Archduke Ferdinand was named regent of the kingdom following his mother's death. After remaining single for a decade, he secretly married the commoner Philippine Welser. This ruled out the possibility of a court establishment around his consort. There was effectively no center for the noblewomen of the Czech lands to serve, no place for them to be trained as ladies and courtiers, no location in the Prague castle where they could see and be seen, meet potential marriage partners, and so on. Instead, the Bohemian, Moravian, Silesian and Lusatian noblewomen would be left to their own devices

and to the noble courts and castles of the kingdom or its constituent subunits such as Moravia or the various Silesian duchies, not that of the queen.[10]

There was no longer a court in Buda to which they might turn for positions, either. This had been a possibility at least under the Jagiellonians who had ruled both Bohemia and Hungary until 1526. The Ottomans had captured the city in 1541 and there was no Queen of Hungary either after the death of Queen Anne in 1547. The Bohemian noblewomen could not even easily turn to Polish service due to the unsettled nature of the queen's court there in the late 1550's: María's sister-in-law, the unhappy dowager duchess of Mantua Queen Katharina, was being progressively stripped of her status and would be sent back to her brother King Maximilian in 1566.[11] Bohemian nobles were on their own and could further develop their autonomous and national ties.

This situation makes the reign of Queen María all the more important. Its importance also increases when one recalls that her time as Queen Consort was followed by over thirty years again without a queen of Bohemia. (There were transitional periods before María's coronation when she was living mostly in Austria and from 1576-1581 when the widowed María and her daughter Elizabeth, Dowager Queen of France, resided in Prague and kept courts there, but María then returned to Spain and the court of her brother King Philip II, and Elizabeth went back to Vienna, leaving the queen's apartments in the Hradschin again empty.) The lack of such an important integrating institution as a queen's court helped disrupt the political scene and contributed to the Bohemian kingdom's difficulties in the decades around 1600.

It was not until 1616 that another queen, the Habsburg archduchess Anna of Tyrol, daughter of the earlier regent Ferdinand and his second wife, the Mantuan princess Anna Catarina of Gonzaga, would briefly ascend the Bohemian throne, beginning a period of more frequent occupation of this position in the Bohemian constitution.[12] Of course, Queen Anna's two-year reign was followed by the similarly brief and even more tumultuous reign of the Danish-Scottish princess Queen Elisabeth Stuart for a year and a day in 1619-1620 (as Consort to the Pretender to the Bohemian throne until 1632).[13]

Things began to settle down beginning with Queen Elisabeth's successors, one who ruled for fifteen years and was active for another eighteen as dowager queen. This was the Mantuan princess Queen Eleonora, who married the King of Bohemia, Ferdinand II, in 1622.[14] Queen Eleonora's successor on the Bohemian throne was Queen María Ana, another Spanish *infanta* from the Iberian branch of the Habsburg family. Queen María Ana, daughter of Queen Margarete and King Philip III of Spain, ruled for nine years in the final stages of the Thirty Years War, from 1637 to 1646.[15] (Queen María Ana was the great -granddaughter of the queen María under discussion in this article.)

The increased number of courts for the queens and queens dowager, as well as their international connections to the kingdom of Spain, the kingdom of Hungary, the British kingdoms, the Imperial court, and Imperial territories such as the duchy of Mantua, the Palatinate, and of course the Habsburg hereditary lands (particularly the county of Tyrol), made court service more attractive and provided a mechanism for recruiting noble supporters from a wide range of territories. This mechanism also served to connect the various Habsburg lands. The late sixteenth century with its interregna was followed in the mid-seventeenth century by more queens, fewer periods of vacancy on the

throne, and a complex knitting of court alliances which helped the Habsburgs establish their rule over the kingdom for the next three and a half centuries.

In 1562 this rule was not yet as fully established, based as it partly was on the 1526 recognition of the claims of the Spanish prince Fernando (Ferdinand) of Habsburg through his marriage to Anna, the sister and heiress of King Louis II who had been defeated and killed fighting the Ottomans in Hungary that year.[16] Anna had died in 1547 and Ferdinand ruled Bohemia alone or through his son and namesake Ferdinand, at times having to resort to force to maintain his dominant position. Now he was aging and sick and presented his eldest son, Maximilian, as his heir to the Bohemian throne. (The Bohemian estates had agreed in principle to Maximilian's succession back in 1549.) Due at least partly to Maximilian's apparent tolerance in religious questions, an important point in the religiously-diverse Bohemian kingdom with its large number of Utraquists, Moravian Brethren, Lutherans, traditional Roman-oriented Catholics, Jews, and others, he and his wife the Spanish *infanta* María were accepted and crowned in two ceremonies in St. Vitus Cathedral on September 20 and 21, 1562.[17] Revealing the reproductive power of the new queen's body, the ceremonies had been delayed due to her pregnancy. On June 21, 1562 she had given birth to her tenth child, the archduke Friedrich. (He would die seven months later.)

Queen María's coronation was very similar in structure to the ceremony for her husband Maximilian the day before.[18] This time, however, the women of the courts were given central roles. Archduchess Anna, the queen's oldest daughter, for example, accompanied Queen María on her left while King Maximilian walked on her right in the procession from the royal apartments. Her second daughter, Archduchess Elizabeth, and Anna walked behind the queen into the cathedral. The Bohemian regent's secretary, Hans Habersack, wrote that María wore a white dress with gold, the long arms of which were described as "Old Spanish … and the decoration and veil on her head was also Spanish."[19] This costume would underline in the spectators' minds the international connections of the new queen. Her brother King Philip II's realms with their large overseas possessions in the Americas were increasingly becoming known as some of the richest and most powerful in Europe.

At the coronation, Queen María's two daughters and her sister-in-law Duchess Anna of Bavaria, consort to the ruler of one of the most important duchies of the Holy Roman Empire, sat in the choir stalls. Bohemian noblewomen as well as foreign ladies and maidens watched from the risers in the abbreviated nave as the queen processed from St. Václav Chapel. Unlike the king's procession, this one did not include Bohemian lords carrying the day's offerings, and the royal sword was not included among the insignia of office which preceded the queen. The abbess of the Convent of St. George, the female Benedictine house located within the castle confines just steps from the cathedral, played a key role in the coronation. She wore a small crown of her own and attended the queen, together with another nun and María's male head of household, a Spanish nobleman.

King Maximilian led Queen María to the main altar and presented her to Archbishop Antonín Brus of Prague. The ceremony continued as it had for the king the day before, with the anointing of the queen with consecrated oil and her reception of the scepter, orb and crown associated with the office of Queen of Bohemia. After the crown had been placed on María's head, the ab-

bess, the burgrave, the archbishop of Prague, and the bishops of Olomouc and Wrocław placed their hands on it. María did not swear an oath to the kingdom nor did the kingdom's officers and notables swear oaths to her while touching her crown as they had the day before at the king's coronation. The assembled were again asked, however, to affirm their new queen through triple acclamation, which they duly did.

Queen María, wearing her crown, participated in the offering and then, after processing from the cathedral, attended a large banquet in the royal palace across from the cathedral. María was seated at the place of honor next to her father-in-law King Ferdinand. Each table was filled with women of the kingdom or the court. For example, the first table was headed by Anna Kolovrat, the wife of the kingdom's Lord High Steward, and her two daughters. Two other Kolovrat women and two Lobkovic ladies were also at this table.[20] Because not all of the wives and daughters of the kingdom's officers had accompanied their husbands and fathers to Prague for the ceremonies, many of the tables remained unfilled; women of the court moved in to make sure that all the seats were taken. For the position of queen and the attendant offices, titles, and incomes, a fifteen-year long interregnum had finally been ended. Bohemia again had an anointed and publicly-acclaimed queen. The positions and prestige tied to attending a queen's court could again be accessed. There were now two Habsburg queens in Europe: María of Bohemia and her sister-in-law Katharina of Poland.

The role of female rulers in Bohemian history was a storied one.[21] It is unclear how much Queen María had been told concerning the history of the kingdom, but she may have been introduced to the stories from the twelfth-century chronicler Kosmas or the text known as the *Dalimil Chronicle*.[22] These stories, which apparently also circulated in oral traditions into the later Middle Ages, told of how the impressive Prague castle had been established by the legendary Libuše, wife of the founder of the first Bohemian dynasty, Přemysl. They told, too, of the exploits of the great female military leader Vlasta who led a legion of unmarried women warriors to avenge the death of Libuše, shouting to the women, "If we crush them now, our deed will always be remembered and praised./ And we will select our own husbands …"[23] After Vlasta's victory, the chronicle continued, she established a five-year reign in a castle the women built. Her laws included the following: "a girl could take as a husband any man she herself wanted, and the wife would hold court, while the husband did the work."[24] Ultimately defeated and killed, Vlasta's memory survived.

Queen María may have also heard of the sainted duchess Ludmilla, widow of the first Christian ruler of the territory. Her festival had been celebrated just a few days before, on 16 September. Strangled by her veil, St. Ludmilla's legend tells, the martyred duchess was buried just steps away from the Prague cathedral in the convent church dedicated to St. George. St. Ludmilla was considered an intercessor for duchesses and a patron of widows. She has also been turned to over the years by people needing help with their in-laws. (Legend has it she was murdered by her daughter-in-law.)

The St. George Convent had been founded by permission of Pope John XIII through the intervention of St. Ludmilla's granddaughter Mlada, who also received papal permission for the establishment of the Prague diocese in 973. St. George Church would become the burial site for many of the early

rulers of Bohemia. By the thirteenth century, a burial chapel housing St. Ludmilla's remains was built in there. The convent's importance was underlined by the prominent role its abbess and a second nun played in Queen María's coronation ceremony. In the context of 1562, María's coronation served to connect her to deep traditions in the Bohemian kingdom, helping shore up a relatively weak political position by appealing to history beyond the religious divisions of the present.

After celebrations marking the accession of the new queen and king, María and her family left Prague (which was suffering from an outbreak of the plague) and progressed to Frankfurt am Main where King Maximilian was officially elected King of the Romans. He was crowned on 30 November. With this coronation, María, as Maximilian's consort, became the designated heiress to the throne of the empresses. Like the Bohemian queens' throne, this throne had also been vacant for many years. Queen María's mother, Empress Isabel, had been its last occupant. She had died over two decades before, in 1539. Queen María's prestige and international significance were advancing. She and her husband King Maximilian were officially to rule over the multi-ethnic and multi-religious Holy Roman Empire which included Bohemia and its affiliated lands.

Seven years before, María's father-in-law King Ferdinand had helped negotiate an end to a period of bloody religious wars in the Empire. The peace settlement signed in Augsburg officially recognized Lutheranism within the Empire's boundaries. Now, María and her husband were associated with the executive power charged by that agreement with implementing the religious peace. Back in Bohemia, this aspect of the queen's "body," its manifestation of Imperial law, could have helped buttress her family's claims to rule: if the new royal couple accepted religious diversity in the Empire as a whole, why not in its most important constituent part, the lands of the Crown of St. Václav (Bohemia)?

In the neighboring Kingdom of Hungary the situation was much more tenuous for the Habsburgs than it was in the Empire or in Bohemia: there, Fernando Hapsburg's claims to the throne had been met with a disputed election, renewed Ottoman invasion, and a breakaway principality in Transylvania. Decades of on-and-off warfare since the death of King Louis II in 1526 had left the kingdom divided into three parts: a western, pro-Habsburg one (basically including Croatia, Slovakia, and a sliver of present-day Hungary and Romania) administered from Bratislava and Vienna, an Ottoman-occupied central region ruled from Buda and Constantinople, and a quasi-independent Transylvania to the east. In order to maintain some control over at least some of the divided kingdom, King Ferdinand had to place the exclusive support of one type of Christianity as a lower priority. As he had discovered in the Empire during its religious wars, even had he wished to forcefully support the reformed Catholicism being advocated by the Rome of the Catholic Reform and Counter-Reformation, he did not have the means to do so. Hungary, perhaps more than Bohemia, had a type of at least *de facto* religious toleration.

After their return to Vienna from Frankfurt, Queen María and the rest of the royal and imperial courts moved to Bratislava in August, 1563 to negotiate the acceptance and recognition of King Maximilian and Queen María as rulers-designate of the Hungarian kingdom. After a contentious meeting, the representatives of the Hungarian estates present in Bratislava reluctantly ac-

cepted the Habsburg claimants. On Wednesday, 8 September, Maximilian was crowned King of Hungary in Bratislava's St. Martin Church, the first of a long row of Hungarian rulers to be crowned there.[25] The next day it was Queen María's turn. Habersack's description is rather brief, explaining that María's coronation was organized "as the Hungarian queen's coronations were normally done over the ages."[26] There were, however, apparently various traditions associated with Hungarian queens' coronations. Back in the fourteenth century, King Louis I "the Great's" daughter and heir Maria had been crowned as "king" and ruled jointly with her husband Sigismund.[27] In the late 1430's there had been disputes between the archbishop of Esztergom and the bishop of Veszprém over who held the right to crown the Luxemburg heiress Elisabeth queen. The kingdom's lords backed Veszprém in this case, but the precedent did not hold into the mid-sixteenth century ceremony for Queen María.[28] She was crowned by Archbishop Miklós Oláh of Esztergom.

In 1563 Hungarian noblewomen participated in the ceremonies in Bratislava. María wore her own crown: the Holy Crown of St. Stephen was placed touching her shoulder for a while during the ceremony.[29] As in Bohemia and the Holy Roman Empire, in Hungary the years of vacancy on the queen's throne were over. (Strictly speaking, Queen María was not yet ruling; she was the consort of the heir-designate.) Following Queen María's thirteen-year reign (1563/4-1576), another interregnum, this one of almost forty years' duration, would follow. Queen María's reign was the only queen's reign in Hungary from 1547 to 1613, adding another factor to the chronic instability in the troubled kingdom and its confederated lands.

The coronations of Queen María in Bratislava in 1563 and in Prague in 1562, together with the coronation of her consort King Maximilian as King of the Romans in Frankfurt am Main the same year, connected this Spanish princess to the political bodies of the two kingdoms (and the Empire) in particular ways. As anointed queen, María represented something more than the narrow political interests of any particular faction, religion, or dynasty. She could be seen as a connection to the relatively tolerant realm of Hungary and the Empire, where religious toleration had recently been mandated by Imperial law. Her courts could become points of transaction where noblewomen and men from across Bohemia and parts of Europe came together, sometimes going so far as to marry, tying physically Bohemians to non-Bohemians.

In Prague, Queen María's body became tied to the Crown of St. Václav, representing as it did wider political interests than those perhaps associated with her physical body, thus echoing Ernst Kantorowicz's fifty-year-old analytical distinction between the king's two bodies, his political and physical ones.[30] Queen María, mother, twice-anointed and once-accepted queen, had an array of bodies which helped the women and men of the late sixteenth century reach beyond the religious divisions of the period. After she and her court left Prague in 1581, the lack of such a unifying body contributed to the tumult which was soon to come: the succession crisis first between her sons Rudolf and Matthias, and then between her husband's nephew Ferdinand and the palatine prince Frederick. This latter dispute would unhappily lead to civil war and the start of the decades-long military struggle now known as the Thirty Years War.

APPENDIX

Queens of Bohemia and Hungary, 1526-1673

1. Anne Jagiellon 1526-1547 (HU, 1527: disputed election)
b Prague 1502, m Ferdinand (I) Linz, 1521, died 1547
F Wladislaw V of Bohemia/Hungary
M Anne de Foix (France)

2. Isabelle Jagiellon (HU 1539-1540) (No Bohemia)
b 1519, m John I Szapolyai, 1539, died 1559
F Sigismund I Jagiellon of Poland
M Bona Sforza of Poland
son John (II) Hungary

3. María Habsburg (1549) 1562-1576 (HU, 1563)
b Madrid 1528, m Maximilian (II) 1548, died 1603
F Charles V Holy Roman Empire/Spain
M Isabel Holy Roman Empire (Portugal)

4. Anna Habsburg (1611) 1616-1618 (HU, 1613)
b Innsbruck 1585, m Matthias 1611, died 1618
F Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol
M Anna Katharina Gonzaga (daughter of Eleonora Habsburg)
no children

5. Elisabeth Stuart 1619-1620/1632 (No Hungary)
b Falkland Palace, Scotland, 1596, m Frederick/Palatinate 1613, died 1662
F James VI Scotland
M Anne of Denmark
son Rupert b in Prague, 1619
heir to Scotland/England/Ireland until 1630
pretender Charles Louis, 1632-1680, then Charles II, 1680-1685

6. Eleonora Gonzaga 1622-1637 (HU too)
b Mantua, 1598, m Ferdinand II 1622, Bratislava coronation 1622, (he died 1637), she died 1655
F Vincenzo I Gonzaga (son of Archduchess Eleonore Habsburg)
M Eleonore Medici (daughter of Archduchess Johanna Habsburg)
no children

7. Maria Anna Habsburg (1631)1637-1646 (1638, HU)
b Madrid, 1606, m Ferdinand III 1631: 1st wife (he was crowned king of HU, 1625, king of Bohemia, 1627), her coronation in Bratislava, 1638; died 1646
F Philip III Spain
M Margarethe Habsburg, Queen of Spain
six children, including King Ferdinand IV of Holy Roman Empire, Emperor Leopold I

8. Maria Leopoline Habsburg 1648-1649 (HU too)
B Innsbruck, 1632, m Ferdinand III 1648: 2nd wife, died, 1649. apparently no Bratislava coronation

F Archduke Leopold V of Tyrol
M Claudia Medici
One son

9. Eleonora Gonzaga 1651-1657 (1655, HU)
b Mantua, 1630, m Ferdinand III, 1651: 3rd wife, her Bratislava coronation, 1655, died 1686
F Charles II Gonzaga of Rethel
M Maria Gonzaga
4 children

10. Margarethe Teresa 1666-1673 (HU too)
b Madrid, 1651, m Leopold I 1666, (apparently no Bratislava coronation) died 1673
F Philip IV Spain
M Maria Anna Habsburg, Queen of Spain
4 children

NOTES

1. This article is based on a paper originally delivered at the 2007 conference "Contributions of the Moravian Brethren to America" sponsored by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences and Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, June, 2007. My thanks to Organizing Committee member Dr. Zdeněk David for his kind invitation to participate in the conference and to the conference participants for their comments and suggestions. Such a discussion of the roles of queens and their courts seems particularly appropriate at a college founded originally as a girls' school by the Lusatian noblewoman Benigna von Zinzendorf in 1742.

2. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957). In her study published two decades later, Marie Axton placed Kantorowicz's ideas in the specific context of the succession struggles with characterized the reign of Queen Elizabeth I of England, the last Tudor queen of that country. *The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977). Axton's chapter four places the discussion of the two bodies at the Inns of Court in the decade of interest to this paper, the 1560's (pp. 38-60).

3. Regina Schulte, ed., *The Body of the Queen: Gender and Rule in the Courtly World, 1500-2000* (NY: Berghahn, 2006). Clarissa Campbell Orr, ed., *Queenship in Europe 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort* (NY: Cambridge University Press 2004). See also Theresa Earenfight, ed., *Queenship and Religious Power in Early Modern Spain* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate 2005) and Fanny Cosandey,.*La reine de France: Symbole et pouvoir, XVe-XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Gallimard, 2000).

4. For a list of the Bohemian and Hungarian queens in the period, see the appendix. For an introduction to Empress-Queen María, see Brigitte Hamann, ed., *Die Habsburger: ein biographisches Lexikon* (Munich: Ueberreuter, 1988), pp. 287-288. Her life in Spain after the death of her husband is dis-

cussed in Magdalena S. Sanchez, *The Empress, the Queen, and the Nun* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998). María is the empress to whom reference is made in the title. Her daughter Margarethe (1567-1633) is the nun. See also Friedrich Edelmayer, "Maria (de Austria)," *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 16 (1990), pp. 174-175. Some of María's correspondence has recently been published: Juan Carlos Galende Díaz and Manuel Salamanca López, eds., *Epistolario de la emperatriz María de Austria. Textos inéditos del Archivo de la Casa de Alba* (Madrid: nuevosescritores, 2004). For a brief overview of the Habsburg dynasty and Bohemia, see Joseph F. Patrouch, "The Habsburg Dynasty and the Kingdom of Bohemia with an Emphasis on the First Century of Their Rule: 1520s to 1620s," *Český dialog/Czech Dialog* (Prague) 7 -8 (2005) 36-37.

5. The title "King of the Romans" was given to the elected heir-designate of an emperor. One of the key sources for these coronations is the edition of a manuscript found in the Austrian National Library written by a secretary to Regent Ferdinand: Friedrich Edelmayer, Leopold Kammerhofer, Martin C. Mandlmayr, Walter Prenner, and Karl G. Vocelka, eds., *Die Krönungen Maximilians II. zum König von Böhmen, Römischen König und König von Ungarn (1562/63) nach der Beschreibung des Hans Habersack, ediert nach CVP 7890* (Vienna: ÖAW, 1990).

6. Rudolf has been well studied of late. He was born in Vienna in 1552 and became King of Hungary in 1572 and King of Bohemia in 1575. He was elected King of the Romans in 1575 as well and ascended to the imperial throne upon the death of his father the following year. He died in 1612. The British historian R.J.W. Evans wrote an influential study of King Rudolf: *Rudolf II and His World*, Rev. Ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984). For an overview of the various exhibitions and publications which centered on this Bohemian king in 1997, see Joseph F. Patrouch, "Rudolf II and Prague/Rudolf II. a Praha: Early Modern Europe Meets Postmodern Europe," *Austrian Studies Newsletter,* 10:1 (1998) 15, 19. Rudolf's younger brother Matthias, with whom he became entangled in various conflicts and intrigues, was born in Vienna in 1557. He became King of Hungary in 1608, King of Bohemia in 1611, and Holy Roman Emperor in 1612. See Joseph F. Patrouch, "Matthias (Holy Roman Empire)," in Jonathan Dewald, ed., *Europe 1450-1789: Encyclopedia of the Early Modern World* (NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2004), Vol. IV, 59-60.

7. Queen Anna of Spain was the fourth wife of the famous Spanish king Philip II. She was born in Spain in 1549 and died there in 1580. She ruled as Queen of Spain from 1570-1580 and was the mother of the Spanish heir, King Philip III, who ruled Spain and its possessions from 1598-1621. See Hamann, *Habsburger*, pp. 55-56. Her younger sister Elizabeth was born in Vienna in 1554 and died there in 1592 after reigning briefly as Queen of France from 1570-1574. Her husband was King Charles IX. As Dowager Queen of France, Elizabeth was active in Prague and Vienna. See Joseph F. Patrouch, "Elisabeth of Habsburg," in Anne Commire and Deborah Klezmer, eds., *Women in World History* (Waterford, CT: Yorkin Publications, 2000) Vol. V, 129-133. See also Patrouch, "Dowager Queen Alžbeta (1554-1592): From the Religious Wars in France to Prague," *Morava viděna z vnějšku/ Moravia from World Perspective: Selected Proceedings of the 22nd World Congress of Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences* (Ostrava: Repronis, 2006)

Vol. I, 246-252. On her wedding in 1570: Patrouch, "Reichstag und Hochzeit (Speyer 1570)," in Václav Bůžek and Pavel Král, eds., *Slavnosti a zábavy na dvorech a v rezidenčních městech raného novověku* (České Budějovice: Editio Universitatis Bohemiae Meridionalis, 2000) Opera Historica 8. 265-280.

8. On Empress Isabel, who was born in Portugal in 1503 and died in Spain in 1539, see Hamann, *Habsburger*, pp. 167-168. She ruled as empress and queen from 1526 until her death and was thrice regent of the Spanish territories in this period. Francisco Javier Vales y Failde, *La Emperatriz Isabel* (Madrid: M. Aguilar, 1917). For a recent overview of the Spanish king and Holy Roman Emperor Charles, see Harald Kleinschmidt, *Charles V. The World Emperor* (Phoenix Mill: Sutton Publishing, 2004). He was born in Ghent in 1500 and died in Spain in 1558. Charles was elected emperor in 1519.

9. It should be pointed out that María and her husband Maximilian were nominal, but uncrowned queen and king of Bohemia from 1549. It appears that these titles were largely ceremonial. The couple did not reside in Bohemia and the business of government was carried out by María's brother-in-law Archduke Ferdinand. Queen Anne's reign in Hungary was disputed in much of the kingdom.

10. On these various roles for female courts, see the important set of conference papers edited by Jan Hirschbiegel and Werner Paravicini, eds., *Das Frauenzimmer: Die Frau am Hofe in Spätmittelalter und früher Neuzeit* (Stuttgart: Thorbecke, 2000). See also Beatrix Bastl, *Tugend, Liebe, Ehre. Die adelige Frau in der frühen Neuzeit* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000). On the general issue of integrating the courts: Václav Bůžek and Géza Pálffy, "Integrating the Nobility from the Bohemian and Hungarian Lands at the Court of Ferdinand I," *Historica: Historical Sciences in the Czech Republic*, Series Nova 10 (2003), pp. 53-92.

11. On Queen Katharina (1533-1572), see Hamann, *Habsburger*, pp. 236-237.

12. On Queen Anna (who lived from 1585-1618), the consort of King Mathias: Hamann, *Habsburger*, pp. 57-58. She is perhaps most famous for founding Vienna's Capuchin Friary with its Imperial Crypt. Her remains were transferred there in 1633. She had no children. Her coronation as Queen of Hungary was reenacted in Bratislava in September 2007.

13. Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia, the consort of King Frederick, has been the subject of many biographies. See, for example, Mary Anne Everett Wood Green, *Elizabeth, Electress Palatine and Queen of Bohemia*, Second, revised ed. (London: Methuen & Co., 1909) S. C. Lomas, ed. See also Carola Oman, *Elizabeth of Bohema*, Revised ed. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1964); Ronald G. Asch, "Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia," pp. 85-92, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 16 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004). Queen Elizabeth was the heiress apparent to the kingdoms of Scotland, England, and Ireland until 1630. Her son Charles Lewis, the Pretender to the Bohemian throne, died in 1680. His son, Charles, died without heirs in 1685, ending the line of succession from this anointed queen of Bohemia. Queen Elizabeth's Prague-born son Rupert went on the become an important Royalist military leader in the English Civil War, fought against the Commonwealth forces in the Caribbean, and settled in England during the Restoration where he was named one of the honorary founding members of the Royal Society. Ian

Roy, "Prince Rupert," pp. 141-154, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Vol. 48 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

14. On Queen Eleonora (who lived from 1598-1655): Hamann, *Habsburger*, pp. 78-79. As the dowager empress and queen for eighteen years she continued to play a role in court politics. She founded convents of Carmelite nuns in Graz and Vienna as well as the well-known Heart Crypt in the Augustinian Hermits' church in Vienna where many hearts of Habsburg dynasty members are entombed. She had no children.

15. On Queen Maria Ana (who lived from 1606-1646): Hamann, *Habsburger*, pp. 289-291. As a seventeen-year-old princess, she was briefly engaged in 1623 to the heir to the Anglo-Scottish-Irish thrones, Charles Stuart, the brother of the exiled Queen Elisabeth of Bohemia. After that engagement was broken off, she married the crowned king-designate of Bohemia, Ferdinand III, in Vienna in 1631. This means that briefly there were three queens of Bohemia simultaneously: the exiled Queen Elisabeth, the ruling Queen Eleonora, and the consort to the heir apparent, Queen María Ana. Her thirteen-year-old son Ferdinand was crowned King of Bohemia in 1646, the year of her death, and King of Hungary the following year. Her daughter and namesake Maria Anna (1635-1696) became Queen of Spain and mother of the last Habsburg King of Spain, Charles II (1661-1700). One of Maria Anna the Younger's daughters, Margarita Teresa, was briefly Queen of Bohemia (1666-1673) after the tragic reign of Queen Maria Leopoldine (1648-1649) and the happier reign of the second Queen Eleonora (1651-1657). This Gonzaga princess was the mother of the queen of Poland, Eleonore Maria Josepha (reigned 1670-1673).

16. For a recent biography of Fernando: Alfred Kohler, *Ferdinand I. 1503-1564. Fürst, König und Kaiser* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2003). The five hundredth anniversary of his birth brought him a significant amount of historical attention in 2003.

17. On the general religious situation in Bohemia proper at this time, see Zdeněk V. David, *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003).

18. The court would no doubt soon learn that another significant family event occurred on this day: Elizabeth's Aunt Eleonore, the new Duchess of Mantua, gave birth to a son, Vincenzo, the heir to the ducal throne in Mantua. Vincenzo's daughter Eleonora would one day go on to become Queen of Bohemia.

19. "alltspannisch; und der schmuckh und schlayr auf dem haupt ist auch auf spannisch zuegericht gewest." Habersack, *Krönungen*, p. 120.

20. Habersack, *Krönungen*, pp. 124-125.

21. The basic background is discussed in John M. Klassen, *Warring Maidens, Captive Wives and Hussite Queens. Women and Men at War and Peace in Fifteenth Century Bohemia* (NY: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 13-32.

22. Adolf Bachmann, "Die Reimchronik des sogenannten Dalimil," *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte* 91 (1902), pp. 59-119. Bachmann points out the large role in Bohemian history for angels and saints such as Procopius and Michael which Dalimil gives in the chronicle: pp. 117-118. Bachmann adds that "Dalimil ist nicht Geschichtsschreiber, sondern Erzähler," (p. 113) and that he acted more as a collector of folk traditions than as a historian (p. 76).

23. Quoted and translated in Klassen, *Warring Maidens*, p. 17. For more on the chronicle, see Alfred Thomas, "Myth and History in the Dalimil Chronicle" in his *The Labyrinth of the World* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1995) pp. 33-46.

24. *Ibid.,* p. 19.

25. Beginning in 2003, the Bratislava authorities have sponsored reenactments of the Hungarian coronations which are recorded as having been held in the city. That year, King Maximilian's coronation was performed for tourists. The following year, the coronation of Queen María was reenacted. This year (2007), it is Queen Anna's turn.

26. "wie es in der hungerischen khünigin crönungen von allters heer gebreuchig,"Habersack, *Krönungen*, p. 202.

27. Kantorowicz, *King's Two Bodies*, p. 80 n. 93. This fact led Kantorowicz to comment that perhaps "in corpore politico nullus est sexus." Queen Maria's younger sister, Jadwiga, went on to rule Poland.

28. János M. Bák, *Königtum und Stände in Ungarn im 14.-16. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1973), p. 169. Queen Elisabeth of Hungary, Bohemia, and the Empire (1409-1442) was the pregnant widow of King Albrecht II whose servant Helene Kottanerin famously smuggled the Holy Crown to the castle at Komorn in time for the birth of King Ladislaus in 1440. He was then crowned with it at the tender age of twelve weeks. Kottanerin described the events in her memoirs. For much of his youth, Ladislaus "posthumous" was a ward of Emperor Friedrich III in Wiener Neustadt. He died at the age of 17 before a planned marriage with a French royal daughter could take place. Hamann, *Habsburger*, pp. 85-86, 39-42, 241-243.

29. Martin C. Mandlmayr, "Die Beschreibung der Krönungen durch Hans Habersack," pp. 43-60 in Habersack, *Krönungen*. Here, p. 58.

30. The difference between the political meaning associated with the Crown of St. Václav and that associated with the Crown of St. Stephen cannot be developed in this context. For more, see Josef Karpat, "Die Idee der heiligen Krone Ungarns in neuer Beleuchtung," pp. 349-398 in Mandred Hellmann, ed., *Corona Regni: Studien über die Krone als Symbol des Staats im späteren Mittelalter* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1961).

The "Eastern-Orthodox Crisis" in the Czechoslovak Church Through the Eyes of the Old–Catholics: Cooperation or Merger? Reflections on the Corollary of Czech Catholic Modernism

Pavel Marek

At the beginning of the 20th century, Catholicism experienced a major internal crisis in the Czech Lands,[1] which influenced not only masses of believers (as Czech society was progressively becoming more secular) but also the clergy as a whole, though not all its orders were affected to the same extent. While the higher Catholic hierarchy, mostly German-speaking, particularly resented the fervent Czech nationalism of that time but, on the other hand, was fairly receptive to ultramontane attitudes of the Roman Curia, the lower clergy – notably curates – had long suffered from negative effects of the so-called Austro-Catholicism and secretly feared that the Curia would not be able to respond adequately to the rapid growth of the civic society. The lower clergy was also only too aware of numerous painful issues associated with their everyday pastoral duties, personal situations and social status. Aloof and careless, Church authorities were doing next to nothing to address these issues and failed to set up a new framework for the work of priests who, starting from the mid-1800s, had twice brought up proposals for Church reform (1848 and 1899-1907). The proposed changes were to have made ideas of Catholicism more appealing for the inhabitants of the Czech Lands, thus starting a new process of re-Catholicizing and helping the Catholics not to lose their position in Czech society. Both reform attempts can be considered failures as they had not met with the approval of relevant Church authorities.[2]

It is therefore hardly surprising that in the middle of the general turmoil that embraced Central Europe immediately after World War I, with the collapse of the old political system accompanied by major political changes that resulted in the emergence of so-called successor states replacing the Dual Monarchy (the Czechoslovak Republic being one of them),[3] churches and religious communities went through dramatic changes, too. First and foremost, the idea of reforming the Roman Catholic Church was once again revived in the Czech Lands: the aforesaid reform endeavor of the Czech clergy reached its third stage. Unlike in the earlier cases, the attempts of 1918-1920 mustered relatively massive support, at least in the beginning; a substantial part of the clergy sided with them and a radical faction that was soon to emerge even declared its determination to put the reform program into effect "most definitely", i.e., irrespective of views of the Church hierarchy, even of the Pope. After twists and turns in the reform movement, early in 1920, the radical faction seceded from the Roman Catholics and established the national Czechoslovak Church. Its founding fathers supposed, and some even took for granted, that as soon as the new national church was established priests and members of the Roman Catholic Church would come over *en masse* while the adherents of Rome would become a marginal group. Such overoptimistic expectations soon deflated, though, after it turned out that the new church's theological teaching and organizational structure were rather shoddily made.[4] Especially, the unsolved question of the new church's theology was a major stumbling stone for its leaders; in fact, the Czechoslovak Church had borrowed only a slightly altered version of Catholic teaching and although everybody considered such

arrangement temporary, the future searching of the church's path and leanings was to be far from easy. Internal frictions eventually surfaced in 1920-1924 during the so-called "Eastern-Orthodox crisis", a fierce conflict within the Czechoslovak Church which, at that time, was trying hard to resolve fundamental questions of its existence, namely the abovementioned issue of theological teaching: the question was whether it should go its own way and create a brand new theology that would fit well with modern times, or rather incline to an existing church and adopt its teaching as well as organizational pattern and standards. As already mentioned, it was to be painful searching accompanied with numerous clashes of views, personal quarrels and polemics, both public and internal. Many were going to be disappointed and frustrated; others would soon ask themselves whether the change of church allegiance had brought any substantial change at all.

One of the most prominent protagonists of the "Eastern-Orthodox crisis" was Matěj Pavlík: originally a priest, adherent of the Catholic Modernist Movement and member of the movement of radical priests called *Ohnisko* (The Hearth), he was soon to become the main opponent of the Czechoslovak Church's leader Karel Farský (1880-1927) and, eventually, he emerged as the bishop of the Czech Orthodox Church and founding father of Czech Orthodoxy as such. It was Pavlík who first approached the floundering leaders of the Czechoslovak Church (and masses of its believers, as well) with a concept of the Eastern Orthodox teaching flavored with some specific Czech features. It took some time before it turned out that most priests and believers were not willing to accept his concept and the Orthodox faction eventually abandoned the Czechoslovak Church, but the process of secession was relatively slow, piecemeal and hesitant, accompanied by further searching, maneuvering and conflicts of conscience: Pavlík was trying hard to find a way out of the difficult situation for himself and his adherents who followed him eagerly and without hesitation. Even though he had received ordination from the Serbian Orthodox Church (as the first bishop of the Czechoslovak Church), Pavlík was a clever enough strategist to see how complex his situation was: he kept seeking and examining every feasible option. For this reason he established contacts with representatives of different denominations and religious communities, consulted them and considered their offers to help, only to settle on Orthodoxy in the end. In the course of his quest, Pavlík also got in touch with the Old Catholic Church of the Czech Lands, in particular with its bishop Alois Paschek (Pašek; d. 1946).

Published only recently, documents mapping the developments of the Old Catholic Church in the years of the first Czechoslovak Republic[5] comprise, among other things, previously unknown – or, rather, unpublished – correspondence between M. Pavlík and A. Paschek. Apart from recording the then attitudes of Old Catholic personalities, speakers and men of letters towards the newly established Czech national church and the subsequent "Eastern-Orthodox crisis," these valuable documents also prove that at the turn of 1923/24, immediately before his final conversion to the Serbian Orthodox Church (or Savvatiy's Prague-based Orthodox faction, to be more precise), M. Pavlík toyed with the idea of merging his group with the Old Catholic Church of the Czech Lands.[6] At the same time, we can modify and complete a portrait of M. Pavlík as a reformist priest thanks to hitherto unavailable materials recently obtained from Prof. ThDr. Pavel Aleš.[7]

Our two-part article portrays the intriguing personality of M. Pavlík-Gorazd, outlining the story of this "man of three denominations" – a typical Czech Catholic reformist of the turn of the 20th century – and, at the same time, gives a picture of the Czechoslovak Church and its "Eastern-Orthodox crisis" as it was perceived and chronicled by the press of that period and captured in correspondence of prominent Old Catholics in the Czech Lands, namely A. Paschek. This article is based on our research, studies of materials kept in public and church archives and the recently discovered documents referred to above.

1. Excerpts from the Life and Works of a Reformist Clergyman

The story of Matěj Pavlík-Gorazd (born May 26, 1879 in Hrubá Vrbka, Hodonín district; executed Sept 4, 1942 in Prague–Kobylisy),[8] a Czech priest, shows how complex the religious situation was in the Czech Lands in the late 1800s and early 1900s. His boyhood was that of an ordinary boy coming from a South Moravian family of devout Catholics – a usual phenomenon of that time. His father owned a farm but was massively in debt and Matěj with his two siblings eked out their living. His humble background must have been one of the main reasons why he entered the Archbishop Lyceum in Kroměříž (still private at that time) in 1890, from which he headed, like most of his schoolmates, directly to the Olomouc Faculty of Divinity (1898-1902). In Kroměříž, the "Athens of the Haná Region," Pavlík could have nearly met another student of the Lyceum, Karel Dostál-Lutinov (1871-1923), a promising Catholic poet and man of letters that attracted wide attention among his fellow students. Even though the young men missed each other in their schooldays, Pavlík was going to become a keen reader of Dostál-Lutinov's *Nový život* (The New Life) and other periodicals of the Catholic Modernist Movement. Like so many students of theology and young clergymen of that time, he, too, was enthusiastic about the ideas of Herman Schell (1850–1906), a German theologian who was acquainting the Czech public with thoughts of European modernists. Pavlík became a strong supporter of Church reform and this idea was to turn into his mission. Another concept he embraced during his schooldays was that of the legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius and of the cooperation of Slavic nations, which meant to him much more than a mere passing fad. At the Lyceum, he started to learn Old Church Slavonic and Russian, played an active role in the *Jednota Velehrad* society and lectured on the history of the Eastern Church at the Slavic Club, focusing on the Eastern Schism, its cause and chances of possible reunion of the Christendom. It is only understandable that, around 1900, he became close to the pivotal personality of the Moravian Cyrillo-Methodian Movement, Antonín Cyril Stojan (1859-1923) in whom he found not only a colleague but also a patron and mentor. The same can be said for Ignác Wurm (1852-1911), another prominent figure of the Moravian clergy of that period. In his youth, Pavlík acquired another characteristic that is worth mentioning, as it was going to accompany him through his life and distinguish him from many fellow clergymen of various denominations: we are talking about religious toleration he had learned in his hometown from Emil Pellar, an Evangelical priest. Ironically as it might sound in view of his later switching between churches and repeated polemics in the press, no less fierce than numerous, the truth was that Pavlík, while advocating his opinions really vigorously,

would eventually treat his former adversaries decorously and magnanimously, being careful not to be insinuative or derisive. On the contrary, he always tried to understand the true motives behind his opponents' hostility.

In July 1902, the Olomouc Archbishopric Consistory could rejoice at the fact that one of the best graduates of the Faculty of Divinity was being instituted to a benefice of a curate. Indeed, the fresh clergyman was zealous for pastoral duties in which he also found a niche for himself to work for his nation and for the poor. These qualities made up for his innate mistrustfulness, impetuousness and ill-concealed sympathies with the Modernist movement. During his first years as a clergyman in Austrian Silesia between 1902 and 1905 (after four months in Karlovice he was moved to Brumovice) the young priest met all expectations, as he eagerly set to work for the Church, believers and nation. He was one of first thinkers who tried to attract the attention of the Czech Catholic Modernists from purely literary (and reformist) issues to questions of philosophy, history and learning in general, deeply regretting that Modernism had not spread beyond the borders of Western Europe. Keen to give a picture of the history of religious beliefs of 19th-century Czech Lands, notably of the Cyrilo-Methodian idea, he wrote a study of priests-awakeners titled *Z dob pojosefinských* (From the Post-Josephine Times), portraying notably the personality of Vincenc Zahradník, a philosopher. In others, like Hurdálek, Bolzano, Vacek, Kamarýt, Ziegler, Sláma, and Sychra, Pavlík identified the clergymen who had paved the road for the Modernists of the 1890s and whose legacy was therefore worth attention. In the early stage of his scholarly and journalistic career, Pavlík thoroughly studied scholarly and historical works (by Srb, Tobolka, and authors gathered round the journal of the Catholic clergy) and also established new contacts (with F. Grivec) and learned from older and more experienced fellow clergymen (P. Vychodil). After he realized that he lacked adequate education to become a scholar, he decided to enroll himself at the University of Vienna in 1903 and made the first steps in this direction, but Archbishop Theodor Kohn (1845-1915) did not sanction his application – probably because of Pavlík's Modernist leanings. Far from becoming embittered, Pavlík kept studying sources and literature with typical persistence to even greater depth, trying hard to make up for his inadequacy through meticulousness and self-improvement.[9]

The fact that Pavlík was invited in 1904 to take over the editing of *Pozorovatel* (The Observer), a weekly published in Kroměříž, from František Světlík (1875-1949), who was to move to the Olomouc periodical *Našinec* (The Compatriot), is hardly surprising. The twenty-six-year-old priest enjoyed an excellent reputation as a journalist and erudite speaker at meetings and rallies among his fellow-clergymen, played an active role in the National Catholic Party, and, last but not least, had influential intercessors – Mořic Hruban (1862-1945) and A. C. Stojan. However, it took a year before the personnel changes in the Central Moravian Catholic periodicals were pushed through: the notorious "Archbishop Kohn's scandal" had just reached its climax and the proposed changes had to be approved by Kohn's successor, the new Archbishop František S. (Franziscus von Sales) Bauer (1841-1915). In mid-September 1905 Pavlík took a year's leave, only to throw himself into the editing of the newspaper a month later. During the twelve months of working as a journalist, he proved his excellent capability of addressing the public. Many of his intellectual interests became reflected in the newspaper: the young

priest paid attention to the Slavic East, wrote about the situation in Russia (where his brother was living at that time, supplying Pavlík with fresh news) and discussed issues related to the cooperation between Slavic nations. He was so engulfed in journalism that, at the 3rd Congress of the Catholic Modernist Movement that took place in Přerov (1906), he came up with the concept of a complete reform of the Catholic press as regarded its content and structure. Even after he left the editorial board of *Pozorovatel*, he remained its mainstay. At the same time, he took part in abundant social events and activities of numerous societies in Kroměříž, as well as regional activities of both existing Catholic parties.

An ambitious and hard-working man, Pavlík undoubtedly found much satisfaction in the work of an editor. Nevertheless, starting from July 1906, he strove after the pastorate at a newly established provincial mental home in Kroměříž, which he eventually took over in January 1908. His motives behind the change are obscure: he allegedly wished to improve his financial situation after he had gone into debt during the foregoing three years he had spent in politics. Although Pavlík continued his public work, he could have done much more for the Moravian political Catholicism had he had better conditions. In fact, the new job completely absorbed him and he could reveal his qualities: inventiveness, assiduity, purposefulness and tenacity that never shrunk back. In a mere four years Pavlík completely vindicated (and newly demarcated) the role of a spiritual pastor of the institution, promoting it to the level of a physician. He set about studying psychology and psychiatry and started to advocate new ways of treatment and education of mental patients. Resenting the system that reduced their treatment to mere solitary confinement, Pavlík wished to appeal to the patients, if possible, by immediate stimuli; he founded musical and theatrical clubs at the mental home and organized cultural events. Being aware how important the role of nurses and tenders in the new system of treatment was, he required that they were professionally trained and, furthermore, made sure that their wages were raised and social situation improved. Pavlík's reforms concerned not only the Kroměříž mental house but also similar institutions throughout the Dual Monarchy. He based them on extensive research, questionnaires, statistics and journeys through Central and Western Europe (German experience was especially inspiring) and sent out memoranda explaining his theories to central (Viennese) and provincial authorities, which were fairly supportive. He was planning to write a book and his speech made at a conference of the association of mental institutions run by the Church that took place in Rottenmünster, Württemberg (1913), in which he gave a report of his work, met with a good response.

Pavlík's success had a seamy side, though. Physicians in the Kroměříž mental home responded in a way that showed lack of understanding; atheists attacked him for political reasons; some people even threatened him with death. The Social Democratic press unleashed a campaign against Pavlík (as well as against other political activists – Šrámek and Urban) that resulted in a disciplinary action. Even though the affair was eventually settled, M. Pavlík seemed to have felt hurt. The campaign might have prompted him to leave the institution, to which he had dedicated his energies and skills – only to earn ingratitude and end up frustrated and overburdened. To top it off, he had been working in a very dangerous environment since the outbreak of World War I, as the mental home had been converted into a military hospital for soldiers sick with con-

tagious diseases, especially typhus, and the number of patients had risen up to 2,000. There was no time for study, writing or relaxation.[10] In September 1916 Pavlík asked for redeployment to Brno, to a smaller mental home where the post of spiritual pastor had fallen vacant, but the Consistory turned down his application in January 1917 on somewhat vague grounds: the clergyman in question was allegedly unknown to them. It seems plausible enough that somewhere at that point Pavlík must have undergone a change of mind – a decisive u-turn that eventually resulted in a slow but sure split with the Roman Catholic Church.

Although we have no reliable document in our hands that would prove this claim, it is nevertheless evident that Pavlík became gradually more and more frustrated and discontented with the way the Church elites behaved during the war years and with the fact that they rebuffed him personally. At first he tried to change the situation. He wished to move to Brno not only to escape from unpromising drudgery but also to be in the political center of Moravia – in the city where Moravian Catholic parties had their headquarters. Pavlík had kept in touch with party leaders and members of parliament; as a secretary of A. C. Stojan, he closely cooperated with this eminent clergyman; and both M. Hruban and Jan Šrámek (1870-1956) expected that he would become their expert counselor. Now, he wished to have a greater say in shaping the policy of Catholic organizations. Ironically, leaders of the National Catholic Party were most likely to be blamed for persuading the Consistory to reject Pavlík's petition, since they were supposedly afraid of his disapproving opinions and feared that he might try to reverse the Party's submissive policy towards Vienna and the Monarchy. Indeed, Pavlík had never concealed that he had considered such policy anti-Czech and anti-Slavic, even alien to the nature of genuine Christianity and religiousness. Having been turned down, Pavlík eventually decided to go his own way, rushing forward irrespective of his previous development, his status and obligations.

As the first step on his way to independence, he founded a newspaper in which he tried to disavow the official policy of the Catholic mainstream and draw the attention of the readers to the fact that there were individuals among clergymen and believers who were Czech patriots and behaved like genuine Christians. Foolishly, he believed that he would remove the scales from the eyes of Catholics. He prepared the publishing of the newspaper only to experience further disappointment when the Catholic authorities, both political and non-political, appeared to be reluctant and afraid of such a venture. Searching for potential collaborators, Pavlík gradually drifted close to the Czech Democratic Party of State Rights, which was supportive enough, and eventually joined the party.[11] Unfortunately, the first issue of *Právo národa* (The Right of the Nation) was issued as late as October 1, 1918 due to technical problems and therefore could not have the political impact it had been supposed to: watershed events were running ahead. Within a short time, Pavlík sold *Právo národa* to the Czechoslovak Church and the newspaper became a central press organ of the church. By joining the political grouping, which was to become the Czech National Democratic Party, Pavlík made a u-turn he might not have been fully conscious of at that time; anyway, in his letter to A. C. Stojan, he promised that he would do his best to curb the antireligious policy of the party. In fact, he was soon elected secretary of a party clergymen's organization and became close to radical reformists like Bohumil Zahradník-Brodský (1862-

1939) and K. Farský. From there, it was but a few steps onward to the Catholic Clergy's Union. M. Pavlík asked the Olomouc Consistory for leave to move to Prague in January 1919, as the Union leaders appointed him secretary and charged him with editing *Věstník* (The Gazette), an official periodical of the Union. Pavlík's writings in the periodical were fairly uncompromising and the Consistory started to investigate him as early as in March 1919, forbidding him to work for the Union. Pavlík disobeyed; on the contrary, he advocated establishing a strong and united nationwide organization of clergymen, completely independent of the episcopate, and bore the brunt of drafting the ticket of the reform movement, which he edited and published in April 1919 under the title *Obnova církve katolické v Československu* (Reconstruction of the Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia). Although no documents survived to prove his membership in *Ohnisko* (founded on June 11, 1919), we have no doubts about it, the more so because he became a member of its succession organization, the Club of Reformist Clergy, that very fall. As for the idea of an independent national church that emerged after the Union mission to the Pope had failed, Pavlík adopted a cautious attitude. He thought that the ideological and organizational ground for a national church was not well prepared and was reluctant to proclaim direct theological links with the Czech Reformation, notably John Huss and the United Brethren *(Unitas Fratrum)*. Indeed, Pavlík often emphasized that it was not enough to separate from the old Church only technically, but that the new denomination had to be qualitatively different from the Roman Catholic Church and make high moral demands on its clergy; he also envisaged Isidor Zahradník (1864-1926) as its potential leader.

Between late November 1919 and early July 1920, Pavlík did not play an active role in the reform movement and could not exert any direct influence on that process; hence, he did not participate in the establishment of the Czechoslovak Church, either. In mid 1919 he fell seriously ill: degeneration of the retina threatened to develop into permanent blindness. He was hospitalized in Brno that fall, and later – at the turn of 1919/20 – underwent treatment at the spa at Dolní Lipová. The foundation of the Czechoslovak Church, or rather its appeal to the nation published on January 10, 1920, embarrassed him, and he did not even try to conceal his feelings. Even though he welcomed the emergence of the new church, he was horrified at the shallowness of the published document, in particular at the statements concerning freedom of conscience of the church's members, which he considered vague, ambiguous and dangerous from a theological point of view. In Pavlík's opinion, there was no space for freedom of this kind, because a church had to be firmly anchored. He considered the establishment of the church as rash and poorly organized; for these reasons he did not join it and was apprehensive of future hurdles.

We are not sure what eventually made him change his mind and directly support the Czechoslovak Church as he did from the summer of 1920 on. The truth is that after Pavlík returned from another convalescent stay that he had spent with his brother in Košice (having retired from priesthood due to poor health) he suddenly started to advocate the new church at public meetings. He even celebrated a Holy Mass at a square in Kroměříž on July 6, 1920, the anniversary day of John Huss, the very first mass to be celebrated in the Czech language – branding the medieval priest as a champion of religious revival. Later he celebrated Holy Masses in accordance with the new "Czechoslovak" rite elsewhere in Central Moravia and prompted his followers

to establish the church community in Kroměříž. Early in September he was invited to Prague to join a session of the Czechoslovak Church's central committee that was going to discuss conditions imposed by the Serbian Orthodox Church, based on which the Czechoslovak Church was to have adopted Eastern Orthodox theological teaching.

It was only then, after Pavlík had become involved in activities of the Czechoslovak Church, that his antagonism against Roman Catholicism became critical. In August 1920 he sent an outspoken letter to the Olomouc Consistory in which he severely condemned what he called "the Roman system" within the Church that, in his opinion, flew in the face of modern times and Czech national ambitions that had lately been crowned with the foundation of the Czechoslovak Republic. Now that the national revolution had broken the Roman fetters, the Czechoslovak people would at last be able to follow Christ without being patronized by uncaring foreigners. The young Republic adored John Huss and Chelčický, Komenský and Havlíček-Borovský, whom the Catholic Church despised. "There is nothing mysterious about my behavior; it is an utterly natural way of a man that has no intention of closing his eyes and ears to events and needs of the present times." Pavlík was subsequently excommunicated and abandoned the Roman Catholic Church soon thereafter.

As early as the fall of 1920, having overcome initial reservations and vacillations,[12] Pavlík became involved in building up the Czechoslovak Church with his usual fervor. In the beginning he even acted in such radical ways that he was generally thought to be an advocate of uncompromising separation from traditional Christian religious systems; however, Pavlík's private criticism of K. Farský's attempts to disavow dogmas, together with his recommendation concerning the religious leanings of the Czechoslovak Church presented in January 1921 to the church assembly, suggested that Pavlík found himself somewhere between both extreme wings that emerged in the new church soon after it had been established. He was not merely cautious; first and foremost, he was willing to abandon the Roman Catholic Church, but not his Lord. Therefore he wished to spare the feelings of believers, fearing that the Czechoslovak Church might put them off had it been labeled as a non-Christian group. He thought it best to incline to Eastern Orthodoxy, at least at the beginning, and to postpone for the future the creation of a new modern-day Christianity, for which the Czech nation must have been predestined. For him, the Czechoslovak Church was but an episode in his quest for religion (in spite of the fact that, in April 1921, the Provincial Council of Elders for Moravia and Silesia elected him a provincial spiritual pastor, in fact a bishop-administrator – an honor he had never sought).

Still, Pavlík's way to the Orthodox Church was far from being as straight and easy as it might have seemed. In March 1921, while negotiations between the Czechoslovak Church and the Orthodox Church of Serbia continued in Prague and the former was preparing an answer to a memorandum of the latter, Pavlík condemned Orthodox preconditions of integration and urged that further negotiations with the Serbians be stopped. When the Serbian Orthodox Bishop Dositei (1878-1945)[13] met rank-and-file believers in Olomouc a month later, on April 21, 1921, Pavlík was already embracing an opposite attitude. Later he explained that he had been driven by a sense of responsibility for the future welfare of his church; having been appointed its administrator and expected to organize the church, he realized that the issue of the confession had

to be solved fast and thought that the drift towards Orthodoxy would consolidate his church and save it from disintegration. We may only guess as to how far Pavlík was captivated by Dositei's personality; the truth is that late in the spring of 1921 the two clergymen became close friends for the rest of their lives. It was Bishop Dositei who played the most important role in Pavlík's conversion to Orthodoxy. After he pushed through Pavlík's ordination (September 25, 1921, in Belgrade), Pavlík became the first bishop of the Czechoslovak Church inclined to Orthodoxy. At this time, he adopted the name Gorazd. The Synod even appointed Dositei a mentor and counselor to the Czechoslovak Church and the Serbian Bishop also sponsored Pavlík-Gorazd's[14] two months' stay in Serbia that decisively influenced the latter's spiritual orientation. On the other hand, Gorazd's ordination added fuel to the flames of a latent theological struggle between two antagonistic wings inside the Czechoslovak Church, which gradually grew into fierce public controversies and tactical maneuvering. Neither of the factions that had formed around the two prominent leaders, K. Farský and Gorazd, was willing to give up or split the difference but, at the same time, they did not wish the struggle to result in an open quarrel and rift; actually, the brawl was mostly a business of church elites while the masses of believers sought reconciliation and rejected intolerance and scandalizing of opponents. Most of the believers from Bohemia sided with K. Farský, while Gorazd had Moravian communities behind him. While modernists were supported by most members of the church, traditionalists enjoyed support from the Serbian Church whose diplomacy managed to involve Czechoslovak government authorities into the conflict and interest them in resolving it. Gorazd denounced any extreme measures, even those that could end the conflict and bring religious reconciliation in the Czechoslovak Republic, being convinced that time would heal everything. He often spoke about things getting settled in time and the swing of the pendulum moving towards his side. K. Farský did not wish to assume responsibility for a new split within the church, either, believing that its members would eventually find out that the Orthodox Church was no better than the Roman Catholic.

The resulting stalemate was only seemingly insoluble, though, as both central characters had been suspecting throughout the entire "Eastern Orthodox crisis" in the Czechoslovak Church that they were going to break off in the end and their church was going to split. Things got settled in time, indeed – but not quite in the way expected. Taking advantage of Bishop Gorazd's missionary journey to the USA (August-December 1922), K. Farský's adherents undermined the Orthodox wing within the Czechoslovak Church in the Bishop's absence; poor Gorazd returned to his diocese early in 1923 only to find it in ruins. Consequently, he resigned his post on March 5, 1923[15] but later resumed it again after his supporters persuaded him, trying to pick up the pieces. Another year elapsed before he left the Czechoslovak Church for good (July 1924),[16] resigned the post of the Bishop of Moravia and Silesia and started to negotiate a merger with the Czech Orthodox Community.[17]

Gorazd's complicated journey from Roman Catholicism through the Czechoslovak Church to the Orthodox Church exemplifies the fact that reformist priests must have undergone a profound crisis of belief accompanied by traumatic looking for a way out. They painfully tried to find a right answer, weighed all the pros and cons, and often groped in the dark. Gorazd's twists and turns also show that whenever reformist priests went over to a new church

community, their expectations were enormous: they worked zealously and with dedication but often earned only ingratitude and met with a lack of understanding.

In August 1924 Gorazd arranged a meeting of his Moravian followers in Olomouc, at which they decided to join the Czech Orthodox Community even though it represented a different stream of Orthodoxy (that of Constantinople), from the point of view of both church jurisdiction *and* their idea of how a Czech Orthodox Church should look. Nevertheless, they believed that autocephalous churches of Serbia and Constantinople would reach an agreement on the jurisdiction over the Czechoslovak territory[18] and a separate Orthodox Church of the Czech Lands, Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia would gradually emerge. Having been elected a chairman of the eparchial council of Moravia and Silesia and being a legitimate bishop, Gorazd became a head of the entire church community of the Czech Lands in November 1925, after his fellow brethren staged a "coup" at a church assembly in Moravská Třebová. Thus, under the aegis and patronage of the Orthodox Church of Serbia, Gorazd became the founding father of Czech Orthodoxy with its specific peculiarities. A fervent reformist clergyman, he built on his life-long priestly experience and made a deep impact on virtually every aspect of life of the Czech Orthodox Church,[19] setting the stage for its becoming an autocephalous body. Looking for a "better" church, he eventually found his ideal and object in life – Eastern Christianity.[20]

As for Gorazd's later fate, he continued as the Bishop and head of the Czech Orthodox Church until his death (he fell victim to the Nazi retaliation after Reinhard Heydrich, the Deputy Reich Governor of Bohemia and Moravia was assassinated in Prague in June 1942). It was in a crypt of the Orthodox cathedral of Saints Cyril and Methodius in Prague where Czechoslovak partisans found their shelter after Heydrich's assassination. When they were found out, Nazis arrested Gorazd and his collaborators; he was court-martialed, sentenced to death, and executed by firing squad on September 4, 1942. The Czech Orthodox Church was disbanded. In 1945 Gorazd received posthumously the Czechoslovak War Cross 1939; in 1987 the Orthodox Church canonized him as St. Gorazd II; and in 1997 president Václav Havel awarded him, *in memoriam*, with the Order of T. G. Masaryk.

2. The Old Catholic Church of the Czech Lands and the "Eastern-Orthodox Crisis" in the Czechoslovak Church

When the Czechoslovak Church was established in February 1920, members of the Old Catholic Church[21] and, notably, their press were rather enthusiastic, welcoming it as a "sister church."[22] The *Altkatholisches Volksblatt* emphasized the fact that the new church found itself in the difficult position of being a secessionist community condemned by the Papal Court and Czech episcopacy. "A bitter struggle broke out" among the clergy and it was upon masses of believers to determine the winner. "This passionate nation has tried more than once to win religious freedom, but such efforts have always dwindled in the very beginning. Apparently, the ground for the church reform has not yet been prepared there."[23] Others were of a contrary opinion, though, and the same paper soon asserted that Czech reformist priests deliberately drew from teachings of the pre-Lutheran martyr reformer John Huss burned to death

in Constance (1415): "This church reformer, Huss, is taken as an example by Czech nationalists in Prague. Indeed, his fight against the Church marked the beginning of an awakening of Czech nationalism. Slavic Czechs have always perceived the final downfall of the Hussites as a German victory over Czech national aspirations. We must not forget that during and in the wake of the Hussite wars – an encounter that horrified entire Europe in those days – Czechs emerged as the protestant and nationalist multitude fiercely opposed to the Imperial Court and Rome. That notion is still present in the national consciousness and Czechs are convinced that Rome has always colluded with Germans. The fact is that starting from the 16th century on, Vienna has been successful in eradicating the national church of Slavic Czechs, or rather various sectarian offshoots thereof. After Ferdinand of Austria started to persecute Utraquists, Calvinists and Lutherans following the battle of Mühlberg, 1547 and – having defeated the army of the Czech Diet – invited Jesuits to the Kingdom, German bishops of Olomouc became the major oppressors of the Czech national Church. Even though Catholicism gradually gained the upper hand, the spirit of the 'Bohemian Brethren' had survived in hearts of the nation that, quite understandably, sought independence – both national and religious. A very similar situation evolved in Germany after 1870, where the Old Catholics were trying to recruit masses of adherents, before their movement slowly but surely got bogged down: apparently, it lacked the breeding ground of tradition that undoubtedly exists in the Czech nation."[24] Besides identifying common denominators and historical parallels, authors of these articles discovered existing links between the newly established national church and Old Catholics: "The list of priests who celebrate Czech Masses in the St Nicholas Church in Prague includes the surname of Kysilka.[25] We know this gentleman only too well. Having abandoned the order of Minor Friars, he joined our church and worked as a cooperator in Warnsdorf for some time. Before the war he humbly returned to the fold of the Roman Church. Now, he is to be seen with Czechoslovak reformists. Let us hope that he will no more slough away his beliefs like reptile skin."[26] The papers informed about emerging religious communities with membership of thousands. Conversions of believers to the Czechoslovak Church were accompanied with mass rallies, often in the open, sending fervent resolutions to the government. The *Katholik*, published in Bern, reprinted an article from the *Freie Kirchenstimmen* whose editorial board allegedly watched closely the developments in Czechoslovakia, observing that: "The Czechoslovak Church seems to be coming into existence. The mass conversion [of Czech Catholics] is rather embarrassing for the Germans [. . .] One would have never expected that any Slavic nation might outstrip Germans, using German weapons and tactics. Frankly speaking, Czech fervor and determination make us feel ashamed." The *Katholik* further added: "The internal structure of the Czech Church is to be praised, embracing – in fact – the Constitution of the Old Catholic Church, that masterpiece of Prof. Dr. von Schulte, an eminent church lawyer. Breathing freedom and unity, the democratic Constitution of 1871 makes even today's 'republicans' blush in astonishment."[27] A little deferential criticism leaked only rarely among all the praise and admiration: "Remarkably enough, the said manifesto and other documents utterly ignore the Old Catholic Church of Austria (now Czechoslovakia) that has been here for fifty years. Hopefully, it is only due to wariness: 'March divided, but fight united.' What is no less remarkable, though: one does not come across a single

word of resentment against the Germans in the central press organ of the Czechoslovak Church . . ."[28]

It was not before mid-1920 that the Old Catholic press started to reflect upon the theological bearings of the Czechoslovak Church. Initially, the newspapers quoted K. Farský and his views expressed in the pamphlet *Z pode jha* (Breaking the Fetters),[29] in which he advocated cooperation with the Evangelical Church of Czech Brethren and labeled the Old Catholics as a church that was very close to the Czechoslovak Church due to similar rites and dogmas.[30] Only later did the press start to publish independent commentaries on negotiations between leaders of the new church and various churches and religious movements from abroad (Orthodox churches, Church of England, American Episcopal Church, et al.). Gathered round Václav Jaroslav Ráb, a Prague faction of Old Catholics attracted wide attention when they tried to woo away the entire Old Catholic parish of Prague (under the jurisdiction of the Warnsdorf bishopric since 1900) to the Czechoslovak Church. Their attempt resulted in a split among the parishioners: Ráb's faction eventually merged with the national church while adherents of Adolf Liebisch refused to do so. No matter how delicate the issue was (having also Czech-German national connotations), the press commented on it in a fairly moderate and restrained way.[31] Starting from the turn of 1920/1921, journalists interested in church developments were much more absorbed by approaches the Czechoslovak Church was making to the Orthodox Church of Serbia: here, the question of future theological bearings of the new church manifested itself very apparently. Browsing through newspapers of that period we nevertheless observe that most authors refrained from direct comments, borrowing from other sources instead. Those who expressed their own views were at first rather disappointed that leaders of the Czechoslovak Church had preferred Eastern Orthodoxy over Old Catholicism and later, in 1924, unanimously regretted that " . . . the Czechoslovak Church is nothing but a sophisticated club of libertines,"[32] and eventually "ended up in a freethinkers domain."[33]

Attitudes of those Old Catholics who brought them into the open were fairly moderate and suave, though critical of Farský's faction; and so was the private correspondence between Old Catholic leaders, notably A. Paschek and V. J. Ráb, only that the said gentlemen were somewhat more up front. More than once they labeled K. Farský and his Czechoslovak Church as freethinkers, trying to analyze the Church's documents, particularly Farský and Kalous's *Catechism*, and to identify principles and phenomena they could not approve of. Paschek, among others, pointed out that Farský asserted that Christianity should have been brought up to date, reconciled with modern science and adjusted to match Czech national needs and Hussite traditions. In his view, decrees of the Ecumenical Councils were no longer binding, as they were products of their times and reflected ancient religious needs.[34] Paschek reproached Farský for satisfying his personal and egotistic interests and deeply regretted that Farský had attracted more adherents than Gorazd, because "the Christianity he preaches is very indolent."[35] The correspondence we have analyzed is fairly standoffish even towards the Orthodox, despite some implicit sympathies (which were understandable, as Gorazd's teaching was for the Old Catholics the more acceptable of the two alternatives of the future leanings of the Czechoslovak Church). Only rarely one comes across a suggestion that Gorazd had made a mistake by having accepted ordination from the Orthodox Church of

Serbia: if he had wished to offer to his compatriots an alternative to rationalist visions of Farský's, he should have come up with "something else than the Eastern Orthodoxy, which is here perceived as the most fossilized of all existing religious systems."[36]

Generally speaking, the Old Catholic elites were welcoming towards the Czechoslovak Church and if they commented on the internal clashes with regret, they nevertheless expressed their hopes that the issue would soon be resolved "without any detriment to the Church" They had two good reasons for doing so, apart from Christian charity, which should always guide the steps of church aldermen. First, from the Old Catholic point of view, the Czechoslovak Church was a body that had seceded from the Roman Church and thus reinforced opponents of Catholicism, having similar roots and being their ally in their "war against Rome." Second, we dare put forward a hypothesis about possible hidden motives: there was a good chance that both churches would merge[37] and the Czechoslovak Church had enough members to become one of most powerful bodies among Czech churches. It was therefore wise to remove barriers and bridge gaps.

Where did we get this notion? In January 1923, Bishop Gorazd returned from his missionary journey across the USA that turned out to have been a tactical mistake. Not only that outcomes of his overseas mission were arguable, but being abroad, he vacated his positions to Farský's faction only to find his church community disrupted upon his return home. Dositei, who should have been his deputy in Moravia, had long been back in his country, having advised the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Serbia on his failure. Completely dispirited, Gorazd resigned his pastoral duties in February, but soon changed his mind and resumed his post as a leader of the Orthodox faction within the Czechoslovak Church. We daresay that in this delicate situation, standing on serious crossroads, he proved his ability to find the best possible way for himself and his followers under the given conditions. First, he made an attempt to turn the national Church into a "duplex house" – an umbrella to both factions, Modernist and Orthodox. In April 1923, K. Farský and his adherents among the Church leadership turned down such a proposal as impracticable. Gorazd persisted in negotiating with Farský for the rest of the year in a vain attempt to seek a way to coexist. (The correspondence between the two clergymen is a valuable source of knowledge about their personal characters and the final stage of the Czech Catholic Modernist Movement.) At the same time, Gorazd was in contact with the Orthodox group of Savvatiy.[38] Although the bargaining was going to last for more than a year and was very difficult for more than one reason, it eventually proved to be fruitful; the question is, whether Gorazd chose this pragmatic solution in earnest or whether he accepted it only because he hoped he would be able to transform Savvatiy's group to his image. Besides, Gorazd still cherished the idea of founding a completely new church for his followers – but would it have been an Orthodox church? Last but not least, he was still thinking about another option, as his letters to leading personalities of the Old Catholic Church clearly suggest. In one of these letters he wrote: "I have long striven for collaboration and rapprochement of Christian denominations, notably Orthodox and Old Catholic churches and the Church of England."[39]

Gorazd's actual vision was two-fold and he conceived it around mid-1923. At that time, most probably in May 1923, he started corresponding with

A. Paschek, a prominent representative of the Warnsdorf-based center of the Old Catholic Church of the Czech Lands; later – probably in July and September – they met in person. We are informed about the latter meeting from Paschek's letter to Parson Lagerweyr of Dodrecht, the Netherlands, dated October 3, 1923. Apart from other things, Paschek wrote: "Bishop Gorazd further asked me whether it would be possible for him to become involved in our church. I told him that it would have been most welcome, but that he should have joined the Utrecht Union,[40] which would not be practically possible, as he had been ordained by the Serbian Church. He wishes to visit Serbia once more and make some inquiry there. [. . .] Bishop Gorazd believes that the Serbian Church is no longer so vigorously opposed as it used to be and that a union between us and the said church could easily be effected." It is possible that Gorazd was pondering a loose union with the Old Catholic Church; he knew only too well that his followers would reject a merger with the "German" church on national grounds. The Old Catholics, on the other hand, did prefer a full-fledged merger. That is why we daresay that Gorazd's proposal was a mere feeler. Indeed, he could hardly expect that the Old Catholic Church would be willing to undergo a profound transformation of its national structure: its members would not have allowed anything like this to take place. Bishop Paschek was less stringent, as he suggested in his letter to Lagerweyr of February 26, 1924: "Had he [i.e., Gorazd; author's note] joined our Old Catholic Church, he would have been somewhere else by now. [. . .] But he was afraid that his compatriots might have felt some repugnance against Old Catholicism, which is here thought of as a German invention. However, other Slavs, who are no less nationalist than Czechs, did follow suit; why on earth did not Czechs?" In his letter to Gorazd (October 24, 1924) he reiterated the same idea: "What a pity that your church could not merge with ours due to the delicate circumstances. It would have been the easiest solution – the more so because there is no barrier between our churches. But still, who knows what the future has for us!"

Our "feeler theory" appears even more plausible due to the fact that, while negotiating with the Old Catholics, Gorazd had another option in mind: a more plausible one, because it involved no national barriers and did not force him to make commitments at any cost. We are referring to Gorazd's deliberations with V. J. Ráb, which took place some time before October 7, 1923, i.e., the date on which Ráb's group of Czech Old Catholics constituted itself as a Prague-based church community loosely associated with the Warnsdorf center. Ráb had abandoned the Czechoslovak Church that in his opinion was "far from being Christian" in 1921, after 14 months of membership, and having reentered the Old Catholic Church, resumed his leadership of the Old Catholic community of Prague (Czech-speaking). His return to the church aroused some animosity and he had to try to take up a definite attitude towards Warnsdorf, too. This was reflected in his attempts to establish an independent Old Catholic church in Czechoslovakia under the label of the "Hussite Church" or "Old-Catholic Hussite Church." Trying to make the best of it, Gorazd kept pleading with Ráb to unite Old Catholic and Orthodox believers in a new church. Although we still lack detailed information on their negotiations, it seems that both parties expected that their fusion would be accompanied by a theological shift or transformation of a kind, or that each party would at least make some concessions to the beliefs of the other. A quarrel over a name of the new body was

symptomatic: while Ráb held firm to the adjectives "Old Catholic – Hussite," Gorazd would have rather called the new church "Czechoslovak Cyrillo-Methodian" or "Czechoslovak Catholic"; indeed, he thought that the latter name, or the Czechoslovak Orthodox Church, would have best reflected the reality.

Once again, Gorazd's negotiations with the Old Catholics failed: as in the case of contacts with Bishop Paschek, he had most likely come up against opposition from the Orthodox Church of Serbia, which still preferred the scenario of a merger between both Czechoslovak Orthodox factions, despite all difficulties, and even exerted pressure on public authorities – and consequently to the Czechoslovak government – to attain this goal. Eventually, even Bishop Paschek welcomed such merger. In his letter to Gorazd of December 14, 1923 he wrote: "Now that you have joined Savvatiy, I nevertheless believe that you shall maintain an old friendship between our churches. It is my genuine opinion, my most honored Sir and Brother, that it shall be the best we can do under these circumstances. Any attempt to found a new church would lead to nothing but further division." At the same time he could not help but express his sorrow for what had happened to the national church: "I sincerely regret that the Czechoslovak Church, once so promising, has failed so bitterly. Dr. Farský is assuming awful responsibility.[41] [. . .] Indeed, I wonder who shall ordain him as a bishop. Such an atheist – how he even dares to call himself a patriarch!"[42]

NOTES

1. This paper was written as part of the GAČR grant assignment No. 409/05/2726.

2. There is plenty of literature covering this topic. It has been summarized in a book by Pavel Marek, *Český katolicismus 1890–1914* (Czech Catholicism 1890–1914) (Olomouc, UP 2003), which also includes its comprehensive bibliography.

3. *Politický katolicismus v nástupnických státech rakousko–uherské monarchie v letech 1918–1938* (Political Catholicism in Successor States of the Dual Monarchy, 1918–1938), ed. Ivana Koucká and David Papajík (Olomouc, UP 2001).

4. For recent comments on this topic, see Pavel Marek, *Církevní krize na počátku Československé republiky (1918–1924)* (The Church Crisis in the Early Years of the Czechoslovak First Republic [1918–1924]) (Brno, L. Marek 2005). – The book also includes lists of further literature and sources.

5. *Dokumenty k dějinám českého starokatolictví* (Documents Concerning the History of Czech Old-Catolicism) Vol. 3. Years 1919–1928, ed. Josef König, (Prague, Starokatolická církev 2006), electronic version.

6. Thus confirming our assertion put forward in Pavel Marek, *Pravoslavní v Československu 1918–1942* (Orthodoxy in Czechoslovakia 1918–1942) (Brno, L. Marek 2004), p. 67.

7. We are referring to the Archimandrite Sáwa's manuscript titled *V zájmu pravdy. Doplněk k životopisu Gorazda (Matěje Pavlíka) zpracovaný na základě dosud neznámého archivu Josefa Žídka v Chudobíně* (For Truth's Sake. An Appendix to Gorazd's [Matìj Pavlík's] Biography) (Opava, 1975). – The manuscript is currently filed at the Olomouc Archives of the Eparchial Council of the Olomouc-Brno Eparchy of the Orthodox Church (without Ref.

No.). According to its author, one copy should have been deposited at Stojan's Memorial Hall, Velehrad, along with J. Žídek's papers. However, custodians of the Hall, when asked, alleged to be ignorant of its existence.

8. As concerns Gorazd's personality, see Jaroslav Šuvarský, *Biskup Gorazd (Bishop Gorazd),* (Prague, ÚCN 1979); Pavel Aleš, *Vztah svatého biskupa Gorazda k ruskému pravoslaví* (Saint Bishop Gorazd's Attitudes Towards Russian Orthodoxy), in: Pravoslavný teologický sborník 15, 1989, pp. 5–16; V. Buchta, *Vladyka Gorazd – průkopník praktického ekumenismu* (*Vladyka* Gorazd: A Pioneer of Practical Ecumenism), in: Pravoslavný teologický sborník, 12, 1985, pp. 115–125; Vladimír Grigorič, *Pravoslavná církev v Republice československé* (The Orthodox Church in the Czechoslovak Republic) (Prague, 1928); Radomir Jedlinski, *Gorazd, episkop češkomoravski (1879–1942)* (Gorazd, the Bishop of Bohemia and Moravia) (Kragujevac, 1991); *Pastýø a martyr* (Pastor and Martyr), ed. Pavel Aleš, (Olomouc, Pravoslavná církev 1992–1995); *Směřování* (Striving), ed. Pavel Aleš, (Olomouc, Pravoslavná církev 2002).

9. In 1906 he once more enrolled at the University of Vienna but never started to attend lectures.

10. Pavlík, then 35 years old, had suffered from long-standing strain. In 1914 doctors recommended him a twelve-month sick leave.

11. A member of the National Democratic Party until 1923, M. Pavlík was allegedly considered to become a prospective MP.

12. Even later, M. Pavlík would have a reputation for being rather irresolute. Some authors even claim that he was vacillating by his very nature. In our opinion, there might be another explanation. While intentionally postponing some crucial decisions, he was often pragmatically looking for another solution better than those at hand. There undoubtedly was much tactical maneuvering in it, even if hidden and almost imperceptible. Contemporaries described him as an extremely persistent man, tenacious in pursuing his goals. Outwardly, he was quiet, modest and good-natured. See Sáwa, *V zájmu pravdy* (For Truth's Sake), p. 111.

13. See Pavel Marek, *K Dositejově československé misi v letech 1920–1925/6* (Dositej's Mission to Czechoslovakia 1920–1925/6) in *O exilu, šlechtě, Jihoslovanech a jiných otázkách dějin moderní doby* (Olomouc, 2004), pp. 181–205.

14. Having received his bishop ordination in Beograd, M. Pavlík adopted the name Gorazd. – Archives of the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prague, Collection: Political Reports from Beograd, June 1–August 31, 1921, Nos. 435, 439, 445 and 466, received by the Ministry on September 24, 27, and 30. 9. and October 9, 1921. See also František Kovář, *Deset let československé církve 1920–1930. Přednáška proslovená na jubilejní synodě duchovenstva čsl. církve v Praze dne 8. ledna 1930* (Ten Years of the Czechoslovak Church, 1920–1930) (Prague, 1930), p. 38; Bohumír Aleš, *Na památku 25. výročí smrti biskupa Gorazda* (Commemoration of the 25th Anniversary of Bishop Gorazd's Death), in: Pravoslavný teologický sborník 2, 1968, pp. 4–8; V. Buchta, *Vladyka Gorazd – průkopník praktického ekumenismu* (*Vladyka* Gorazd: A Pioneer of Practical Ecumenism) in: Pravoslavný teologický sborník 12, 1985, p. 118; Pavel Aleš, *Biskup Gorazd. Z díla* (Bishop Gorazd: Excerpts from His Works) (Prague, 1988), p. 15; Pravoslav Trebišovský, *Obnovenie cyrilometodovskej pravoslávnej cirkvi v Československu* (Restoration

of the Cyrillo-Methodian Orthodox Church in Czechoslovakia) in: Pravoslavný teologický sborník 15, 1989, p. 28.

15. *Resignace biskupa* (Resignation of the Bishop), Pravoslavný směr 1:16–17 (1922/3), pp. 7–8.

16. Some assert that Gorazd, having abandoned the Czechoslovak Church, intended to establish a church of his own (or rather a religious community without a government approval). See Vladimír Grigorič, *Pravoslavná církev v Republice československé* (The Orthodox Church in the Czechoslovak Republic), 1st ed. (Prague, 1926), p. 87. It is truth that Gorazd was toying with an idea for founding a new church, but only for the event that his vision of unifying of all Orthodox groups in Czechoslovakia should have failed. In fact, these were only fantasies and no practical steps followed, since Gorazd was primarily a responsible pastor and clergyman. Grigorič's assertion from the 1st edition of his book might have been pure speculation.

17. To this account of Pavlík's split with the Czechoslovak Church, Jaroslav Šuvarský adds that the radicals within the church had not been able to come up with new theological solutions. Therefore Pavlík inclined to the Orthodoxy, which gave him what he was looking for: a paragon of the pure original Christianity. J. Šuvarský, *Biskup Gorazd,* p. 166.

18. The involvement of the Orthodox Church of Serbia on Czechoslovak territory was an unfortunate move: the Serbian Church maneuvered and sat on the fence for so long that believers split into adherents of Serbia and those of Constantinople. Fatal jurisdictional disputes that logically ensued have affected the Czechoslovak Orthodox Church ever since.

19. Pavlík's reformist (modernist) concept of the Czech Orthodox Church was far from being widely accepted. Understandably enough, Orthodox emigrants from Russia to Czechoslovakia were apprehensive of it, and so were members of Archbishop Savvatiy's faction inclining to the Russian Orthodox Church. As for other opponents, these were mostly former Catholic Modernists who like Pavlík, having abandoned the Church of Rome, were trying to find their religious bearings. The most prominent of them was Josef Žídek, a priest from Chudobín near Litovel (Moravia), who was the first to have won his entire parish over to Savvatiy – a good time before Pavlík took his final decision. In following years Žídek would keep criticizing, both openly and in private, Bishop Gorazd and his modified Orthodox liturgy as well as other activities. The tension between the two men developed into overt conflict and a Church Court eventually ruled against Žídek. Sáwa, *V zájmu pravdy*, p. 57 ff.

20. In his critique of Gorazd's character, Archimandrite Sáwa asserted that Orthodoxy might not have been Gorazd's last harbor. While his attempts at unifying the Czechoslovak, Orthodox and Old Catholic churches of Bohemia and Moravia after the Munich Agreement and events of 1938 were quite understandable in the atmosphere of national peril and uncertainty and cannot be construed as his "failure", during the years of Nazi rule Gorazd resorted to seclusion, taking stock of his life. Allegedly, he eventually decided to returned to the fold of the Roman Catholic Church: he entered into contacts with some regular clergymen and negotiated with representatives of the Society of Jesus about the terms under which he would be allowed to join their Order. Dr. František Cinek (1888–1966), too, purportedly endorsed Gorazd's intention to rejoin the Church of Rome. However, the response of the Church was unenthusi-

astic and Gorazd's subsequent fates decided a different course. Sáwa, *V zájmu pravdy*, pp. 113–114.

21. Initially, the Old Catholic Church was constituted in the Czech Lands as part of the Austrian Old Catholic Church after 1870. Its Bishopric was first in Vienna but was moved to Warnsdorf (Bohemia) 1896. After the WWI it split into two national churches – Austrian (Vienna) and Bohemian (Warnsdorf). The latter was then headed by Bishop Miloš Amandus Čech (1855–1922), a former Catholic priest and brother of the Czech writer Svatopluk Čech. Since the Old Catholic Church in the Czech Lands had a strongly German character, its Czech-speaking members (who technically belonged to the same Prague parish, although being scattered across the country) started to seek independence and as early as on October 31, 1918, called for the establishing of a Czech national Old Catholic Church. Their effort resulted in a breakup of the Prague parish in 1920: a majority of believers followed Václav Jaromír Ráb, curate of Prague, to the Czechoslovak Church, while a minority remained loyal to the Warnsdorf Bishopric. However, in the fall of 1921 most members of Ráb's faction returned to the Old Catholic Church which was soon to be administered by a new Bishop, Alois Paschek (from 1922; elected an Administrator by the Synod on July 13, 1923; confirmed by the government 1924). This solution did not pour oil in troubled waters, though, as Czech-speaking Old Catholics would keep in touch with the Czech Orthodox faction of Archbishop Savvatiy (who ordained their priests) and even put out feelers towards the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople: an attempt at entering into closer relations failed in 1936. The constitution of the church was approved by the government on Sept 15, 1927. Towards the end of the Czechoslovak First Republic the church had 11 parishes and about 24 thousand believers. *Církev starokatolická v ČSR* (The Old Catholic Church of Czechoslovakia) in: Ročenka Československé republiky, Vol. 6 (Prague, 1927), p. 291; Radim Pulec, *Před rozhodujícím krokem. (Studie o životě starokatolické církve v ČSSR)* (Before a Decisive Step: Essays on the Life of the Old Catholic Church in Czechoslovakia), in: Pravoslavný teologický sborník, 6 (1979) pp. 120–126; Jan Krško, *Pokus o začlenění české starokatolické církve do Církve československé v roce 1920* (An Attempt of 1920 to Incorporate the Czech Old Catholic Church into the Czechoslovak Church), in: Semper Idem. Jiřímu Tùmovi k pětasedmdesátinám (Ústí nad Labem, 2003), pp. 46–58; Karel Koláček, *Vznik a vývoj starokatolického hnutí na území severních Čech do roku 1946* (The Origin and Development of the Old Catholic Movement in the Northern Bohemia up to 1946) (Brno, 2006), 185 p.; *Starokatolická církev* (The Old Catholic Church) (Prague, 2002).

22. *Altkatholisches Volksblatt*, Feb 20, 1920, p. 63.

23. Ibid, Feb 13, 1920, pp. 53–53.

24. Ibid, Mar 26, 1920, p. 99.

25. Karel Kysilka, the then secretary in the Ministry of Nutrition.

26. *Altkatholisches Volksblatt*, Mar 26, 1920, p. 102.

27. *Katholik*, Apr 3, 1920, pp. 106–107.

28. *Katholik*, Apr 10, 1920, p. 116.

29. Karel Farský, *Z pode jha. (Vznik církve československé)* (Breaking the Fetters: The Emergence of the Czechoslovak Church) (Prague, 1920), 58 p.

30. *Internationale kirchliche Zeitschrift* 2, 1920, pp. 142–143.

31. This topic has hitherto been outside our scope of interest. For circumstances of the merger see J. Krško, *Pokus*.

32. *Katholik*, Aug 2, 1924, pp. 247–8.

33. *Katholik*, Nov 22, 1924, p. 376.

34. A. Paschek to Lagerweyr, parson in Dodrecht (the Netherlands), Warnsdorf, May 28, 1923.

35. A. Paschek to Lagerweyr, n.d.

36. A. Paschek to Lagerweyr, Feb 26, 1924.

37. It must nevertheless be observed that it was mere illusion relying either on eventual reconciliation of the two factions or on victory of Gorazd's group. In that case, bishops of the Czechoslovak Church were to be ordained by the Old Catholic Church.

38. Those who gathered round the Orthodox Archbishop of Prague, Savvatiy (adopted name of Antonín Vrabec; 1880–1959) were heirs of the very first Orthodox group in the Czech Lands that dated back to the 1870s, the Czech Orthodox Community. Savvatiy's followers were the first to enter into contacts with the Orthodox Church of Serbia after the war (even before the Czechoslovak Church did so), but the Serbs were rather slow and procrastinating. Hence, Savvatiy and his collaborator Miloš Červinka contacted Meletios, Patriarch of Constantinople and Savvatiy's acquaintance. As a consequence, two Orthodox groups emerged – one under the Serbian jurisdiction, the other under that of Constantinople. Such duplicity left its mark on further developments of a unified Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia. Gorazd eventually entered into talks with Savvatiy and merged his faction with Savvatiy's group – only to oust Savvatiy at the same time. The conflict was to continue. Cf.: P. Marek, *Pravoslavní…* (Orthodoxy . . .), p. 59 seq.

39. Gorazd to A. Paschek, May 30, 1923.

40. Founded Sept 24, 1889 it established a Bishop' Conference. The Union was a federation of Old Catholic Churches of the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, France, North America etc. Miloš Pulec, *In omnibus charitas,* Sborník ke stému výročí Utrechtské unie 1889–1989, (Prague, 1989).

41. A. Paschek to Gorazd, Oct 6, 1924.

42. A. Paschek to Gorazd, July 18, 1924.

Don't Look Back, Orpheus:
"Before" and "After" in the Poetry of Rio Preisner

Charles S. Kraszewski

In reading through the seven volumes of poetry composed by Rio Preisner, who passed away in Western Pennsylvania this past August 2, one is struck by the constant *Leitmotiv* of time which runs through them all, from *Pùdorys města* (*City Plan*, 1964) up to and including *Vídeňské veduty* (*Viennese veduti,* 1994). For the Catholic poet, concerned as he was with the growing indifference of the secular world to the person of Jesus Christ, His message and act of salvation, an understanding of the linear nature of time — as opposed to the cyclical "eternal return of the same" — is an indispensable, irrefutable guarantee of the reality of history, the responsibility of the individual to act well in the real moment, and the existence of God's plan for the world. Preisner emphasizes the reality of linear time in many ways. In two of his most personal works, *Zvíře dětství* (*The Animal of Childhood*, 1978) and *Praha za času plujících ker* (*Prague in Thaw,*1992) this is achieved by the setting up of temporal coordinates, in relation to which significant happenings are shown as occurring "before" and "after" these crisis points. Our discussion will center on this theme of linear time in Preisner's poetry, his refutation of any sort of cyclical pattern (excepting Augustine's idea of *recapitulatio*) and the way this informs the poet's faith in the reality of salvation history beginning with creation, and stretching through Christ's one oblation on the cross to its culmination in judgment and resurrection.

That time itself has long been poetic material there can be no doubt. After all, Spanish comparatist Claudio Guillén devotes a good section of his lengthy discussion of form to the use of time as a formal aspect of narrative.[1] What is interesting, however, is the fact that poets often take the passage of time for granted, and those who do choose to make it a central aspect of their work speak of their awareness of time's passing as something painful. Many express a wish to hold it fast in some enduring, eternal moment. The idea is as old as poetry itself. So as not to belabor the point, we may quote the oft-repeated lover's sigh from Ovid's *Amores*: *O lente, lente currite, noctis equi!* (I.13:40), although we could with equal justice go back at least as far as Homer's description of the generations of man like falling leaves. The concluding lines of Marvell's "To his Coy Mistress", in which he laments that the lovers "cannot make our sun / Stand still" are familiar to all Anglophones, as is John Keats' melancholic jealousy of painted clay, depicting "happy love"

> For ever warm and still to be enjoyed,
> For ever panting, and for ever young,
> All breathing human passion far above.
> ("Grecian Urn", 26-28)

All of these verses deal with love, and a longing to eternalize the happiness it brings. But whereas Keats, in the early nineteenth century, still partook of the Judeo-Christian idea of linear time (even when rebelling against it), poets toward the end of the nineteenth century and during the early decades of the twentieth were wondering whether we were *not* part of a cold, universal

mechanism of the unchanging, after all. After Keats, after Byron, comes Schopenhauer letting loose the floodgates of the East and the "blind impelling force;" comes Nietzsche with the "eternal return of the same" and a revivified glorification of pagan Greece. This is what separates the Romantics' unfulfillable desire for eternity from the Modernists' quietist melancholy, which can be expressed by the refrain from Stanisław Przybyszewski's prose poem "Nad fjordem" ("On the Fjord"): *Sto lat, i wszystko przeminie* ("One hundred years, and all will pass").

In Przybyszewski's musing on the littleness of man vis-à-vis monumental nature, the "one hundred years" signifies the outer limits of human life, and the phrase "everything will pass" must be qualified with "from the perspective of man's existence." Here then, we see a picture of disinherited man, man deprived of his mastery over nature, man as a product *of* nature, an effervescence secreted *by* nature for the greater purpose of ensuring her eternity by his returning to the rich loam from which he was molded.

This pessimistic view of human life, inimical to the Judeo-Christian traditions of Europe, is itself a return to the paganism of a Menander, instructing a young friend οταν ειδεναι θελης σεαυτον οστις ει, / εμβλεψον εις τα μνημαθ ως οδοιπορεις (When you want to know who you are, consider the gravestones as you walk along the road); of a Semonides of Amorgos, who takes man to task for the very hope he harbors in his breast, calling those who refuse to despair like him at the prospect of man's mortal insignificance fools:

> νηπιοι, οις ταυτη κειται νοος, ουδε ισασι,
> ως χρονος εσθ ηβης και βιοτου ολιγος
> θνητοισ.
>
> (Fools, who keep that in mind. They do not know that the length of youth and life itself is short for mortals.)

This sort of thinking, so popular among the decadents, leads E.E. Cummings to compare eternity to the endless monotone of a prisoner's existence[2] and, in its most fauve fin-de-siècle expression, for Preisner's compatriot Jiří Karásek ze Lvovic, despair has a macabre, inverted heroism:

> Marno vše! Dávno již nahost pozbyla všech svých vnad.
> Jehovo! Proč jsi nás stvořil? Kletbou by rty se chvěly?
> Tráva jak v žáru schnou city, v marnu již otupěly.
> Nadarmo! Hnusno je žíti, nudno jest umírat!
> ("Vyžila rasa," Blasted race," 11-14)
>
> (Vanity, everything! Nudity's long ago lost all its seductiveness. Jehova! Why have you created us? For our lips to tremble in damning you? The emotions desiccate like grass in the sun; they've been dulled to vanity. Senselessness! Disgusting is life, and death is boring!)

Jan Zahradníček, the Catholic poet martyred by the Czech communists in 1960 after a long imprisonment,[3] accepted and interiorized this preoccupation with eternity in a Christian sense. In *Znamení moci* (*Sign of Power*, 1948), a prophetic work shot through with Biblical imagery, Zahradníček confronts modern man by lifting him out of history and placing him in the extra-temporal moment of Augustine's God — an eternal moment of decision in which he must choose between good and evil, heaven and hell.

Preisner's fascination with time is interesting in that he embraces, clings to, exults in the linear time scheme of this life's reality. Linear time, triple time, with its past that really was, its present actuality, and its real, promised future, helps the poet get his bearings in a world full of gnostics, whose deconstruction of values, responsibility and accountability begins with their undermining of the reality of unreturning, ever-progressing, time. The Central European poet is especially sensitive to any such attempt at skewing, or ignoring, history by totalitarian rulers who, unsatisfied with simply superseding the democratic, national institutions predating their *Machtergreifungen* — 1948 in Czechoslovakia — wish to abolish the past, raze it from book-page and memory, so that all that remains is, in Zahradníček's words, the memory of

> předloňskou dovolenou
> anebo tím rokem,
> kdy se vylíhlo tolík chroustů a otec umřel
> (*Znamení moci*, VII: 39-41)
>
> (the holiday two years' past
> or this year
> when so many cockchafers hatched and father died).

How easy it is to lead a people by the nose, whose memory is restricted to the banal (vacation) or the unbalanced, deconstructed history of one's immediate surroundings, where a plague of insects (hardly of Biblical dimensions!) is mentioned in the same breath as the death of one's father. Preisner's bulldogged preoccupation with linear time is a defense of man's dignity — which must be grounded in reality — as well as the only proof available to our senses that we are moving along, despite all injustice and catastrophe, toward the meaningful culmination of time.

For Preisner, history is a tangible thing, as natural, real, and inescapable as the earth ripped open by the ploughman's blade. In *Zasuto* (*Buried Layers Deep*, 1980), his first attempt at "telling the tale of the tribe" from a Christian perspective, he speaks of time in this context:

> se rozevírá mokvající rána,
> z níž zvolna vytéká míza dějin.
> (I: 9-10)
>
> (the sopping wet, opened wound
> from which the sap of history seeps out)

Here, history, and the linear time that generates it, are seen not only as real, but as living entities which can be done violence to, which will bleed when cut.

The form of *Zasuto* itself — *Zasuto* in its *fonction esthétique* as well its *fonction communicative* — testifies to the reality of time and historical actuality. Perhaps the most challenging of Preisner's poetic works, it bombards the reader with a blizzard of visual images. We are, as it were, in the midst of a rich archaeological dig and uncover artifacts dating from all of the ages of humanity. Here we find a metal buckle, there a thigh bone, here an ancient charcoal pile. Now, all that remains is to put it together and make sense of it. Composed at roughly the same time as his major work on cultural history, *Kultura bez konce* (*History without End*), *Zasuto* can be seen as growing out of his polemic with Václav Černý's socialistic metahistorical pamphlet *O povaze naší kultury* (*On the Character of our Culture*). Only help from the outside, in the form of Judeo-Christian revelation, can guide us to a proper, positive and meaningful understanding of

té rozsochaté možnosti času
třikrát lomeného jako údy lotra
a vzbouřence.
(*Půdorys města*, 68-70)

(those branching possibilities of time
thrice broken like the legs of thief
and rebel.)

This is the sense, and the beauty, of linear time. The 'branching possibilities' of each human activity, each of our undertakings, our very lives.

And this is the essence of linear time and its importance for man: possibility. Possibility of *different* actions and *different* outcomes, which is absent from any system of blind necessity like the non-progressive "eternal return of the same." In *Pùdorys města* (*City Plan*), Preisner's first volume of poetry, we find the following description of this eternal return of the same as an hermetically-sealed circle in which dust turns to dust and never anything more:

A tak jsme se octli u strážců civilisace,
jak si dřepli k strážnímu ohni
v magických kostýmech rozikruciánů
k stavitelům pískem zavátých měst.
K nesmrtelnosti jim chybí už jen život,
smrt mají a živou vodu lokají
v skupenství prašném,
aby nezaspali bdělost,
až je přijde vyplevelit z nich samých
a hodit na pospas plamenům věčné minulosti,
do popela nesmrtelné smrti.
(313-323)

(And thus we rub our eyes and find ourselves
among the guardians of civilisation
as they squat around the picket's bonfire
in the magical costumes of rosicrucians
on their way to the founders of cities buried in the sand.

For immortality they're lacking nought but life;
death they've got, but lack living water
in their dusty concentration,
taking care not to nod off, watching
until it come to extricate them from themselves
and toss them into the flamy mouth of the eternal past,
into the ashes of immortal death.)

Man can do nothing without God. His eternal Romes decay and crumble; his rites are misguided and directed toward inferior creation,[4] like the fire-worshippers of ancient Persia, or evaporated into the gnostic ether of New Age religion, which is really nothing "new" at all. What can these bleary-eyed watchers be waiting for in their arid wasteland? What except death?

The prospect of nothingness, of an endless end to our existence, is repulsive to us. After having experienced the fullness of life, the idea that we should one day be deprived of it all, nullified by death, is essentially incomprehensible. It seems beneath our dignity. We rebel against it, and find the despair of acquiescing to nihilism somewhat cowardly. As Preisner says earlier on in the same work:

Proto i mytický návrat je jen posledním odmítnutím
souboje na válečných pláních
před vozovými hradbami
se speřenou hrudí reků,
je vyznáním veliké nicoty,
jak ji najdeme v úsměšcích indických božstev,
poslední nicoty knotu vytřeného z objetí vosku.
(124-130)

(And thus even the mythical return is but the final refusal
of the challenge on the battlefield
before the circled wagons[5]
with the bruised breasts of heroes.
It is an acknowledgement of the great nothingness
as we find it in the smiles of Indian idols;
the final nothingness of wick torn from wax.)

We will speak more of the responsibility exacted of us by history, by real time, in a moment. The concluding line of the above-cited fragment, with its magnificent metaphor of ahistorical man as wick torn from wax, is of the utmost importance, as it focuses our attention on the central tenet of Preisner's understanding of salvation. Without history, without a real time into which the man-God Christ could be born, there could be no question of progress through the endless round of birth to death to re-birth, or, as Hopkins puts it, from Spring to Fall to Spring again. In *Kultura bez konce* Preisner notes: *Dějinná inkarnace Krista vyzdvihla dějinnou realitu, v níž žije člověk, nad všechnu možnost její dialektické negace* ("The historical incarnation of Christ elevated the historical reality in which we live past any possibility of its dialectical negation").[6] And further:

> Neexistuje-li žádný absolutně subsistentní Bůh, který by rozhodnutím své absolutně nezávislé vůle dal člověku milost umožňující jeho touze ono „vynesení do nové, vyšší roviny", pak ovšem zbývá jen automaticky fungující zákon popírající, vyzdvihující a zachovávající dialektiku, jež toto vše dokáže za jediného nevývratného předpokladu: totální negace lidské svobody.[7]
>
> (If there existed no absolutely subsistent God, who might by the decision of his absolutely independent will give man the grace enabling his aspiration towards that "self-elevation to a new, higher plane" [spoken of by Černý], there would remain but some automatically functioning law supporting, elevating and upholding the dialectic, which proves all that, on the grounds of an unique, unassailable basis: the total negation of human freedom.)

God enters reality in Christ's incarnation, sanctifying that reality and making it indisputable;[8] without God as the guarantee of the possibility of our striving, we are nothing but slaves to necessity: Sisyphus, Tantalus, the leaden-caped damned trudging on in an endless, sterile circle.

All of Preisner's poetry is impregnated with an apocalyptic assurance of the culmination of history, which is tending towards a final revelation, so to speak, in which the reality of the Cross will be made palpably manifest to all. Nowhere is this assurance more strongly felt than in *Odstup* (*Distance*) a collection of lyrics from 1977.[9] In this volume we come across assertions such as these:

> čekám ted jenom,
> až se po objetí kostýmů
> obou anglických krejčí
> na dostřel Japonska,
> v teplém dechu sibiřských věznů
> setká slovo dějin s křížem.
> (Být čist po terpentýnu, 6-11)
>
> (now I'm just waiting
> until, after the embrace
> of the English tailored suits
> — a stone'sthrow from Japan —
> in the warm breath of Siberian prisoners
> the word of history meets with the Cross)
>
> Ted však nic nesmíří chudého,
> ani skok blouznila do kráteru Etny.
> Jako by nebylo té řady nástěnek

na zdivu egyptských hrobek,
dost rzivých odkazů na rozcestí
k pravému příbytku dějin
i k lstivé centrále proměny světa.
V slepých šachtách se otvírá
oko Boží.
(Ještě bylo možné v únorové noci, 5-13)

(Now nothing gives a poor bastard any rest—
Not even a daft jump into Aetna.
As if those rows of billboards
on the walls of the Egyptian crypts
weren't the rusting heritage of the crossroads:
this way the true home of history;
that way the Central Committee for World Change.
And in the blind shafts
God's eye opens.)

S kruhem věčného návratu v chřípí
prohrabují se ondulací
asyrských vousů
a větří smečky z konce milénia.
Ještě není jisto,
že Bůh je mrtev.
(Ti všemi mastmi mazaní, 4-9)

(with the ring of eternal return through the nostrils
they rake their fingers through the undulations
of Assyrian beards
and they air out the wolf-packs from the end of
the millennium.
It's still not apparent
whether or not God is really dead.)

This culmination of history has been present, embryonically, since the very beginning of human time:

už v obrysu Akropolis
zahrnut je plán boží spásy,
že za dórským sloupem
přibit láme se stín toho,
kdo zemřel za mnohé.
(*Visuté mosty,* I:7-11)

(Already in the contours of the Acropolis
the plan of salvation is contained—
and behind the Doric column
breaks the shadow of the crucified,
who died for the sins of many.)

The Greek Way, the neo-paganism of the Swinburnes and Pounds, is no longer an option. It has seen its day; it has played its role as a part of God's plan, and Byzantium supersedes Athens[10] in a logical progression as mathematically exact and satisfying as the octaves of Kallikrate's design for the Pantheon — which itself evolved from temple to the virgin goddess to sanctuary dedicated to the Virgin Mother. This same sort of idea is expressed in Canto II of *Zasuto:*

> Tak se valili v houfech
> Gibraltarem a Kaspickou branou,
> od smolných altajských tunder
> s hrůzou ledových lesů v nozdrách
> do sadů zlatého věku.
> (Zas II: 68-72)

> (Thus they beat in hoards
> through Gibraltar and the Caspian Gate,
> from the pitchy Altaian tundra
> with the terror of icy forests in their nostrils
> to the orchards of the Golden Age.)

Is this a snapshot of barbarian invasions, or a mapping of the great migrations of the Indo-European peoples? Whichever it may be, we see the movement in a larger perspective than the hunt for spoil or a new, milder climate — whatever might have been foremost in the minds of these irrepressible mobs, the important motion, the pilgrimage, was from paganism to Christianity, from the darkness of the fatal *Götterdämmerung* to the light of salvation. In other words, from point to point on a progressive, straight course.

Returning for a moment to the earlier citation from *Visuté mosty* which speaks of the Acropolis, the Central European reader is reminded of one of the consummate ironies of modern communism. In the days of socialism triumphant, when it was well-nigh impossible to even imagine the crumbling of the iron curtain, Erich Honecker, head of the East German communist state, built a gigantic radio tower in East Berlin, in the vicinity of the cathedral. His purpose was two-fold; on the one hand, the practical reason for its construction was to widen the reach of his propaganda into Western Germany. On the other, the symbolic reason for its being built was his desire to overtop the neighboring steeples, so that the highest point in his socialist capital should not be topped with a cross. Ironically, the position of the tower in relation to one of the steeples is such that, every evening, the light of the westing sun casts the shadow of the cross onto the silver disc atop the radio tower.

This reminiscence causes us to wonder, if the reality of historical time is so irrefutable, why are there so many who stubbornly refuse to believe the evidence presented them by their senses? Why, when this man or that ideology wished to create a heaven on earth, *Na smetiště dějin první vyhozen byl / Kristus* ("The first one tossed out onto the garbage-heap of history was Christ," "Na smetiště dějin," 1-2)?

Aside from the obvious revulsion of totalitarian governments of all stripes to Christianity (for the idea of an individual's free will is inimical to Socialist *Massenwahn*), Preisner feels that the reason for this is to be found in a

desire to avoid the responsibility for one's actions. Thus, even in the secular West (if not *especially* in the secular West) the demanding God of the Judeo-Christian tradition, Who has entered time in order to afford man the possibility of a meaningful life, is rejected in favor of the two-faced Roman god: *Všichni svorně ctí boha nestrannosti, / bastarda Januse blahé paměti* ("Everyone unanimously honors the god of non-alignment / the bastard Janus of blesséd memory," *VM,* Pád I:21-22).

Janus faces both sides at once, preferring neither. He serves as the unwobbling pivot stagnating in the center of the eternal wheel, bereft of any possibility of progression. Overlooking the fact that Janus's very non-existence — he has been "dead" for nigh on two thousand years — is itself proof of the inexorable march of time, the people whom Preisner is satirizing in these lines have chosen their patron well. If history is real, if man must progress, since he cannot be in two places at once, the blessing of possibility becomes for him the curse of decision-making. And in this age of relativism, when words like "sin" and "virtue" have lost their meaning, where what was once called reprehensible behavior is considered an "alternative" to be tolerated, if not in fact propagated, the fact that time and reality enjoin upon us responsibility for what we *really do* can be a terrifying prospect indeed.

And yet there is no choice. We do exist, we do act, and we must accept the consequences of our actions, both good and bad. In the lyric "V Čechách i hradby jsou pojídzné," from *Odstup*, Preisner presents us with a vivid image of the fate of those who shrug off responsibility in a reciprocal apokatastasis: *Konečně se obrátil proti sobě, štírek, / v ohňovém kruhu domnělých nevin.* ("At last the scorpion turns upon himself/ in the fiery circle of supposed innocences," 11-12).

This desire to escape responsibility for one's actions by mutually supposing each other's innocence and appealing to the sinner's good intentions, or the relativity of moral outlooks, is reminiscent of the situation found in the parallel universes of Borges' "Garden of the Forking Paths" where simultaneously-enacted virtuous and immoral actions not only deprive the agent of free will, but nullify the possibility of moral assessment: praise, or blame.[11] Yet this sort of approach to the world is suicide. One cannot *wish* God's moral order, or the particular judgment to befall each of us, out of existence any more than one can replace linear with circular time by *fiat.* And whereas by virtue of God's gift of free will we are not impeded in acting irresponsibly or neglecting to reflect on the fruit of our actions, this does not mean that we shall not be made accountable for them, because we would rather wish not to be.

The only "eternal circle" to be found in Preisner's works, the only salutory and indeed vital *recapitulatio* available to us, is that described in *Visuté mosty*:

> Je nám dovoleno žít v hříchu jen,
> abychom denně umírali,
> a denně se znovu zrodili:
> pokropeni rosou milosti boží.
>
> *Christus totam novitatem attulit,*
> *semetipsum afferens.*
>
> (*VM,* I: 60-65)

(We are allowed to live in sin only so that
we should daily die,
and daily be reborn:
sprinkled with the dew of God's grace.

Christus totam novitatem attulit,
semetipsum afferens.)

Preisner himself experienced this "second birth" in his conversion to Christianity as an adult. This overwhelmingly important experience is one of the greatest pivotal time points according to which "before" and "after" are coordinated in the most introspective of his volumes of poetry, *Zvíře dětství* (*The Animal of Childhood*, 1978). In this book, the reality of linear time is foregrounded most strongly, for here the notion of the historical is transformed from the theological, universal and cultural to the eye-witness testimony of a person who experienced it — as we all do — on his own skin.

It would not be inaccurate to say that Preisner begins his description of the real history of his own life *ab ovo*. Consider the following lyric from *Zvíře dětství*:

SOUSED ODNAPROTI pořádal v neděli
loutkové představení.
Ve městě se šířil mor
a s princeznou bylo zle.
Jak to vyřešil Kašpárek,
už nevím.
Kuchyn přepažili prostěradlem,
stáhli rolety. Svítilo se jen
v tom morovém městě.
V příbytcích vládly
neúprosné zákony svobody.
Nic nebylo napsáno.

(THE NEIGHBOR FROM ACROSS THE WAY
held puppet-shows on Sundays.
A plague spread through the city
and the princess was in trouble.
Just how Kašpárek made everything all right,
I don't quite remember.
They drew a bedsheet across the kitchen
and pulled down the blinds. There was light
only in the plague-stricken city.
In the houses ruled
the implacable laws of freedom.
Nothing was written down.)

The amateur puppet-show, improvised to suit the exigencies of the dramatic moment, or the tastes of the children, is an allegory of life itself, full of possibilities. "Nothing is written down" — there is no script to follow, there

is no pre-extant future into which we are moving day by day. There is no necessity which jams us into any pre-determined role or activity; we are living our life, progressing through it, shaping it unconstrained by any author laying out the brooches for the eyes of Oidipous at the moment when Iocaste is boring his ankles through. It is of no small significance that the plague with which the puppet-show begins is accepted as a given, to be worked out and worked out from, not the result and catalyst of fate, such as in the play by Sophocles. We, like the puppeteers who improvise the show as they go on, are not harried by necessity. "Nothing is written down" — we play each moment by ear.

As in the private sphere, so in the public, the larger sphere of geopolitical history. The oft-heard phrase "If Napoléon had not come along, he would have had to have been invented" — as if he were an historical necessity not to be dispensed with — is something with which Preisner would disagree:

> AŽ Z MORAVY, zdaleka, přijel bratranec
> na kole. Stál opřen o kašnu nedaleko smetiště,
> a jak se vynořil, tak zmizel.
> Zbyla jen hadí stopa.
> Zvečera syn ruských emigrantů,
> malý bělogvardějec Filipov,
> jedl pocukrovaný chléb s máslem.
> Bělomořsko-baltický kanál
> imeni Stalina,
> koně kulaků vytáhli už
> z doby kamenné do věku železa.
> Ani to nebylo nutné.
>
> (FROM AS FAR AS MORAVIA, that far, my cousin came
> on his bicycle.
> He leaned against the fountain not far from the trashbin
> and just as he surfaced, so did he vanish.
> There remained but a snake's trail after him.
> In the evening, the son of Russian emigrants,
> the little *bielogvardiejec* Filipov,
> ate sugared bread and butter.
> The White Sea—Baltic Canal
> *imieni Stalina*
> Was stretched out already (by kulak's horses)
> from Stone Age to Iron Age.
> Quite unnecessarily.)

Like the forced famine in the Ukraine, which turned the weakest of Stalin's 7,000,000 "kulaks" to cannibalism in the early thirties, this little excursion in slave-labor cannot be blamed on historical necessity. Like many of the world's crimes, both big and little, these were precipitated by a tyrant's whim. In this, with fitting irony, the canal was well-named!

If one cannot see into the future,[12] looking back into the past from the vantage point of the present can reveal the sensible progression of time in a wider context than that of the growing child who *Zamilován do sebe, (měří) / odstup mezi kotníky a lemem nohavic* ('in love with himself, [measures] / the distance

between ankle and pants-cuff').[13] In the reflective volume of autobiographical lyrics which is now our main object of interest, one of the most powerful orientational *Sehepunkte* which divides "before" from "after" is made up of Preisner's experiences of war and the Stalinist gulag. This is most clearly marked in the lyric "ZATO V ZIMĚ" ("THEN IN WINTER"), a companion piece to the puppet-show verse cited above:

ZATO V ZIMĚ přijížděl loutkář.
Pokaždé když Škrhola měl co říct,
trhal tělem v radostné křeči.
Dupák na rozloučenou vyskakoval
a rostl a rostl
za jásotu nás všech ne k nebesům,
ale na samu mez ztuhlého světa.
Skoro zapomenut byl rytíř,
třebas mávnutím meče zahnal draka.
Nebylo ran a nebylo nože,
který by se v nich obracel.

(THEN IN WINTER the puppeteer would come.
And when Škrhola had something to say,
he jerked his body in joyous spasms.
Dupák jumped out at goodbye
and grew and grew
to the cheers of us all not to the heavens
but to the very borders of the frozen world.
The knight was good as forgotten—
let him chase the dragon with his sword!
There were no wounds nor knives
to twist in them.)

Like Zbigniew Herbert's anti-hero Don Cogito, possessed with history, the fifty-year-old poet, looking back from this side of the period of twisting knives constantly correlates the microcosmic *res gestae* of his personal life with the history of the macrocosm. Recalling the fierce seasonal windstorms that swept across the Carpathian surroundings of his youth, upon reflection, Preisner senses that another sort of threat was then blowing in from the East:

STALETÉ DUBY ležely prostě
po pádu.
Dodnes mi písek žlutých bouří
skřípe mezi zuby a vypaluje zrak.
Zjara to chodívalo z madarské puszty,
v podletí z haličských stepí;
zásadně tedy ze strany mírných pogromů.
To bylo v čase, kdy pavouk vševěd
vypouštěl z řitě provaz.
na usmýkání národů.

(HUNDRED YEAR OLD OAKS lay straight

after the fall.
To this day the sand of yellow storms
grinds in my teeth and burns my eyes.
It came in the Spring from the Hungarian *puszta;*
in late Summer from the Galician steppe;
basically, from the direction of minor pogroms.
Those were the times, when the omniscient spider
pushed out the leash from his anus
with which he was to drag along the nations.)

One might be tempted to see in this poem an image of the fatalistic helplessness of the individual facing an irresistible, eventual onslaught of tyrannic might, such as informs Günter Grass's poem "In Ohnmacht gefallen":

Ohnmacht legt Platten auf: ohnmächtige Songs.
Ohne Macht mit Guitarre.—
Aber feinmaschig und gelassen
wirkt sich draussen die Macht aus.

(22-25)

(Powerlessness puts records on — powerless songs.
Powerless with a guitar. But outside,
Finely meshing and composed,
Power has its way).

But it must not be forgotten that here the poet is not looking forward to an eventuality, but backward, to an actual past event, which he is recalling, analyzing. The big difference between the "omniscient" Soviet spider and the windstorms is just that: the irrepressible eventuality of the biannual tornadoes as opposed to the workings of men, for good or evil, which are not unavoidably predetermined like some fatalistic time bomb. The "dragging along of the nations," as successful as it was to prove to be, was yet no more a certainty than World War Three, the threat of which loomed so great at times during the Cold War, yet which seems to have been finally defused — if perhaps replaced after 11 September with a more frightening menace.[14] We perceive, we speculate, we strive to avert catastrophes which may, but needn't, arise, and often we succeed in our efforts, for there is no script.

Looking back is what we are concerned with at the moment: the before, rather than the after.

> The power of putrefaction aims at the obfuscation of history; it seeks to destroy not one but every religion, by destroying the symbols, by leading off into theoretical argument. /. . . / Suspect anyone who destroys an image, or wants to suppress a page of history. / . . . / History is recorded in monuments, and that is why they get destroyed.[15]

So writes Ezra Pound in his 1942 essay "A Visiting Card." We have already touched upon the imperative which Preisner feels to preserve the monuments of history — something which we will go into in more depth when we turn to the volume *Praha za času plujících ker* (*Prague in Thaw*). *Zvíře dětství* is interesting in that the real, personal experiences of his childhood recorded in this work stand alongside and give credence and witness to the larger scheme of history which is of the utmost importance to us all. In this way, *Zvíře dětství* is, like *Královská cesta* (*The Royal Road*), a palimpsest. In reading and accepting the reality of the sometimes banal details of Preisner's childhood, we cannot help but see the text scrawled beneath the last layer of characters — the anything but ordinary story of our own world.

Thus the importance of documenting every single experience, of casting the death-mask before the body decomposes:

> ŽILA KDY kabbalistická dívka
> s tváří zbledlou do dvourozměrna?
> (Kdepak se napila černého mléka?)
> Zněla kdy zvonkohra vídenské dlažby?
> Pýřila se pod plachetkou osoba?
> Svítilo se v hradních oknech?
> (1-6)

> (DID THE CABBALISTIC GIRL once live, really,
> with her face paled to the two dimensional?
> [Where on earth did she get the black milk to drink?]
> Did the soundplay of the Viennese cobbles ever really ring?
> Did she blush behind her veil?
> Did the dawn ever light up the castle windows?)

On the positive answers to these simple questions depends our assurance of the reality of our world — depends our ability to avoid being led by the nose by those who destroy monuments to suit their own purposes and our enslavement.

The palimpsest technique referred to above is well illustrated by Preisner's memory of the Jewish girl who used to work in his father's travel agency and spend many leisure hours with the family during his childhood. She is not just a snapshot witness to his youth in Mukačevo; she puts a tangible, human face on the millions of her co-religionists murdered, like herself, in Auschwitz. She testifies to a past reality which we choose to overlook or doubt at our peril.[16]

There was a large Jewish community in Mukačevo; in fact, the only gymnasium in Europe with Hebrew as a language of instruction was located there. Preisner, often introduces Jews into *Zvíře dětství* as a symbol of a past reality annihilated, which can never be replaced:

> MĚSTO PRIPADLO CIZINCŮM,
> co vyšli z minula.
> Na náměsti s pomníkem hvězdáře
> skauti prodávali odznáčky
> pod zelenými prapory.
> Nedávno ještě jsem náměsíčně

kráčel po zídce gymnázia
a v pohanské vyvolenosti shlížel
na odsouzence v modrých košilích.
Od ucha k uchu šalom.
(1-12)

(THE TOWN FELL TO THE FOREIGNERS
who came out of the past.
On the square with the statue of the astronomer
scouts sold badges
beneath green pennants.
Not so long ago I walked in my sleep
along the wall of the gymnasium
and in my pagan election gazed upon
the condemned in their blue shirts.
From ear to ear a whispered shalom.)

Here, Preisner is describing the occupation of Košice carried out by Hungarian[17] fascists, which he witnessed during his flight to Moravia at the start of the war. In the second part of the poem, the poet is recalling the Jewish gymnasium in Mukačevo, where he took instruction in violin and of whose orchestra he was the only gentile member.[18] If, in another poem dealing with the "two-dimensional" Jewish girl, he strikes an ominous tone of time maturing to its horrible culmination— *Carodějka s tváří polapeného supa/ se strojila k spálení v Osvětimi*[19] ("The sorceress with the face of a captured vulture / dolled herself up for the ovens of Auschwitz")— here, in the strong coupling of Košice and Mukačevo, we have a definitive expression of time matured to crisis. The trees that had been growing on the hillside, to paraphrase Eduard Mörike,[20] have now been cut down for coffin-boards.

No less important in this verse is Preisner's mention of his "pagan election." Son of an old Communist party member, Preisner was for the most part raised in an a-religious atmosphere. In *Zvíře dětství*, Jews and Jewishness play a central role in filling out another temporal demarcation between before and after: before, and after, Preisner's election to the Judeo-Christian faith, which event was to have a decisive formative effect on how he was to come to understand the meaning of time and history.

Considering *Zvíře dětství* as a spiritual autobiography, we can see that Preisner groups the poems dealing with his journey towards Christ in a set of stages, progressing in linear fashion. First, we can speak of poems treating of his "pagan election," then, a group devoted to his awakening consciousness of the existence of Hans Urs von Balthazar's "totally different," transcendent God, and, finally, several references to the moment of his unexpected election to faith in Christ.

As an example of the first phase of his journey, we might put forward the following verse, a reminiscence of afternoons spent in the orchards outside town:

NA VINICÍCH ZRÁLA JABLKA
onoho rajského šíra,
z něhož se blýskalo na časy.

Skryt v kukuřičném poli
větřil jsem oblak sarančat.
Otec však si prozpěvoval.
Cikáni hráli v kopcích.
Opilci hulákali o zduřelé lásce;
do brázd blili gulášové víno.
Vykračoval (jsem) po strništích naděje
bez víry a zrál po plané sliby.

(IN THE VINEYARDS APPLES MATURED
of that paradisical expanse
where lightning announced fair weather.
Hidden in the field of maize
I sniffed out a cloud of locusts.
But father sang to himself.
The gypsies played in the hillocks.
The drunks bellowed about swollen love,
and puked a goulash of wine into the dirtclods.
And I walked over stubblefields of hope
without faith, maturing for vows in vain.)

The Edenic reference is not coincidental; despite the subdued threat of locusts we have the positive image of a peaceful, almost timeless existence with father singing, amidst the innocent distractions or annoyances of the drunks on their outings and the gypsies in the hillocks. But time is grinding on in the background of the child's mind, and the yearning feeling aroused by the confused, aimless wandering about "stubblefields of hope," picked clean of the corn by those who knew how to get in on the harvest before him, is to be sounded ever more clearly in the other verses dealing with his Jewish friends. In these poems, Preisner's consciousness is slowly awakening to the painful realization of the brevity of life, jealously watched over by

neomylně dřepící smrti—
Nezaměnitelná krajina a její čas
darovaný.
("MIRKO byl syn primáře," 14-16)

(infallible death watchfully squatting—
That inexchangeable country, and its time
lent.)

This idea of living on borrowed time, and the sense that there are others who have somehow learned not only to live that allotted time to the fullest, but also to cheat death — that second death of which Augustine speaks is at the bottom of these verses of the second group, in which he expresses a jealous appreciation of the Jews' privileged position before God:

VZCHÁZELY DNY.
Židé na dvory vynášeli stoly,

na stoly kladli posvátné knihy.
Děti v košilkách, s holou prdýlkou
— to aby se neutekly do zámku —
rostly od svazku k svazku,
obracejíce list zprava doleva.
Tím směrem vanuly Jobovy zvěsti.
Na křídlech molů se vznášela
mocná tajemství zcela jiného.
A že nikoli já mám žít.

(DAYS DAWNED.
The Jews carried tables outside
and laid their holy books upon them.
Children in undershirts, with bare bottoms
— so that they needn't run off —
grew from volume to volume,
turning the page from right to left.
In that direction they aired at the message of Job.
On the wings of moths there arose
the strong mysteries of the totally other.
And that it wasn't me going to live).

This sense of his name being somehow excluded from the number of those to be written in the book of life, of the "strong mysteries" of God somehow slipping past him, is the theme of more than one such poem in *Zvíře dětství*:

BYL JSEM, ano, byl jsem mezi těmi,
co se věšeli na ruku důstojného pána,
když přecházel plácek před kostelem.
A zatimco Pán Ježíš proměnil hroudu v skřivana
a odměnil chudou ženu podle ok v polévce,
rostl jsem do jistoty zhola ničeho.
Nevím, zda to vzlyklo v tůni
plné andělů hlubin,
nebot jsem vesele zaspal slovo lásky.
Jádro podstaty však černalo
zrajíc v samém středu nepodstatného.

(I WAS, yes I was among them
who hung on the arm of the reverend Father
as he crossed the little square before the church.
Yet while the Lord Jesus turned clods into skylarks
and changed the fatrings in the poor wife's soup
to good round coin,
I grew to an assurance of absolutely nothing.
I don't know if there was any sobbing in the depths
of the abyss of angels because of it,
but I slept right through the word of love.
And the essence of substance turned black,
maturing in the very midst of the insubstantial.)

His "Christian election," coming as it did much later in life, does not, logically, form a significant part of what we might call the "overt content" of *Zvíře dětství*. The Christian perspective of the work, however, is its guiding thread. Preisner looks back upon the period of his youth, as a Christian adult, interpreting the same as a maturing toward that moment of conversion, which is mentioned more than once in the volume with a sense of wondering surprise:

> Jak dobré je žít v úzkostech
> až do konce, když všechno vlastnictví
> se vydralo ze mne,
> abych byl snad zachráněn o vlas.
> ("TAM, KDE ZA MOSTEM tvrdlo bláto," 10-13)
>
> (How good it is to live in fear
> to the very end, when all possession
> was torn away from me,
> so that I might be saved by a hair.)

And elsewhere:

> Ve skutečnosti (ve skutečnosti)
> všechny mosty na cestách byly už zbořeny.
> Milost mě zatím předběhla
> k okraji propasti.
> (PRÍBĚHY o štastných trosečnících, 13-16).
>
> (Really, [really]
> all bridges had already been burnt.
> Meanwhile, grace raced ahead and beat me
> to the lip of the chasm.)

The sense of being saved from imminent catastrophe found in these works is not only dramatic, and it doesn't simply redound to the glory of Christ as Saviour, whom, by the palimpsest technique, is being put forward here also as the only hope for our world, hurtling to the lip of the chasm itself. What is intriguing here is the idea of Christian election as something not to be worked towards or grasped at, but which falls on one unexpectedly, like the light of God knocking Paul off his horse. Hence the importance of the Jewish verses in *Zvíře dětství*, in which we see Preisner the child searching for that "totally other," jealously observing the good luck of those who seem to possess an avenue of approach to God blocked to him, and not knowing where to turn, somehow "sleeping through the word of love." The orthodox Christian doctrine of man's election to salvation via his acceptance of the grace sent upon him by God who initiates the process — here exemplifies the central significance of Preisner's linear idea of time: the existence of God's plan for us, for the world, acted out in history — both personal and cosmic.

As a convert to Christianity, Preisner feels this process, this plan, most keenly. He was not fated to faith by birthright, like his Hebrew neighbors and the other children hanging on the arm of the popular priest who most likely

baptized them as infants and saw them each day dragged to church by their parents, nor was it the fruit of a conscious desire, the attainment of which might be questioned as a self-fulfilling prophecy. No, the election came upon him right when he did not expect it to, and the fact of its salvific nature, coming as it did just before potential catastrophe, argues its ordering by a benevolent, caring God, who was patiently waiting for the child to advance close enough to be finally gathered into the paternal embrace.

The fact that his maturation to the right moment for election was in the plans of God from the very start of his journey — although he hardly recognized it at the time — is given eloquent expression in the final poem of the collection, which echoes the incipit from the gospel of St John:

LÁSKA STOUPÁ z trnité vatry,
u níž se hřeji na útěku.
Hlídky vyhnanců se dělí
temna vypuzeného k nebesům.
Jak sálá ta železná doba,
žhne zvolna — paulatim — nalézaným slovem.
Bylo na počátku,
bylo, milovaný,
bylo v nukleu ohně,
bylo — — —

(LOVE ASCENDS from the thorny bonfire,
around which one warms oneself on the run.
The scouts of the exiles are frightened by
the darkness chased heavenward.
But however this iron age rages,
the fire glows slowly—paulatim—fed
by the discovered word.
Was in the beginning,
was, beloved,
was in the nucleus of fire,
was)

This is not a fairy tale. What happens after the happy end is — continued reality. Preisner's poetry is not a sentimental pietistic tract retracing, for example, the steps of the Wesleyan method from acknowledgement of one's sinful nature to the relieving, enduring peace of the Christian assurance. Christian election, as expressed in Preisner's work, is gift, opportunity, and responsibility — the talent entrusted to the servant. We are now on the other side of that line of demarcation which is the dominant orientation point of the poet's personal history. We've seen what has gone "before," now, after the moment of election, the important image contained in the above cited poem of the bonfire takes on especial meaning. Now that Christ has enabled Preisner to spell out the confused Sibylline leaves of this world, this does not mean that the challenges and doubts will disappear. The Christian must be a responsible "keeper of the flame" — he must remain faithful to and unshakably sure of God's promise, keeping his faith in the meaningful culmination of God's plan for the world. As we are about to see, the task is far from an easy one.

Rio Preisner was never one to mistake the city of man for the city of God — after all, the naive faith in man's temporal perfectibility, a characteristic of the "scientific" totalitarianism against which he battled for so long, is refuted at length in *Kultura bez konce*.[21] However, the rapid spiral away from God, the Christian tradition and values, which he witnessed in Czechoslovakia after the "velvet revolution" of the early '90s confronted him with a strong challenge to his faith in God's plan, which demanded of him a response. The history of this new, one might even say unlooked-for, attack on his *Weltanschauung*, and his resolution of the conflict, forms the basis of a collection of verse no less personal than *Zvíře dětství*: that is, *Praha za času plujících ker* (*Prague in Thaw*), composed in 1990-91, during his first visit home after nearly a quarter of a century.

In all of Preisner's poetry written before the democratic liberation of Czechoslovakia from the communist system, we find an unshakable assurance in the calm progression of God's plan for the world from inception through history to meaningful culmination. For example, as early as *Půdorys města* he speaks of this in some of the most transparent lines he ever wrote:

> Čas i prostor dozrávají ve věčnosti,
> nebot v této chvíli,
> zavěšeny mezi minulostí a budoucností,
> jsou pouhým zeleným příslibem vína,
> a také přítomnost je znamením pravého času
> a pravého raje—
> minulé i budoucí je podobou zrání a naděje
> v dobré slunce.
> (106-113)
>
> (Time and space mature into eternity,
> for in this moment,
> suspended between past and future,
> they are merely the green promise of the wine;
> and thus the present is a sign of the proper time
> and the proper heaven—
> the past and the future the image of waxing and hope
> in the good sun).

This segment, with its uncharacteristic simplicity of diction, comes as an island of straightforwardness in the midst of the sea of poetic images, the thick collage, which is *Půdorys města*. Preisner here most resembles Zahradníček — whose tropes from *Znamení moci* can be sensed in this small fragment — who also will often shock the reader with the most plain statement when he wishes to get an idea across unmistakably. As in *De civitate Dei*, we see the emphasis on *exortus* (note the image of the dawning sun), *processus, finis.*

To keep the matter in the proper perspective, we must stress that the poet sees this *finis* in time matured in eternity, and thus the culmination of God's plan for history as not being of this life.[22] This can also be seen in his constant expression of faith in the triumph of the cross over its temporal enemies. And here he is not speaking only of the godless communist systems of Central and Eastern Europe, but also of

Sen harwardských politologů
o světovládě lidumilného spravedlivce,
jenž sestoupil s kříže
na všeobecnou žádost.
(KOŽUCHY SE JEŽILY nalíc, štítily naruby, 7-10)

(the dream of Harvard political scientists
of the world-governing, philanthropical just one
who descends from the cross
by popular demand)

and the gnosticizing of Jesus Christ in the meccas of liberal western pop art and *Formgeschichte* theology:

Ježíš, zbaven roušky i jména,
nikdy nebyl, ba hůř,
pokoušen vlastním stínem
veřejně popřel sám sebe
a se zpravodajci, filmaři
a vykladači písmen
zmizel za obzorem dvojí smrti.
(VM, Pád VI: 50-56)

(Jesus, stripped of covering and name,
never was — or worse:
tempted by his own shadow,
he publicly denounces himself
and with documentarists, filmmakers
and scripture critics,
disappears beyond the horizon of second death.)

And yet the culmination of history will be, as we have earlier noted, an undeniable revelation even to those who rejected and denounced the reality of history, the reality of Christ. As expressed in the concluding lines of *Královská cesta*: *Poslední půjdou klauni. . ./ Da capo al fine* ("Last come the clowns. . . Da capo al fine," XI: 56-57).

Should Preisner have been surprised, then, to find that, once the communist government had been overthrown by Havel and his Civic Forum, no spiritual renewal of the Czech people should result, that no Te Deum should be sung to the people's true liberator in St Vit's Cathedral, that the Czechs should simply set up the sloppy idol of western relativism in place of the party chairman's portrait — in short, that there should take place anything but a *recapulatio universae iniquitatis*?[23] For this is what he found when he returned to the Baroque capital on the banks of the Vltava that he had left, regretfully, twenty-two years before.

Preisner gives free rein to his distaste for the penny-ante new bourgeois initiative in the following verse describing street-corner capitalism:

PRED VELKOPRODEJNOU KOTVA

krok za krokem sune se,
sune se cosi k lizu.
Znovu nabízejí houby
namočené v octu a žluči.
Na roku Spálené
ulevuje si opilec.
Z postranních ulic
tichounce vybíhají chrti.
Stařeny, které zamlada
pletly pod guilotinou
punčochu s nadílkou udání,
belhají se o berli z hliníku
na trh marnosti;
ty chytřejší přísně rozlišují
mezi močí a výkaly
na trůnì pisoárů.

(BEFORE THE ANCHOR department store
step by step,
someone's tongue nears the trough.
Again they offer mushrooms
soaked in vinegar and gall.
On the corner of Spálená
a drunken man heaves.
From the byways and alleys
greyhounds rush out, silently.
Old women, who in their younger days
knitted Christmas stockings beneath the guillotine
to fill with thirty silver pieces
hobble along on canes of aluminum
towards Vanity Fair;
the sharper among them
carefully set the price of piss and crap
from their thrones in the WC).

The general soullessness that he encounters upon his return to his city obviously weighs on the poet and plays a central role in the ever-growing sense of dejection which threatens to smother him. But even more than this, perhaps, it is the animal facility which his countrymen, whom he once described as little more than a nation of slaves,[24] have to land on their feet without even noticing the heights from which they have fallen, that disturbs him most. The women who once made it their business to inform on their neighbors, to make sure that no one made a few extra crowns by renting out spare apartments on the side or other forms of speculation, now eke out their living among the ubiquitous latrine women in the public restrooms — speculating, Preisner notes with sarcasm, on the market regulating the most necessary comforts.

What the poet is lamenting here is his countrymen's almost total lack of convictions. Ruminating on the state of these women, he now realizes that whatever swinishness they may have committed earlier on during the *ancien régime* was not undertaken out of any belief in that system of government,

however wrong-headed it may have been it was for filthy lucre. The striking linkage of trough and pissoir at the two extremities of this poem constitutes a strong, sarcastic denunciation of opportunism the villainy committed under socialism was simply an expression of their vile natures. Nothing has really changed.

A disturbing sense of collective amnesia has settled on the country. No one is called to account for what he or she may have done wrong, terribly wrong, during the Socialist moral anarchy when the state was the ultimate arbiter of right and wrong, from whose decisions there was no appeal.

> Ve výčepu U zeleného stromu
> od věčného šera zalévají
> žízen pro ležáku otroctví.
> S pačesy v pivě hmatají
> po tváři nepřátel v mlhách.
> S blbým usměvem přikývují
> katovským mistrům.
> (KDYKOLI ZAPRŠÍ, jdu si vypít, 5-11)
>
> (In a dive called At the Green Tree,
> in the eternal funk, they drown
> their thirst for the lager of slavery.
> Their knotted hair in the beer, they paw
> the faces of their enemies in the mist.
> With wet idiotic grins they nod
> towards their executioner-masters.)

This drunken *Brüderschaft*, this willingness to embrace yesterday's informer, yesterday's StB goon, in the spirit of letting bygones be bygones, has something craven, something unnatural and unjust about it. The feeling that "now we're all in this together" suggests to the poet that maybe they all were in it together, from the very beginning, and the relativism which gives birth to this crooked amnesty sets the axe at the very roots of justice, accountability, true assessment of the past and prudent preparation for the future. As he expressed it in *Královská cesta*, written just prior to the collection now under our consideration:

> "Lidé odpouštět si mají,
> soudruh soudruhovi. "
>
> Soudruh, můj milý, to je už peklo.
> (V: 82-85)
>
> ("People are supposed to forgive each other,
> comrade to comrade."
>
> Comrade, dear comrade, that's what hell is all about).

Hell, as we learn from both Dante and Preisner's *Královská cesta*, is circular. Without the proper assessment of the sins of the past, there can be no

avoiding of the same in the future — there can be no progress. Instead, it invites the eternal return of the same old suffering.

V odstupech generačních
do bran kostela vchází dábel
s kalichem věčného mládí,
v kufříku z hadí kůže
/. . . /
Ví, že lačnost naše nevadne
ani po přetětí kořene hříchu;
zalévá ji výtažky máku.
(VM: X:47-50, 57-59)

(In generational intervals
the devil enters though the church doors
with the chalice of eternal youth
in a snakeskin briefcase.
/ . . . /
He knows that our desire will never wilt,
even after the root of sin is cut through;
he sprinkles it with extract of opium).

Something has gone wrong. Preisner has seen his persecutors driven from power; he's returned victorious to a country that declared him a non-person two decades earlier and sought to erase his name from the memory of his countrymen. But after the slight upward shrug, which toppled the communist leadership from their perch on the shoulders of the people, those backs are bent in apathy again, and the nation seems heading back towards the past it refused to learn from:

Na Růžovém paloučku
před stanem hladoví
apoštolové Konfucia.
Kdosi vymáhá opevnění
moravských hranic.
(Ceština zpívá, 18-22).

(On the Růžový meadow
before their tents, hunger
the apostles of Confucius.
Someone demands the fortification
of the Moravian frontier.)

Like Priesner's acquaintance, President Havel, who invited the Dalai Lama to the newly-independent Czech Republic before he even telegrammed the Pope, these young Czechs seeking spiritual renewal abandon Christ for the exotic cults of the East (with their notorious rejection of reality). But what do they have in common with the refortification of the borders? Everything. Here we see the collage technique at its suggestive best: the escape into timelessness which they exemplify, their rejection of individuality for Brahma-soul, of his-

tory for the being and non-being of Nirvana, fosters, or at least goes hand in hand with, a willful ignorance of the past, and fortifications are being planned between Czech and Pole, Czech and Slovak, Czech and Moravian, which eerily recall the various Maginot and Siegfried lines of fifty years before. Is it any wonder that, confronted by this anti-climax to the velvet revolution, the poet should feel close to depression? Is this, too, part of the confident progression of God's plan? *Ti dobří zdá se umřeli zavčas / a já se tu rouhám*. "The good ones seem to have died just in time," we read, "while I remain here, blaspheming."[25]

To be sure, Preisner's discouragement at the situation he found in Czechoslovakia upon his return in 1990-91 is not because he expected to find the Kingdom of God established on St Václav's Square. Nor was his return visit to Prague the first, unlooked-for blow struck against his optimistic, Christian outlook on the eventually successful progression of time. In *Visuté mosty*, written just before the Prague visit, we see the poet in depression over the dangers facing *tu lod zvanou Církev* ("that boat called the Church"), which saved him *v padesátých letech, kdy jsem byl napůl utonulý v nemilosrdných vlnách stalinismu* ("in the fifties, when [he was] half drowned in the merciless waves of stalinism"), yet which although once *směle vzdorující přívalům pronásledování, jak by byla mezitím zahnána do pásma nebezpečných písčin* ("boldly breasting the raging floods of persecution, had been seemingly washed into a range of dangerous shallows").[26] Writing in Canto VII of the Church's decline into relativism and her abandonment of traditional forms for touchy-feely, poetic liturgical experiments, Preisner comments:

> Už zas vrkají zastaveníčka
> setkání milosrdenství a lásky;
> a jak dojemně prý vyvažují se
> láska k dobru a míra zla poctivá.
> Summa summarum všem kyne spása,
> zatracení usnulo v poledním stínu.
> /. . . /
> Introibo ad altare Dei.
> Už ani kněz neví kudy. . .
> (1-6; 32-33)
>
> (Again they coo their serenades
> of the meeting of love with mercy;
> and how, movingly, it seems,
> love of good cancels out an honest measure of evil.
> Summa summarum salvation nods to all,
> and damnation dozes in the afternoon shade.
> /. . . /
> Introibo ad altare Dei.
> Now even the priest's lost his way. . .)

Preisner is certainly not the type of exile who sees only good in the world into which he has been driven; but his great discouragement comes at the swiftness with which the relativism of the West floods into Central Europe once the barbarian wall between them was dismantled. The persecutions done

and gone, the ogre of communism lain low, the Church is abandoned by the Czechs, especially the Czech youth, such as those apostles of Confucius mentioned earlier. Militant apostles, we should say, who in their pitching camp on Růžový meadow bear a striking resemblance to the militant anti-Catholic Taborites of five centuries hence — one of the dearest myths cherished by Masaryk, Gottwald, and Czech anti-clerics of all stripes since at least the national revival of the nineteenth century. Speaking of the Church, Preisner considers the statues of the saints that line the Charles Bridge:

> V úloze věčného svědka
> oklepávám zdi popsané nářkem,
> pátrám po katakombách.
> Ale světci jsou jen kamenní,
> stojí pokryti svrabem.
> v muce strnutí čekají
> asi na královnu Annu.
> Pod nimi přízrak krále
> z Vltavy loví Honzu Nebojímse.
> (Ještě hřmí Aurora, 14-22)

> (In the role of the eternal witness
> I brush against walls scrawled over with lament,
> search for the catacombs.
> But the only saints here are made of stone;
> they stand covered with scabies,
> in the torture of paralysis, they wait,
> perhaps for Queen Anna.
> Beneath them, the wraith of the king
> fishes Jan Nepomucký from the Moldau).

On the one hand, we have a prophetic warning: the nation seems to be headed back towards a repetition of the Hussite catastrophes, when Anna, wife of Frederick the German, Protestant pretender to the throne of Bohemia during the Hussite battles with the house of Austria, threatened to cast down the saints from the bridge into the Moldau. On the other — what might be even more discouraging — the saints needn't really worry. No ropes are being readied to be cast around their necks by a people who simply disregards them, ignores them, allows them to be slowly eaten away by the scabies of pollution and neglect, like the Church in Bohemia itself, like the Czech sense of tradition and history.

The image of the paralysed stone saints is as vivid a descrying of the Czech nation's apathy as is Stanisław Wyspiański's reproach of the turn-of-the-century bourgeois patriots of Kraków as nothing more than straw mulches. In other poems, Preisner speaks of the Czechs as lifeless automatons, or, more precisely, as "animated corpses,"[27] desiring to live carefree lives by ignoring the basis of reality:

> A my chodíme s peškem
> okolo vesmíru,
> dosednout bychom chtěli

na trůn světa, využít času,
dokud On ještě visí přibit
jakoby dvojnásob mrtev
po návratu z pekel.
("Poezie je přímá reakce," 16-22)

(And we walk round the universe
with a string tied round our thumb—
We'd like to take our seat
on the world's throne, make the most of our time
while He yet hangs there nailed up to the tree,
as if dead twice over
since His return from Hell.)

It is difficult to explain a play like Havel's *Temptation* or *Memorandum* to a person who has never experienced the darkly Kafkaesque world of Socialist bureaucracy; it is difficult to disabuse a person's faith in programs like national health, who has not sat in line for two hours with an infant screaming of an earache, to receive from the doctor nothing but a referral to another long queue across town in the surgery of a specialist who owns an auroscope. But the Czechs should know of these things; they should know what they've been through, and what it is they could be headed into again, if they're not careful, and this makes it all the more difficult for the poet to understand the relativists who wish *Ze čtyř stran bolesti / vytýčit nový věk necitlivosti* ("from the four corners of pain / to demarcate a new age of numbness")[28] in which absolution will be given without the confession of sins. In the fragment cited above, the poet suggests that not only should they, but that they actually do know that they are on the road leading away from Christ — with one eye ever on the suffering servant to see if the nails are still holding — determined to live it up in the time allotted to them — their slogan: to Hell, literally, with the future.

The poet is at a crossroads. God, it seems, has not held up his end of the bargain. Is this disappointment also a part of his plan? Does that plan even exist, or are we all, like the hero of Kafka's *Der Prozess*, led around the labyrinth of the world by chance, to no good purpose, toward a rough sentencing for a crime we are not aware of ever having committed? Preisner recalls the hard fate of Karel Hynek Mácha, Bohemia's national poet, dying at the age of twenty six:

jak umíral zády k ohni,
tváří v tvář tomu,
co se nic nazývá.
(Sedmnáctého listopadu dnes, 26-33)

(how he died, his back to the fire,
face to face with that
called nothingness).

Mácha's great, Byronic narrative poem *Máj*, quoted in these lines, has been called nihilistic. In it, the poet discourses on nature in her most lovely incarnation, May, the "season of love," and her total unconcern with the suffer-

ing of her most splendid child, man. The deathbed scene made mention of in Preisner's poem relates an actual event: just before he died, instead of breathing out a last word, the young poet, who had been facing the fireplace, rolled over on his bed to face the blank wall behind him, and thus expired. What did he wish to express through this? His nihilistic conviction that, truly, there lies nothing on the other side of death? Or was it an expression of despairing anger, the understandable, if no less petty, foot stomping of a talented young man whose love, career, and life were stopped brusquely by the hand of God at twenty six? Whatever the case may be, Preisner finds himself faced with a similar problem. The future he saw so clearly just a few short years ago has become clouded — an unexpected bend in the road finds him traveling away from the goal which loomed so obviously in front of him before. Preisner's answer to the challenge echoes the evangelical centurion: "Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief." There is little more he can do than sigh, shake his head, shrug in incomprehension, and resign the reigns once more into Christ's hands. Years before, in *Odstup*, this was his response to similar doubts:

> Co dělat? Když přesto právem jsem odsouzen?
> Prohlodat se narub svobody
> (s tou rulovou vinou v krvi)
> a dát se vyzdvihnout do spásy
> mezi lotry.
> ("Vyvržen nemilosrdnou milostí," 8-12)

> (What's there to do? Blamable as I stand before the law?
> but chew the underside of freedom
> [with that guilt circulating in the blood]
> and allow myself to be winched up to salvation
> among the thieves).

The image is a strong one, and puts the matter into stark perspective. We have here the three crosses on Calvary: now, if anyone has a right to complain about unjust treatment in the world, by the world, would that not be the only innocent person who has ever walked among us? We hear the good thief rebuking his partner, saying: "we indeed /suffer/ justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss." The poet's determination to share the portion of the repentant thief is a courageous choice; it is an acceptance of responsibility, such as the modern Czech society he was reproving earlier wishes to avoid.

Another moving image of trust and a Job-like resignation to the greater wisdom of God, from the same collection, might be coupled to the above-cited fragment. Here the poet responds to the supposition of the other party, who desire to escape accountability through annihilation, as if that were possible:

> Ale což nerůžoví záchrana v zániku?
> Nevidím. Spása mi vyloupla oči.
> Oidipus žijenežije na campo santo
> pod hradbami Atén. Pro slunovrat víry.
> ("Rozpad doposledka proklíná vzpouru," v. 8-11)

(But isn't escape there dawning in annihilation?
Can't see. Salvation's poked out my eyes.
Oidipous livesnotlives on the campo santo
beneath the walls of Athens. For the equinox of faith).

The image of Oidipous is apt. It signifies the proper approach of man to the mysteries of God, his proper attitude in those times when God throws a curve; when God is not reasonable enough to act according to our logic and just expectations. Here we see Oidipous' blinding not as punishment; rather, it is the requisite preparation for the mercy, so late in coming, which was to lead to his apotheosis in Colonus. In these lines of Preisner's we hear the chiding of prudent Kreon: συ νυν ταν τω θεω πιστιν φεροις; ("Now you are willing to trust the god?" 1445).

Just as Oidipous' self-mutilation — speaking of it now as punishment — is a fitting destruction of his prideful mistrust of anything save his own cleverness, his own destructive wisdom (note the famous *Leitmotiv* of sight as understanding which runs, often ironically, throughout the entire play) so in these verses too we see the poet giving up his reliance on human wisdom to a position of blind faith.[29]

This might naturally lead one to wonder whether or not Preisner is advocating escapism; a sort of quietism which has him turn his back on the reality he has been touting in favor of a cheap, cowardly comfort. But this is not the case at all.

Earlier on, in reference to the shadow of the cross on the Acropolis, we mentioned that the Greek way is no longer an option. Here too, Preisner is pointing out the fact that once Christ has entered a person's life, once the election from "pagan freedom" has been effected, the Christian is changed in a way akin to the maiming of Oidipous, irreversibly.[30] The light of Christ, which has transformed the poet's sight, does not blind him to the world —we have already dealt with Preisner's conviction of learning from the past[31] — it blinds one to, renders impossible, the despair which Preisner seemed to be brushing up against in *Praha za času plujících ker*.

Speaking of Christ's light transforming the poet's sight, it would be impossible not to see another, even more apt, persona for the poet: that of Dante. At the very conclusion of the *Divina commedia*, in Canto XXXIII of the *Paradiso*, the cosmic traveler, returning to the community — our community from which he departed uncertainly in that *selva oscura*, presents us with the elixir he has won, for which he undertook his adventure:

la mia mente fu percossa
da un fulgore in che sua voglia venne.
A l'alta fantasia qui mancó possa;
ma giá volgeva il mio disio e 'l velle,
sì come rota ch' igualmente è mossa,
l'amor che move il sole e l'altre stelle.
(140-145)

(the truth I wished for came
cleaving my mind in a great flash of light.

Here my powers rest from their high fantasy,
but already I could feel my being turned—
instinct and intellect balanced equally
as in a wheel whose motion nothing jars—
by the Love that moves the Sun and the other stars).[32]

The leaves of the Sibyl have been placed in their proper order by Christ. How can a person, after exiting hell, whether literally as above, or the well-nigh literal hells of late XXth century Europe, after beholding the mystical rose, ever look back on what has gone before, despairing in the culmination, the after, after which there will be no more time? It is no coincidence that, after stumbling around the arid catacombs with their stony saints, Preisner should bring *Praha za času plujících ker* to an end with an affirmation recalling the afore-cited passages from *Odstup*:

Ale nač počítáš,
kolik už zaniklo Babylónů?
Co je zánik, co je Untergang:
neunést dar živé pravdy,
propást pozvání k hostině.
Proto je lépe být kočovníkem,
cesta necesta, u plotů postát
a být přinucen přijít.
Na křestanovi je,
aby svou nedočkavost odevzdal
starostem všedního dne.
("Doba tu stojí přede mnou," 8-18)

(But why are you keeping count
of how many Babylons have already fallen?
What is annihilation, what is Untergang:
not to bear the gift of living truth;
to disregard the invitation to the banquet.
Thus it's better to be a nomad,
as the bird flies; to stand at the gate
and be gently pulled inside.
The Christian must
turn away his impatience
with the cares of each new day.)

As if answering the nagging question about annihilation advanced earlier, Preisner defines the term: Annihilation is the willful, fatal refusal of God's gift of living truth, as it is, gratefully, without trying to understand the incomprehensible. We are all of us blind men, like Milton, and must comfort ourselves with the knowledge that "they also serve, who only stand and wait." And wait we must, at the gate, busying ourselves with our little matters and leaving the big ones in God's hands, so as not to repeat the damning, proud cry of Oidipous; "what good were the gods, even?"[33] We must wait on the invitation to the banquet, wait on God's righteous realization of history, which, like election itself, cannot be forced, or pouted, into being. Secure in the faith that

Vždy větší láska Jeho
sjíždí do příštího věčna,
kde nejvyšší teprv začíná růst,
do zásnub souborných časů
mimo prázdno, mimo bezčasí pekla.
A navzdory schýlení,
navzdory sdílení a soužití,
úrodně miluje z nenutnosti,
z nepotřebna.
(VM, II: 27-35)

(His always greater Love
descends to the future eternal,
where the greatest just begins to grow,
to the betrothal of the times harvested
despite the vacuum, despite the atemporality of hell.
And in spite of decline,
in spite of the sharing and the togetherness,
He fecundly loves unnecessarily,
unconstrainedly)

we must cease to worry about what *we* cannot change, and rather trust in God's wisdom, God's love, that moves the sun and stars day after day toward the final goal of our glorification.

Mrtví necht pohřbívají mrtvé.
Nerozhlížej se po katedrálách.
Neohlížej se, Orfee.

(Let the dead bury their own dead.
Don't look over your shoulder in cathedrals.
Don't look back, Orpheus).

NOTES

1. See his "Forms: Morphology" in *The Challenge of Comparative Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), pp. 141-190.

2. See *The Enormous Room* (New York: Liveright, 1978), pp. 82-83.

3. Zahradníček's presence in Preisner's poetic idiom is strongly felt.

4. In *Paradise Lost*, this kind of idolatry is the first sin committed by fallen Eve. It is emphasized there as characteristic of our fallen natures.

5. The image is not taken from the American West, but from the history of the Hussite Wars (1419-1436) in which the Taborites made use of this defensive tactic.

6. Preisner, *Kultura bez konce* (Brno: Atlantis, 1996), p. 73.

7. *Kultura bez konce*, p. 81.

8. In this context, see Eliot's *Choruses from 'The Rock':* 'Then came, at a predetermined moment, a moment in time and of time, / A moment not out of time, but in time, in what we call history: transecting, bisecting the world of

time, a moment in time but not like a moment of time, / A moment in time but time was made through that moment, for without the meaning there is no time, and that moment of time gave the meaning' (VII: 18-20).

9. The title of this work signifies many things, chief among which is its echo of Lactantius' idea of the Christian as a pilgrim, on his way to the distant homeland of heaven, living in his earthly nations as an exile. Of course, it also speaks of political exile Rio Preisner's distance from Czechoslovakia — an element in his consciousness which, as we are about to see, plays a key role in his understanding of the Christian's responsibility to trust in God's plan.

10. *Aporie řecké tragédie byla vyvrácena křestanstvím, a jím byl rozevřen i nekonečný kruh řeckého mýtu /.../ Recká moudrost má pak žretelně adventistickou kvalitu anticipující zjevené křestanství. Poukázal bych tu zejména na Platonův velkolepý jeskynní příměr, v němž mytizovaná násilná smrt svědka pravdy (Sókrata) vytušuje cosi z mystéria Golgoty. Kultura bez konce*, pp. 61, 63.
(The difficulties and perplexities of Greek tragedy were overthrown by Christianity, and the unending cycle of the Greek myth was broken open by it /.../ Now, Greek wisdom possesses an honestly adventistic quality that anticipates revealed Christianity. I would in the first instance point out Plato's splendid cave analogy, according to which the mythified violent death of the witness to the truth (Socrates) anticipates somewhat the mystery of Golgotha.)

11. 'Your ancestor did not believe in a uniform, absolute time. He believed in an infinite series of times, in a growing, dizzying net of divergent, convergent and parallel times. This network of times which approached one another, forked, broke off, or were unaware of one another for centuries, embraces *all* possibilities of time /.../ In the present one, which a favorable fate has granted me, you have arrived at my house; in another, while crossing the garden, you found me dead; in still another, I utter these same words, but I am a mistake, a ghost /.../ In one of them, I am your enemy'. Trans. Donald A. Yates.

12. One can, however, make informed predictions. In 'AČKOLIV ŘEKA rodila tyfus léto co léto' and similar verses, Preisner makes reference to 'signs of the times' by which *při dobrém počasí se dalo dohlédnout / na sám orient neštěstí národa* ('on a clear day, one could make out / the very orient of the nation's misfortunes').

13. ' HNED VEDLE POKLADNY lahůdkářství', 10-11.

14. Even Grass's poem is not totally pessimistic. After all, the poet is protesting the inefficacy of writing protest songs—by writing a protest song.

15. Ezra Pound, 'A Visiting Card', in *Impact* (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1960), pp. 54-55, 60.

16. Zbigniew Herbert, Preisner's Polish contemporary, shares the same need to preserve the victims of tyranny from the oblivion of abstraction. In 'Pan Cogito czyta gazetę' ('Don Cogito reads the paper'), we read, *120 poległych / daremnie szukać na mapie / zbyt wielka odległość / pokrywa ich jak dżungla / nie przemawiają do wyobraźni / jest ich za dużo / cyfra zero na końcu / przemienia ich w abstrakcję / temat do rozmyślania: / arytmetyka współczucia*. '120 dead / vain to look for them on the map / a too-great distance / covers them like a jungle / they don't speak to the imagination / too many of them / the zero on the end / transforms them into an abstraction / something to think about: / the arithmetic of sympathy'. And later, in 'Pan

Cogito o potrzebie ścisłości' ('Don Cogito and the need for exactitude'): *a przecież w tych sprawach / konieczna jest akuratność / nie wolno się pomylić/ nawet o jednego / jesteśmy mimo wszystko / stróżami naszych braci / niewiedza o zaginionych / podważa realność świata / wtrąca w piekło pozorów / diabelską sieć dialektyki / głoszącej że nie ma różnicy / między substancją a widmem*. 'After all, in these matters / accuracy is essential / simply can't make any mistakes / even to be off by one / we are despite it all / our brothers' keepers / ignorance of the dead / undermines the reality of the world / throws into the hell of illusion / the satanic net of dialectics / which holds no difference / between substance and spectre'.

17. Later, as Preisner learned from eyewitnesses, Himmler himself visited Mukačevo where he murdered children mechanically with a pistol in one hand, tossing their little bodies onto a truck for disposal, with the other.

18. He was instructed in violin by Erich Wachtl, professor of music at the Jewish gymnasium. Wachtl, who composed a Sionist musical joyfully describing life on the *kibbutz*, was murdered in Auschwitz.

19. 'POD OBLÁZKY nakažené řeky', 3-4

20. From the conclusion of his novella *Mozart auf der Riese nach Prag*.

21. Cf. pp. 122-123.

22. Its "end" is found in resurrection. Raymond Winling summarizes Hans Urs von Balthazar's temporal theology of the resurrection, building on the theses of Walter Kasper: "The Resurrection is not a unique and complete event, but an event which opens the world toward the future. It implicates that eschatological fulfillment of the world in its entirety, a new people, a new earth. Jesus Christ Himself is our future and our hope. Urs von Balthazar adds that in Jesus there occurs recapitulation through the integration of what's gone before, and what history is, so that there is revealed in Him the insurmountable and final eschatological fullness, which affords man and humanity that completion allowing for total realization according to the laws of their being'. *La théologie contemporaine 1946-1980; Teologia współczesna,* p. 424.

23. *Visuté mosty,* Pád VI: 49.

24. See, among other places, *Kultura bez konce*, p. 112.

25. 'Kněží, už skoro nad hrobem', 6-7

26. *Americana*, I:7 'Na Vysvětlenou'.

27. *V podloubí hoří svíce / na paměť živých mrtvol*. 'Poté co ubili', 32 -33.

28. 'Kněží, už skoro nad hrobem', 18-19.

29. *V čem tkví heroismus hrdinů řecké tragédie (a ostatně i Homérova eposu)? V zástupné manifestaci* utrpení*—nikoli rozum, tot nejhlubší řecké kritérium člověčenství—a v konečném, heroickém odmítnutí nebo překonání propasti zoufalství a absolutní beznaděje. Tato aporie nutnosti zániku života v neproniknutelných temnotách noci světa a vytrvání v naději /.../nejlidštěji reprezentuje model řeckého člověka par excellence: Oedipús. Kultura bez konce,* pp. 60-61.

„In what lies the heroism of the heroes of Greek tragedy (and for all that, of the heroes of the Homeric epic)? In the gradual manifestation of suffering as the most characteristic destiny of (fallen) humanity—*suffering*, not reason, that deepest Greek criterion of humanity—and in the final, heroic refusal or victory over the abyss of despair and absolute helplessness. These difficulties of the

necessity of life's disappearance in the impenetrable darkness of the night of the world and the necessity of remaining in hope /.../ are most humanly represented by that model of the Greek man par excellence: Oidipous."

30. We are of course reminded of the theology of baptism, which sacrament is said to impose an indelible mark on the soul. Speaking of the cause of his "blindness," the Czech preposition *pro* effects a subtle double meaning hard to render in English. It can mean both *for* and *on account of, because of*.

31. The past always impresses itself upon our consciousness. *Z hrobků klasiků se dere peří* ("From the graves of the classics poke feather [pens]," "Odumřela jsi pro synovu tvář," 10, *Odstup*). It is unavoidable, and we can, must learn from it.

32. Translation John Ciardi.

33. ουτ απ οιωνων συ φρουφανης εχων / ουτ εκ θεων του γνωτ ον (395-396) "You had no clue, neither from eagles, nor from the gods."

The Kingdom of God Is in Texas[1]

Theresie M. West

The Unity of the Brethren today is a small denomination whose churches spot the Texas countryside. Their highest concentration lies southeast of Austin, in Austin and Fayette counties, but small congregations may be found over much of the state.[2] Their appearance follows the trail of settlement in Texas by Czech immigrants, the majority of whom arrived in the second half of the nineteenth century, first joining communities in the area around Cat Spring and then dispersing according to the availability of inexpensive land for farming.[3]

Although the majority of Czechs who came to Texas were Catholic, they were accompanied by a strong minority comprised of those who had belonged to either Lutheran or Reformed churches in Europe. Many of those who constituted the latter category did not fully identify themselves as Lutheran or Reformed but had affiliated themselves with those denominations simply because they were the only non-Catholic confessions tolerated within the Austrian Empire at the time. When these non-Catholic immigrants settled in Texas, most of them sought out others who shared their faith and language, in most cases not discriminating between those who had belonged to a Lutheran church and those who had belonged to a Reformed church in Europe.[4]

Soon these immigrants, who held strong beliefs but lacked much loyalty to any church already present in Texas, began to form cohesive groups that were based on providing spiritual nourishment, social support, and cultural activity for those whose native language was Czech. At first groups gathered in homes, schools, or the facilities of a host church.[5] A few men with religious education and an undeniable vocation rose to meet the needs of these scattered assemblies by establishing circuit ministries.[6] Their common leadership, along with the distribution of *Brastrské listy*, a journal that aided communication among the congregations, slowly created a bond among the disparate knots of believers.[7] In time, members of the local units felt the need to organize and define themselves as a larger church. First, they needed to overcome the differences among their own religious backgrounds and beliefs. In order to form a unified belief system, they were forced to return to the ancient past they all shared. This past was as powerful as it was distant.

On December 29, 1903, representatives from eleven Czech Protestant congregations gathered in Granger to vote on whether they should form their own unified Brethren church or to follow a path of assimilation into the other Protestant denominations that surrounded them.[8] They unanimously cast their votes to join under the name of the Union of the Evangelical Czech Moravian Brethren of North America. This decision heralded both the beginning of something very new and the revival of something ancient. The union took its name from a church that had remained a powerful force in the consciousness of its members even though it had been banned in their homeland for 300 years. The Czechs who came to Texas resurrected what had been for them a largely defunct church, mainly by relying on history (1415-1781) as a source for their doctrine and as a myth of their origin. Their understanding of history gave members of this church a sense of their purpose in God's plan.

The founders of the Unity of the Brethren in Texas had several rea-

sons for looking to their past to determine their future. The first was simply that the political establishment in the Czech lands had prevented those who identified themselves as Brethren from expressing the nature of their beliefs for so long that the nature of those beliefs had become obscured. Unlike the religious exiles who found haven in more tolerant areas like Poland and Germany,[9] the Czechs who came to Texas had lived through years of suppressed religious life in their native land and the confusion that followed the Edict of Toleration.[10] This interrupted history created a need for resolution. The belief that they, as Brethren, were continuing the story of a chosen and annointed people drove the Texas immigrants to continue in their new home the story that had begun in Bohemia.

Members of the Unity of the Brethren were influenced by the writings of Martin Luther and were in dialogue with his followers from the beginning of the Lutheran movement.[11] They did not hesitate to participate in the dynamic religious world of Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Many Czech Protestants studied at German universities, where they were educated in Lutheran theology. Perhaps even more influential to the Brethren was their contact with Bucer and Reformed theology, which in some ways more closely resembled their own beliefs.[12] A large number of Brethren young men also went to centers of Reformed thought, especially in the period 1570-1620.[13] Much later, some of the first Czech ministers that came to Texas had studied Reformed theology in Edinburgh, Basel and Vienna. The tradition continued as the first generation of ministers coming of age in Texas attended Presbyterian seminaries, including Oberlin College, Eden Seminary, Austin Presbyterian Seminary, and Princeton Theological Seminary. Not until 1940, when Josef Barton graduated from Moravian Theological seminary in Pennsylvania, did the Texas Brethren gain a minister who had had a distinctively Brethren education.[14]

A prevailing ecumenical attitude among the Brethren allowed them to benefit from sects that were younger but had stronger numbers. Throughout their history, the Brethren sought out other Christians that they could join with in holy fellowship without compromising their own beliefs. In 1492, Brethren delegates even undertook a journey to find like-minded Christians that took them as far as Palestine.[15] Later, when they heard about Luther's calls for reform, they thought that they might join with his followers. In the end, the Brethren found too many differences that made them unable to unite with them entirely, but many members of the Brethren did convert.

In the same way, the Brethren in Texas realized they had to guard against being subsumed by other denominations that were more established in the United States. The Edict of Toleration had denied the right of their church to exist, but they demanded that right in Texas. The Czech Protestant emigrants in Texas more that anywhere else in North America stressed their "Českobratrské" identity, even before the Evangelical Union of Czech Moravian Brethren was established.[16] But what did it mean to be "Českobratrské"? Shunning the controversies that had rent the Hussites into bitterly divided and warring factions, the founders of the Unity of the Brethren had avoided theological debates. But as they tried to re-establish themselves in a new cultural context, the Texas Brethren faced the paradox created by the fact that, while rejection of theology had been characteristic of the Unity of the Brethren, without theology the church had difficulty explaining what it precisely was. While

their focus on inner communion with God did ensure that the Brethren in Texas were true to the principles of the historical Unity of the Brethren, it did not, however, promote a unified church structure.

The Brethren relied on Scripture, spiritual inspiration, oral tradition and the bonds of community to provide a living sourcebook for their beliefs. But Scripture is subject to changing interpretation without guiding theology, and the Holy Spirit is common to all believers. So when tradition and community had been disturbed by oppression and exile, the Brethren had to turn to another source to support their belief: the greater history of the church they wanted to recreate. This history gave them a sense of mission that made them much more than an ethnic sect.

It is not insignificant that two of the most influential leaders in the early Czech Protestant communities in Texas were writers of histories. The first was Joseph Bergmann, known as the "Father of Texas immigration" because of the role his letters from Texas had in encouraging the first wave of Czech emigrants to Texas.[17] As a minister in the Landškroun region of Northern Bohemia, Bergmann had served an Evangelical Church with Brethren ties. Before he left for Texas in 1849, he wrote *Letopisy pamatných událostí evangelické křest'anské obce v Stroužným* (Chronicles of the Historical Events in the Evangelical Christian Community in Stroužný).[18] Bergmann explains in the most personal section of his chronicle that he could not leave for America without first documenting the story of a church that he feared to be nearing its demise. He found hope in the opportunity to settle in a land of freedom where he could begin a new chapter in his own story and provide a better future for his family. In this way, he shares the sentiment of Komenský in his *Bequest of the Unity of the Brethren*: that the legacy that Unity of the Brethren gave to future generations of Christians might be more important than the actual survival of the church. He could not have known how God would use him to continue the Unity of the Brethren in Texas. Though he served and lived in a German community in Texas and would never establish a Czech Brethren church there himself, the letters he wrote were distributed among Protestants in Bohemia and influenced their members. Of the first group of seventeen families to leave Bohemia for Texas, sixteen were Protestant.

The second historian, the seminal figure in creating a church to unite the various congregations of Czech Protestants in Central Texas, was Adolf Chlumský. In 1907 he published *The History of the Evangelic Bohemian Moravian Brethren in Texas*, a short book that relates the origins and development of the Unity of the Brethren. It provides a continuous narrative from the arrival of Slavs in the region that would become the lands of the Bohemian Crown to the founding of the Brethren Church in Granger in 1903.[19] It is the translation of a work that he first published in installments in *Bratrské listy*, which at that time was written exclusively in Czech. Like Bergmann's chronicle, Chlumský's history was intended to educate its readers about their heritage and to preserve the history of the church in hope that it might have a chance at surviving its present crisis to experience a future reawakening. As a feature in the *Bratrské listy*, his installments were aimed specifically at reinforcing a sense of history in the churches belonging to the newborn Unity, among which the journal was circulated.

Chlumský begins with the earliest known history of what could be called the Czech people, long before their conversion to Christianity. He then

relates the work of Cyril and Methodius and the Czechs' switch in alliance from the Greek Church to the Roman: Cyril and Methodius' work in Bohemia "awakened the envy of the German Bishops" and the missionaries were then called to Rome because they "had attracted the enmity of the German priests on account of their using Slavic language in their worship."[20] Chlumský avoids mentioning the role of German priests in baptizing the Czech nobility and thus portrays even the earliest development of Christianity in the Czech lands as a conflict between the Czech language and Latin, Czech autonomy against German hegemony, and Slavic culture against German culture. These are the same conflicts that dominated religious life at the time of immigration among the Czech Brethren. Two ages are present in Chlumský's narrative of the history of the Czech people within his *History*: the one that shaped the nature of the Hussite Church and the original Unity of the Brethren founded in 1457, and the age that shaped the nature of the Unity of the Brethren in Texas 1903.

Chlumský goes on to write that because of Cyril and Methodius's institution of a Slavic liturgy, after Methodius's death the Czechs had a "national church that resembled the Apostolic church in purity."[21] It is not clear what, if anything, made the church initiated by the Greek missionaries so "pure," aside from the fact that it was Slavic in character. The anachronistic term "national," applied to a period when Czech was not even a distinctive language, reveals the modern implications of Chlumský's version of history. He even equates the Slavic liturgy of the Czech people with the "pure" rites of the early Christian Church. According to this principle, Hus and other reformers were not revolutionaries when they advocated the use of Czech during the mass -- they were simply returning to the stunted work of Cyril and Methodius and the "original" Christianity of the Czech people.

According to this scheme, the Czechs in Texas were also returning to the pure original church by using the Czech language in a land where it was again threatened, not by Pope or Emperor, but by the insidious influence of assimilation. They could view themselves as reenacting a drama played many times over throughout the history of their people: as the Czechs approached their God through sincere worship in the language He had blessed them with, they had met with constant opposition from the Catholics, the Germans, and finally from the Americans, whose Anglophone, secularized culture now was impeding their goal of perpetuating their Czech and Brethren church in Texas.

The most powerful hero of the Czechs who tried to retain their ethnic identity and associate themselves with a religious tradition both ancient and independent was, of course, Master Jan Hus. Despite his cruelly shortened life, the seeds of Jan Hus's ministry blew across the ocean to yield bountiful crops that he could never have foreseen. This is the way a Texan belonging to the Unity of the Brethren might see himself: as a Czech flower blooming in a strange soil, the inheritor of an ancient reform movement that predates Luther by a good century. This identification with the vanguard of medieval religious revolution gave the people who claimed it a sense of pride and legitimacy.

One example of these sentiments may be found in a leaflet[22] circulated among Czech Protestant churches in the United States that addresses all the "spiritual descendants of the Czech reformer Jan Hus" as "witnesses to the Christian truths which have ever since been held dear by all evangelical believers." The author claims that the Brethren formed in 1457 "what subsequently became recognized as the first Protestant church." Whether or not the Unity of

the Brethren of 1457 could already be considered a "Protestant" church, and regardless of what effect they had on the development of later churches, the Brethren in the United States considered themselves to be descendents of the "first" and thus felt that they had a particular claim to the purity pursued by all Protestant churches.

"Truth," a ubiquitous theme in Hussite writings and songs, became a popular preaching point for the early Brethren pastors in Texas as they sought ways to unite their independent congregations into one fold. It was the focus of the sermon Rev. Adolf Chlumský gave before the meeting of representatives that made the decision to unite their congregations as the Evangelical Union of Czech-Moravian Brethren.[23] Chlumský also chose "Pravda vítězí" (Truth conquers), Hus's motto and the rallying cry of his followers, as the motto that heads *Bratrské listy*, the journal that linked the various Czech Protestant communities in Central Texas with its message. The "Truth" Chlumský invoked was an idea that encompassed the traditions which had been passed down from Hus to all of his spiritual descendants. The word "Truth" is used frequently to signify the will of God as it was revealed to Hus and his followers through His Holy Word. The Hussites believed that they had the "Truth" with them because Hus had opened the Bible to them and preached from it directly by holy inspiration. Though many violent disputes erupted among the Hussites, this essential concept of "Truth" transcended the factions of Hussitism and proved to be an inheritance for future generations. All of those who subscribed to the Hussite cause believed that what held them together and set them apart from all other Christians was a pure and original insight into God's plan, which was granted to them so they could start building the Kingdom of God on earth. This belief in a direct and intimate communion with the mind of God gave those that held to it a sense of great power and purpose and left them feeling little need to develop their theology. They believed that they knew personally the Word that had been present in the creation of the world, and they recognized His presence in the new world they believed they were hastening on.

But the Czech Protestants who came to Texas did not choose to establish a "Hussite" Church. They wanted to restore the Brethren Church, the fruit of what they saw as the Golden Age of Czech history. Both Bergmann and Chlumský glorify the beginning of the 16th century when, "despite the fact that at the outset they were a mere handful . . . , [the Brethren] were the very heart and conscience of the Czech masses."[24]

The mythical glory of the "Golden Age" of the Unity of the Brethren is underscored by the great tragedy of the Battle of White Mountain. Chlumský describes the fallout from the Thirty Years' War thus: "Over 300 castles and forts, 100 towns and 11,000 villages disappeared from the face of the earth."[25] Chlumský demonstrates the power of the event in the imaginations of Czechs who valued their religious heritage. Though the wound was ancient, it long served as an explanation of their troubles. The pain was still alive, as the Austrian Empire still ruled Bohemia and Moravia at the time of their immigration and the Brethren could not openly gather to worship in the way their consciences demanded. As the devastation caused by the war became the matter of myth, so the people who considered themselves Brethren and met in secret to keep alive their faith came to think of the time before White Mountain as a blessed golden age in which they had their origin. In reality, the Brethren had always been subject to the mercy of successive rulers.

Bergmann writes in his *Letopisy* of how brave Christians carried on the Brethren tradition through the passing of knowledge from fathers to sons and through meeting secretly in caves or in the woods at night to hold services in Czech. Stories from this period seemed romantic and heroic to the Brethren in Texas and inspired them to persist in the faith which had been guarded so relentlessly and at such a great cost to their forebears. They had hidden their Bibles so they could be found again and carried to Texas.

But the period of history that most directly affected the immigrants who formed the Unity of the Brethren was the period that followed the Edict of Toleration in 1781. During this period, the identity of the Brethren became more blurred, as some of those who followed its traditions chose to join Lutheran and Reformed churches. The influence of both the Lutheran and Reformed traditions after 1781 is evident in the way the Unity of Czech Brethren developed in Texas. The close connection between the Brethren and the Reformed churches in particular is clear in the relationships formed between the Czech Brethren churches and the Czech Presbyterian churches. Preference among Brethren congregations for ministers educated at Reformed institutions also indicates an acceptance of Reformed leadership. Furthermore, the Brethren in Texas rejected the episcopal structure adopted by the original Unity and employed by the Moravian Church in favor of the Presbyterian model.

The Brethren Church was not the result of a theological argument, but was rather an ancient, ecumenical institution with no other aim but to live in agreement with God's will. The main task of all Brethren churches has always been to return to the apostolic Christian Church. The Utraquists attempted to return to the Church's holy beginning primarily by restoring the cup to the laity, to whom they believed Christ had originally given it. The religious who flooded the city of Tábor laid their possessions at the feet of their leaders, following the example of Christians living communally after the death of Christ (Acts 4:35). These attempts at recreating the age of Jesus fuelled the growing chiliasm among the more radical Hussites. Their reforms were not only attempts to imitate the first disciples of Christ, but were also a way in which the Taborites tried to recreate themselves *as Christ's new disciples, who would bring about a new holy age of Christ on earth.*

The mission of the Czech-Americans in Texas to rebuild the faith of their forefathers required determination and education of their children. One way in which they differentiated themselves from other groups was through their language. The Brethren in Texas were the first Czechs in North America to demand that they have a preacher who would hold services in their mother tongue and read the Holy Word as their proud forbears had rightly translated it.[26] At the Hus School that they founded, they instructed children and young adults in Czech grammar along with the tenets of Christian faith.[27] The Evangelical Union of Czech Moravian Brethren even started to fund scholarships for study in Czech language at the University of Texas at Austin as early as 1908.[28]

The Texas Brethren realized that language was always at the center of Czech reform movements. Hus had gained his popularity among the Czechs by preaching in their own language and he gained notoriety abroad because he advocated the use of Czech in the church. He also left his mark on the language itself with his innovations in Czech orthography. Later, the Unity of the Brethren bestowed on the Czechs the great gift of their translation of the Bible.

Their rendering of Biblical prose into their own language became the model for pure written Czech when the language was revived in the late eighteenth century. These achievements were often proudly recounted by the Czechs in Texas. They claimed themselves inheritors of that legacy.

The survival of the Czech language despite attempts at its annihilation was a feat not taken for granted by the immigrants who came to Texas. They linked the suppression of the Czech language to their oppression by foreign powers. Looking back to their predecessors, they saw themselves in light of an ancient struggle of faithful Czech-speakers against foreigners trying to crush their holy efforts. Their endurance through this old struggle became a source of pride for the Brethren and a way of defining themselves in opposition to those around them. They told legends of members of the ancient Unity of the Brethren baking Bibles into their bread in order to pass them along to others secretly. These stories dramatized the struggle that had challenged the faith of the original Brethren. In their new country, where the Brethren did not need to struggle to protect their form of worship from official persecution but rather how to preserve it in the face of their own members' desire to assimilate, the stories took on new meaning.

The Czech-Americans accepted the knowledge that their ministers had to offer because they needed it in their new home more than ever. They needed a system of values to teach their children. They had rejected their Austrian and Catholic-dominated past and needed a new system of belief to replace the old ones. The Unity of the Brethren offered more than organization, doctrine, and ethnic solidarity: it gave its members stories that gave their lives meaning and gave them strength to survive. It also gave its members a sense of pride in the accomplishments of their forefathers and in their own ability to accomplish in Texas what their European parents were prevented by fear and tyranny. Most of all, it gave them a vision of a Kingdom of God they were now free to set to work building in their new home.

NOTES

1. This article is based on a paper delivered at the conference "Contributions of the Moravian Brethren to America," sponsored by the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences and Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, June 2007.

2. A complete listing of the congregations belonging to the Unity of the Brethren and the histories of their growth may be found in Mrs. Jesse Skrivanek, et al., *Unity of the Brethren in Texas (1855-1966)* (Taylor, Texas: Unity of the Brethren, 1970), 39-67. Updated information for the years 1967-1981 may be found in pages 21-32 of Supplement I. Information for 1982-2001 is in Supplement II, pages 27-72.

3. Patterns of Czech emigration and settlement in Texas are described in Clinton Machann and James Mendl, *Krásná Amerika*, (Austin, Texas: Eakin Press, 1983) 9-70.

4. An exception is found among the Reformed Czechs who joined Presbyterian congregations as part of the Southwest Czech Presbytery, which was founded in 1911. The two denominations generally enjoyed a good relationship, which is demonstrated by the fact that most Brethren ministers at-

tended Presbyterian seminaries and some Czech Presbyterian congregations later joined the Unity of the Brethren.

5. Vilém Šiller, et al., *Památník Evanjelických Církví ve Spojených Státech* (Chicago: Křesťanského Posla, 1900), 131-163.

6. The great faith and sacrifice of the early Brethren ministers were essential to the growth of the Brethren Church in Texas. The series of short biographies of Rev. Chlumský, Rev. Juren, Rev. Barton, Rev. Hegar, Rev. Kostohryz and others that Daniel Marek wrote for the *Brethren Journal* 1999-2000 are compiled in *How it All Began*, ed. Patricia Marek Hejl (Brenham: Unity of the Brethren, 2004), 24-27, 32-58.

7. The history of *Bratrské listy* is outlined in Skrivanek et al., *Unity of the Brethren in Texas (1855-1966),* 69-75.

8. For a more detailed description of this meeting see the January issue of *Bratrské listy* (1904). Daniel J. Marek translates and summarizes the issue in his article "A Glad Day, Indeed!" first published in the December issue of *The Brethren Journal* (1998), later in *How it All Began*, ed. Patricia Marek Hejl, 12-14.

9. Many Czech Brethren fled to Silesia in 1527 to escape the persecutions of Ferdinand I. Their number was increased after 1620 and the defeat of the Protestants at White Mountain. One notable figure who found a temporary home there was Jan Amos Komenský, the great thinker, educator and bishop of the Unity of the Brethren. Well known is also the story of the Brethren who were invited by Count Zinzendorf to live on his estate in Saxony in 1722. From there, they moved on to the British colonies in North America, the West Indies, and many other distant regions. The church that they developed is now best known by the appellation "Moravian."

10. The Edict of Toleration was issued in 1781. At the time, about 40,000 secret Protestants began to openly practice their faith. The edict allowed subjects within the Austrian Empire to establish Reformed and Lutheran Churches. It did not, however, give the same privileges to the Brethren. Matthew Spinka, "Religious Movements in Czechoslovakia," *The Journal of Religion* 3 (1923): 617.

11. Edmund DeSchweinitz, *History of the Church Known as the Unitas Fratrum* (Bethlehem: The Moravian Publication Concern, 1901), 232-33.

12. Ibid., 256 -260. Otakar Odložilík, "Bohemian Protestants and the Calvinist Churches," *Church History* 8 (1939): 345-347.

13. Odložilík, 350.

14. A list of the ministers of the Unity in Texas 1855-1967 and the institutions they attended is in Skrivanek, et al., *Unity of the Brethren in Texas (1855-1966),* 35.

15. Odložilík, 344-345.

16. See Šiller, et al., *Památník Evanjelických Církví ve Spojených Státech*.

17. David Chroust challenges this portrayal of the pastor and provides deeper insight into his character in "Jozef Ernst Bergmann: Father of the Czech -Speaking Immigration in Texas?," *Kosmas* 20 (2006): 48-64.

18. (Brno: Biblická Jednota, 1930).

19. Machann and Mendl, 30.

20. Ibid., p. 3.

21. Ibid., p. 6.

22. This leaflet is contained in file 2j137 of the collected papers of the Barton family, held at the American History Center at the University of Texas at Austin. No date or place of publication is indicated on the leaflet. The leaflet had been in the possession of Rev. Joseph Barton (1886-1945), who ministered to Brethren congregations in Taylor, Dime Box, Buckholts and Granger, among others.

23. II Corinthians 13:8 was the Scriptural basis for the sermon. Daniel J. Marek, "A Glad Day, Indeed!" 13.

24. Odložilík, 343.

25. Adolf Chlumský, *History of the Evangelic Union of Bohemian Moravian Brethren in Texas* (Brenham, Texas: 1907), 26.

26. The first Czech Protestant preaching in Texas and probably in North America was in 1855 at a service led by Jan Zvolánek in Fayetteville. The church in Fayetteville was the second Czech Evangelical church organized in Texas, after that in Wesley. Šiller et al., *Památník Evanjelických Církví ve Spojených Státech*, 131.

27. A history of Hus School and the Hus Encampment may be found in Skrivanek, et al., *Unity of the Brethren in Texas (1855-1966),* 111-134.

28. Richard Machalek, "Intra-Organizational Conflict and Schism in an Ethnic Minority Church: The Case of the Unity of the Brethren in Texas" (M.A. thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 1972), 35.

ESSAYS

Love Conquering Death and Distorted Reality in *The Year of the Frog*

Tracy A. Burns

Martin M. Šimečka's *The Year of the Frog* (titled *Džin* in the original Slovak) is composed of three autobiographical novellas ("Notice," "The Year of the Frog,"and "Gin") and takes place in a 1980s Communist Czechoslovakia in which the main character, Milan, finds himself trapped in a dead and meaningless world. Followed by the police and banned from studying further than grammar school because of his father's dissident activities, a twentyish philosophical Milan tries to give the world meaning by finding and expressing love. His focus on the physical (which exemplifies itself in sex, running, and surgical operations) also helps him cope with the emptiness of the era. Finally, for Milan the world is illusionary; he is unable to perceive its reality. Sometimes, in order to ward off the harshness of reality, he takes refuge in illusions. The common thread of the book is his physical and emotional love for his girlfriend and then wife Tania, but his love takes many other forms as well – for example, love of women in general and love of life. It is precisely these feelings of love that get him through a time marked by meaninglessness and death. All these qualities make this autobiographical work of fiction very significant in the sphere of contemporary Slovak literature.

The structure has a cyclical nature that runs throughout all three novellas and gives it a consistency which makes the book very appealing. At the beginning and ending of "Notice" Milan quits his job, first at the Slovnaft factory and later at the hospital as an orderly. Likewise, in "Gin" he is working in the hospital ward where women have abortions at the beginning of the novella; at the end he finds himself again in a hospital as he watches the doctors perform a cesarean on his wife Tania and sees his own baby girl, dead. In addition, near the beginning of the first novella "Notice," he starts work in a hospital; at the end of the last novella "Gin" he is in surgery as his own baby dies.

The language is particularly noteworthy in his descriptions of the physical— namely sex, running, and surgical procedures. His writing here changes from the philosophical and somewhat dreamy to a very clinical approach. As always, he incorporates great attention to detail. Take this example of how running affects his body:

> I breathed in the hot air with difficulty; my body was tense and my eyes burned so much that I had to look at my own shadow. I began to feel sweat on my brow and my chest as I passed the Red Bridge. I was finally running in earnest. I lengthened my step and watched my thighs. They had gotten thinner since I stopped racing, but otherwise seemed all right. [1]

His description of Mrs. Bohush's operation also takes on a very clinical style as the doctor removes a tumor from her head:

> Mrs. Bohush had a hole in her head, and white smoke from a second point rose until the whine of the drill became a slow growl and suddenly stopped. There was another hole in Mrs. Bohush's head. It filled up with blood, and that was all. The blood stopped at the edge as if it wanted to provide a veil of chastity. Finally there were six holes, and the room was full of that odor. Maya passed a thin wire to the doctor. It was in fact a saw that he threaded from one opening to another one and cut the bone that separated them. . . .[2]

That the doctor is taking out a tumor is a metaphor in itself, as Milan metaphorically finds a "tumor" in his life. That tumor is the Communist system, the police who persecute him and the ways in which this persecution affects his life (such as by not allowing him to study at university and by forcing him to take menial jobs). Milan can't get rid of this "tumor" as it follows him everywhere, affecting his every move, compelling him to take refuge in the physical world. The tumor can also be considered that of the country itself; the distorted reality that I will touch upon later in the essay is caused by the failure of the system. That Mrs. Bohush dies exemplifies that it is not possible to get rid of this tumor of the times.

Regarding the likeability of the character, the reader appreciates Milan's odyssey as his adventures move and resonate. Very philosophical and serious, he is constantly searching for love, for his own identity, and mainly for answers that don't exist. Yet I personally lost a lot of respect for the protagonist when he had an affair on his wife, pregnant at the time. Even though he confesses everything to Tania and admits that he made a mistake, my respect for him remains badly scarred.

To be sure, death permeates Milan's life. The beginning and ending of "Notice" can be considered sorts of deaths in themselves as chapters of Milan's life come to a close when he first gives notice at the Slovnaft factory, becoming unemployed. Later, he also stopped running competitively. Then, in "Notice" when he gives notice as a hospital orderly, another part of his life ends.

Yet death is even more prevalent in the book, for example, in the scenes where Milan is working as an orderly in the neurology ward, where brain operations are performed. Patient after patient dies. Later he takes another job in the hospital, this time in obstetrics, where women often have abortions. His friend Adam's baby dies shortly after birth; his friend Richard, once jailed and often followed by the police, is found dead in his apartment. A young baby in the hospital where Milan works dies. At the end of "Gin" his own baby dies.

The two most potent images of death, though, occur twice in "The Year of the Frog," when Milan is running, and numerous frogs cross his path.

> Then suddenly I saw black spots all over the path. The spots were jumping before me, dispersing right in front of my Marathon shoes.

> Astonished, I stopped: I was looking at thousands of tiny frogs. They jumped inch by inch ahead, all in the same direction, as if to spite me – toward the ski lift. They were moving with dreadful decisiveness from one brook to another along this highway of death. I ran on past them, angry at the meaninglessness of life and cruelty of Nature.[3]

Thus, even Nature is out of order; the country is moving in the wrong direction, along "a highway of death."[4] The second time the frogs appear just after Tania has had an ectopic pregnancy. That the frogs are killed while mating serves as a powerful metaphor for the fate of his unborn child.

> For the foliage turned to frogs. As I approached them, the horror concentrated my vision, and I saw big toads, green-brown with immovable eyes, as they lazily hopped along the warm asphalt. This time they were double-headed monsters with goggle eyes, because they had made on that fateful day the decision to mate. Each female toad carried on her back her male, who held on to her like a child. They breathed together, shining, glued to each other, hopping in the sun.
>
> Then I saw the car. It approached mercilessly. I had no time to close my eyes or stop my ears: there was the slapping sound of popping under the tires and out flew pink entrails as the glued bodies exploded, slippery flesh quivered, and little tails of intestines stuck to the road.[5]

Milan is not only surrounded by death but also by the inability to decipher reality from illusion. The metaphor of illusion also crops up as he creates illusions himself in order to escape reality. For example, he travels to Pardubice to take university entrance exams, although he knows very well that, because of his father's dissident activities, he won't be accepted. At the university he meets another applicant named Michael, who shares his enthusiasm for running. Parting with Michael at the train station, Milan finally faces the reality that he will never have the chance to pursue his studies at the university level:

> I don't like entrance examinations, but I always find it pleasant to sit and watch the others after I've already proved myself. That was my only victory. Suddenly I felt bad that Michael did not suspect that we would never really run together. Maybe he would find another runner, but I would have to make do with the Bratislava woods and loneliness.[6]

Yet the very fact that he went to Pardubice in the first place shows his own initial denial of
reality.

Racing and running serves as an escape from harsh reality, a sort of illusion, as he concentrates on the physical world, describing in detail how his body reacts to running. He also describes how he prepared for races and how this preparation allowed him to escape reality.

> A week before the race I would not eat any sweets and would even use saccharine in my tea, in order to eat five pastries the night before and pack my muscle cells with extra sugar for the race. I would do that just to beat my opponents, who, as a result, would become sad. And I would do a hundred different things and so ignore life.[7]

When he ends his competitive career, at the beginning of the first novella "Notice," he is forced to face the harsh reality with which he cannot cope.

Soon after his father is arrested, Milan, his brother Peter, and his mother drink coffee in the courtyard, living the illusion that nothing out of the ordinary has happened. When working as a salesman in a hardware store, Milan lies to customers, creating the illusion that the store doesn't carry goods which they really have. In this case he himself distorts reality; it is not distorted for him. He tells Tania about his job: "I was lying all day long. It seems to be my work assignment from now on. I say, 'We don't have it,' even though the warehouse is full of it."[8]

A distorted reality also makes itself apparent when Milan is participating in brain operations as an orderly in the neurology ward. He perceives the surgery as "a play or movie," and "what looks like a murder is the saving of a life."[9]

He describes the beginning of an operation: "Everything went so fast that it seemed like a play or movie. Even the jokes and witty comments they exchanged seemed movielike, because on the altar lay a woman noticed by no one. She lay there like a property on a set, with the red pipe in her mouth."[10] Instead of seeing women as mere clinical objects, Milan, however, tries to see them as human beings, as is evidenced by the strong bonds he feels toward some of the female patients and to the nurse named Annie.

For Milan reality is indeed distorted. When the nurse named Annie is crying, he remarks how he is unable to see the reality of the world. Not only can he not find meaning in the world; he questions its very existence.

> Annie, it's as if the whole world is behind glass, I said to myself. People don't notice it, or they are embarrassed to show that they do notice it. I don't know why it is like that. Sometimes I fear that the reason for it is that the world actually does not exist. Thus, there is nothing to perceive. But when a woman starts to cry, it is like giving me the proof that something is happening. And not only inside my head.[11]

While trying to explain to Annie why he has taken a job there, Milan realizes that he longed to have the illusion that he is helping people, yet he is unable to find meaning in the world.

> What did I expect to find – human tragedy? I think I hoped to find its meaning rather than its real face. Instead I discovered helplessness and not a trace of meaning. Perhaps I also wanted to help, or live in the illusion that I was really helping. Instead I was seeing people out of this life.[12]

Milan gets his will to live by finding and expressing love. His love for Tania is so strong that he sees his identity as a part of her. "If she (Tania) leaves me, I won't survive, I thought suddenly and quite clearly. Tania identifies with me, her meaning of life is in me, and the meaning of my life is in the fact that I give it to her."[13] Scenes of their lovemaking are described throughout the book. Milan also feels a sense of love for the female patients he takes care of as a hospital orderly, such as the young Emma, who dies after a brain operation.

> I loved Emma in the last moment of her life, I know now. At that moment she lived more than anyone else I knew. Even when she looked at me with her black eyes from the operating table, I loved her because she sensed that she was going to die. That made her a real human being, an infinitely wiser being than I and all the rest, because that sort of wisdom can be bought only at the price of death.
>
> I also loved her because she was beautiful and young, and I wanted her to live, wanted her to leave the hospital with a smile. I wanted her to come to me and shake my hand or give me a kiss., . . .[14]

His love of life is the key factor that allows him to cope with death and a reality that seems to be hidden in a shroud. This love of life comes through as he finds the strength to face all the obstacles that beset him. He reflects on his fear of life while running: "I was horribly tired, so tired that I didn't want to think about anything. Not even about my life, which I feared so much. I feared my life, but I wanted to live. Somehow I'll muddle through, I thought."[15]

That he does. But not without trial and tribulation.

NOTES

1 Martin M. Šimečka, *The Year of the Frog*, trans. Peter Petro, forward by Václav Havel, (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1993), 2.

2 Ibid., 20.
3 Ibid., 86.
4 Ibid., 86.
5 Ibid., 159.
6 Ibid., 6.
7 Ibid., 30.
8 Ibid., 122.
9 Ibid., 22.
10 Ibid., 19.
11 Ibid., 66.
12 Ibid., 61
13 Ibid., 198.
14 Ibid., 48-49.
15 Ibid., 13-14.

My American Adventures

Zdenek Salzmann

There is a term in anthropology that sounds rather formidable—acculturation. But despite the learned impression the term conveys, it refers to a very common process that is constantly taking place worldwide. It describes the changes in the lives of individuals, groups, and even entire peoples that occur when they adapt to or borrow traits from the cultures of other societies. The millions of refugees and emigrants who leave their fatherlands to settle elsewhere face the need to adapt. To succeed at least passably, they must acculturate to compete for jobs, or in the case of people of retirement age, to help them feel more comfortable in a different environment, among new neighbors.

Acculturation proceeds on different levels. One way to become culturally comfortable in this country is to adapt to, or at least better understand, the customary behavior of Americans—for example, to realize what the "natives" consider appropriate under specific circumstances and what they are likely to judge odd or unacceptable. There are many practical matters that one must become acquainted with—for example, exchanging greetings or becoming used to strange foods. Take the case of one older European immigrant to this country who when greeted in the street by a friendly "How are you?" not only gave an account of his own state of health but was about to continue with that of his wife and children. He was surprised and felt almost insulted when the other person excused himself, claiming that as interested as he was to hear all this, he happened to be in a great hurry because... (and some made-up excuse followed).

When it comes to food, although this European fellow thought of sautéed kidneys, scrambled calf brains, and tripe soup as very good, when he was offered raw oysters on the half shell, or celery sticks, or even lobsters, he politely declined (who would want to eat *that*!). And this brings me to an early lesson in acculturation I learned soon after coming to the United States in the summer of 1947 as a young man in his early twenties.

In the countries of Central Europe, and more specifically Czechoslovakia where I came from (now it is the Czech Republic), bacon is so cured and heavily smoked that it is edible without any further preparation. It's sold in fairly thick, firm slabs. I remember from before World War II that cross-country skiers would take a chocolate bar and a hunk of bacon with them to sustain them during a long day of skiing. And I also remember that when I was spending summer vacations away from Prague in the small western Bohemian town of Rokycany, my aunt would frequently give me a piece of bacon to chew. I enjoyed it so much that when I think about it now, just the thought makes my mouth water. But of course the bacon of this country is a pig of a different color. Little did I know, in the early fall of 1947, that in this country bacon is sold in thin slices streaked with lean, and cured so lightly that it is practically raw fat.

Several weeks after my arrival in the U. S., as I was sitting in a very pleasant restaurant attached to a large motel waiting to order breakfast, my thoughts took me back to my home country, my family, and my aunt in Rokycany. Probably trying to evoke old-country memories, I asked the waitress for an order of raw bacon to accompany my scrambled eggs (imagining of

course the kind of bacon that I was used to eating). I remember quite well what happened during the next ten or fifteen minutes. The waitress returned, saying "Did you ask for raw bacon, sir?" "Yes, I did," I replied. In retrospect, I now realize that she simply couldn't believe what she'd heard. About three minutes later the waitress approached my table again and inquired in a roundabout way, "You are having coffee, juice, scrambled eggs, and raw bacon, sir?" "That's right," I said again. I must have caused some excitement among the waitstaff because soon a different waitress came to my table and said something like "I'll be taking care of your breakfast, sir; are you having raw bacon with your eggs?" Again I replied in the affirmative, but this time pondering the inefficiency of American waitresses (how many times does one have to order a breakfast?). By then I was quite hungry and already mentally chewing a nice piece of smoked bacon, revisiting my aunt in Rokycany.

You can imagine my surprise when my breakfast finally came. The bacon tasted exactly like what it was--raw pork fat. What did I do? Twenty-something young men don't make mistakes, and if they do, are embarrassed to admit to them. So I ate the three or four slices of raw bacon trying very hard to look as though I was relishing them. I realize now that both waitresses and the cook must have been quite impressed (to put it politely) by how some foreigners, or at least this one, were trying to undermine an important part of good old American breakfast culture. And when I think back on that "cross-cultural" breakfast now, I see how my acculturating to America took me along some strange paths.

* * *

Would you like to spend a night at a police station? I'll bet you wouldn't. I had such an experience my first year in this country, during the week between Christmas and New Year's.

In the 1940s hitchhiking was much easier than it is now. Because the money I had available to spend was extremely limited and I wanted to see as much as possible of this interesting country, I decided to hitchhike from the Northeast to the southernmost part of the United States—Key West, Florida. There I stayed in Hotel Central at three dollars per night (my diary tells me that), cut grass at a much nicer hotel for one dollar an hour, spent some time on the beaches, and lived on bread and processed cheese, which came in little 4-ounce glasses and was quite inexpensive. Then the time came for me to hitchhike north again.

My first ride took me only as far as Lake Wales (I think) in central Florida, and because it was slowly getting dark, it was impossible to get a ride. In the middle of this small town was a park with a few benches, and to save money I decided to spend the night on one of the benches. Using my soft travel bag as a pillow I made myself comfortable (that is easy when you are young), and hoped for pleasant dreams. But before I fell asleep a policeman who was making rounds approached my bench and said, "If you think you can spend the night here, you're mistaken." He may have been concerned that someone might do something to me (I had about ten dollars in my pocket, and that bought much more in those days than it would today), or that I might do something to someone shortcutting through the park. After hearing the story of a traveling foreign student, the policeman took me to the police station and

there he found me a cot to sleep on. In the morning his colleagues suggested that I take a shower, offered me a cup of coffee, and sent me on my way. The moral of the story: Spending a night at a police station is not always as bad as it sounds, and policemen can be very friendly people.

* * *

In Old World folktales, the magic number is three. To give an example: the hero of a tale is subjected to three dangerous tests before he can marry a lovely princess and live happily ever after. (In Native American traditional narratives, the magic number happens to be four, and as you will learn from this third and last "adventure" of mine, I could have legitimately chosen to write four.)

First a brief introduction. In a number of European countries, one of the most popular writers of adventure novels was, and still is, a German by the name of Karl May (1842-1912). He must have written about a hundred novels, so highly readable that they have been translated into more than twenty languages. The two heroes who appear in many of his novels are Old Shatterhand, a white man, and Winnetou, an Apache. As a boy I read all of May's novels, some of them several times. Quite surprisingly, they are not known in this country. In the spring of 1982, when I was lecturing for the Semester at Sea program, we anchored in Manila Bay for a few days and I went into the city to buy a few books to read during the rest of the of the round-the-world voyage. In a bookstore I was surprised to see an English paperback edition of May's most popular book *Winnetou*. I promptly bought it and reread it for the nth time. My feelings about May's stories probably are the reason that my interest in Native Americans (Indians) goes back to my early teens when I was reading May's books with a flashlight under the bedcovers, frequently until midnight.

Ten years later I was doing graduate work in anthropology at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana. In the spring of 1949, my major professor, a leading scholar in Native American languages, suggested that I go to Wyoming, do fieldwork among the Northern Arapaho, and eventually come up with a grammar of their unwritten language for my doctoral dissertation. And so one day in late June of that year I climbed onto an express Greyhound bus and a couple of days later got off in Laramie, Wyoming. From there I used a regional means of transportation to travel to Riverton, a smallish town on the edge of the Wind River Reservation which the Northern Arapaho share with the Shoshone.

For about a week I looked for a suitable place to settle in to do my linguistic fieldwork. It turned out to be the Episcopalian mission of Saint Michael's at Ethete, right in the middle of "Arapaho country." The rector couldn't have been kinder, and offered me a room in his house for a nominal rent. Since my summer field stipend was quite small and I was a foreign student from behind the Iron Curtain who couldn't turn to family for financial help, next I rented a horse at a quarter a day to be able to get around to find a suitable informant close to the mission's campus. I had never been on a horse before in my life (I was a big city boy) but fortunately the horse was quite old and slow (and therefore cheap to rent), and I am proud to say that I never left the saddle involuntarily. In a few days I found my first informant--a full-

blooded Arapaho in his early sixties named John Goggles. He couldn't read or write English, although he spoke it fairly well, but untutored as he was in the white man's ways, he was a very wise man and I developed great respect for him both as an informant and as a human being: I couldn't have asked for a better teacher and speaker of Arapaho than he was. It took several summers of fieldwork and working with several additional informants to complete the analysis of the Arapaho language in enough detail that I could finally write a grammar of the language. Many people have the false impression that Native American languages are simple and their grammars fairly random, without rules. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The grammars of most of these languages are quite complex, and certainly much more complex than the grammar of English. On the other hand, of course, the word stock (lexicon) of English is much more extensive. This is so because the vocabularies of languages of highly industrialized nations have many thousands of technical terms as well as slang words and dialectal words of regional or local character.

Skipping ahead a number of years, in March of 1979 as I was sitting in my office in the Anthropology Department at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst the telephone rang. The caller was the director of one of the National Bilingual Materials Development Centers, this one in Anchorage, Alaska. The message was short and urgent: The Northern Arapaho are becoming concerned that they are slowly losing their language in favor of English; their children no longer speak it because their mothers talk to them in English, and it seems likely to be a matter of only a few generations before the rich Arapaho language will no longer be used by anyone. Would I fly to Anchorage as soon as possible to meet with two Arapaho delegates to discuss what can be done to stop or at least slow down this threatening trend? The meeting in Anchorage was quite successful. The two Arapaho representatives—a man and a woman—were both teachers of Arapaho in the reservation schools, and they were quite impressed that a paleface knew so much about their language.

The result of this get-acquainted meeting that the two Arapaho reported on when they returned to Wyoming was that I made quite a few short and several long trips from Massachusetts to the Wind River Reservation during the next few years. I led several Arapaho language and culture workshops, talked about the Arapaho language to the teachers of the language in the local primary and secondary schools, produced with others a series of television lessons of basic Arapaho, and compiled a dictionary of contemporary Arapaho usage. I was very pleased that since at one time Arapahos had provided me readily with reliable data for my doctoral work, now I was able to "pay them back" in kind. (During the last twenty-five years, the tribal councils of both the Arapaho and other Native American nations have been trying to save their languages from extinction. However, the primary language—the mother tongue—of the youngest generation of Native Americans is rapidly becoming English.)

A most exciting event took place on March 22, 1985, when in a public ceremony with the approval of the Arapaho elders I was given an Arapaho name that translated into English, means "Arapaho chief." It may not have been the culmination of an adventure in the usual meaning of the word, but for me it was an exciting and remarkable experience. A Czech boy who had read all he could about Indians in his youth was honored in his late fifties by being

given an Indian name—something that happens very rarely—for the services he had rendered to his Indian friends. I will continue to treasure this experience for as long as I live.

The Texas Czech Dialect Project

John Tomeček

In modern America, homage is paid to those individuals and groups that paved the way for the current society. Over the years, the actual deeds and events fade from memory as the last pioneers and trail-blazers pass on, leaving instead the idyllic, easily-packaged version to fill the minds of the population. Texas, too, has a long history of idealized figures, "tall tales", and larger-than-life heroes. If one is to take a tour around the lonely prairies of the "heart" of Texas, its historical nexus and geographical center, clichés and stereotypes would be betrayed by the very road signs that signal the next settlement. Rising from the fog of a sultry Texas summer morning, the place names "Frenstat," "Hostyn," "Dubina," "Praha," and "Moravia," to simply name a few, signal a world unlike that of Texan myth. Wandering through the graveyards of lonely, seemingly out-of-place "old world" churches, the language upon the stones tells a very different story. The saga of these people is no less romantic than that of any other struggle for freedom. This is a land tamed by Czechs, Moravians, and Slovaks. Stepping off the gangplank of a leaking, rusting hulk of a steamer onto the soil of their new home, seeing in it potential, goodness, and a slight glimmer of home, theirs was a truly "American" story. From the 1870s until the 1920s, they came en masse, seeking freedom and a land in which to raise their children free of fear and oppression. Across the prairies, these amazing people formed their own communities, transplanted the culture of their beloved homeland, and sought a simple life. For all this time, they have created a vibrant society, a prolific press, and moreover, created a new "little Czech nation," adapting to their new homeland. They contributed to the economic prosperity of a nation, and sent their sons to sacrifice themselves on the altar of liberty in two world wars, to honor Lady Liberty, who had granted them their new home. And when their own countrymen were fighting for a country of their own in Europe, the Texas Czechs sent funds, many sending all their savings, and letters to the American Congress, urging support. Yet, we now stand eighty years since the last of the ships carrying Czechs landed on the coast of Texas, and the legacy of these people is uncertain. Czechs were gradually forced to assimilate and abandon their mother tongue and "un-American" habits. Many moved to the cities, married outside the community, and raised their children with little vestige of their hard-won culture. Now, the last torch-bearers are passing on without their knowledge being preserved.

The loss of a culture from the social landscape of the modern United States is tragic, but the Texas Czechs represent an ethno-linguistic community on the verge of total language death. In order to address this issue, the Texas Czech Dialect Project, modeled on the work of Dr. Hans Boas in the German communities of Texas, has been formed. It is based on two basic premises: that language is the medium by which the culture is preserved, and that Texas Czechs present a unique diaspora community of Czechs, thoroughly adapted to a new environment, that must be catalogued before the chance is lost. Ideally, such work would have been accomplished thirty years ago, but we must make do with what we have. Previous studies conducted by Dr. Eva Eckert, Dr. Kevin Hannan, and Dr. Ludmila Dutkova-Cope, among others, have demonstrated that the language of the Texas Czechs preserves many archaisms of Czech lan-

guage, representative of the mid-nineteenth century. Though the community received constant revitalization until the 1920s, the linguistic tradition maintained an older pattern of speech as its standard. As one begins to delve deeper into Texas Czech language itself, it becomes evident that the peoples of Czech Texas, bringing their regional dialects, have constructed a new "pseudo-dialect" in Texas. Even further, initial work has shown region variation along dialectical lines from Europe, owing to population migration from certain regions of the Czech lands and Moravia, to regions of Texas. The previous studies, however, have not enjoyed years of in-depth study. The Texas Czech Dialect Project is intended as a permanent apparatus by which to study the Texas Czech language and culture in all of its facets.

Methodology

In order to achieve the goals mentioned above, the Texas Czech Dialect Project utilizes a variety of sources of data and methods for obtaining them. As much of the best-quality data is endangered, a "triple-threat" approach is currently being utilized to collect as much as possible, while still maintaining the quality that is required of an ethno-linguistic study. The project is primarily interested in conducting new interviews with the ever-dwindling population of Czech Texas, to obtain examples of language use in the "twilight" of the speech community's life. These interviews attempt to elicit socio-cultural information about the communities and families in which the speakers have lived, while using the medium of the Czech language. This sampling of language is the most critical part of the interview, as cultural practices and traditions can be widely generalized throughout the population in Texas, and the dialects of speech vary highly from speaker to speaker. Due to the complex nature of obtaining an unprompted use of the speakers' native dialects, a loose framework for the collection of interviews is utilized. Interviews are allowed to drift from topic to topic freely with the individual's preferences, as long as communication in the medium of the Czech language persists. An interview protocol is designed to guide discussion and prompt where needed. This protocol follows the pattern of earlier studies, as well as drawing much inspiration from the work of Dr. Boas in German, and consists of questions about one's home, family, pastimes, life history, work, marriage, the weather, and schooling. In some cases this need not be utilized, though efforts are made to guide even the most free-form of conversations to these topics, so that many speakers' answers may be compared. This leads to another question: translation tasks. Though many studies have made use of exercises consisting of elicited words through translation from English into the heritage language, they are not currently utilized in this study, due to their tendency to frustrate semi-speakers of Czech. The work of James Mendl, in his 1976 Master's Thesis at the University of Texas, which will be mentioned later in this essay, focused intently on the differences between speakers in translation. He was, however, interviewing fluent speakers in an earlier time, and the same quality of interviews are difficult to obtain in the present era. The actual interviews generally last between two and three hours, and are conducted in the homes of speakers. While it has been the convention to conduct such interviews individually, group interviews of two to four speakers have produced startling results in terms of fluency. In addition to the spoken interview, a lengthy questionnaire is

distributed to the interviewee, and consists of questions pertaining to the use of Czech language in various spheres of life across time, as well as feelings about the language. Due to the "yes-no/positive-negative" nature of these questions, the written format allows for quick responses, thus saving precious recording time.

The second set of data being considered in this study comes from a variety of earlier studies, and consists of nearly five decades' worth of audio recordings. These earlier materials enable the Texas Czech Dialect Project to track changes in dialect and usage of the language over time, as many speakers have been interviewed several times over the years. While the project anticipates the inclusion of many files in years to come, currently we are focusing primarily on the preservation and analysis of the work of Dr. Svatava Pirková-Jakobsonová, who conducted extensive field work in Texas Czech during the 1960s and 1970s. After her death, much of her material was scattered in a variety of places, and was lost for many years to scholars. Thankfully, since the inception of this project, nearly all of her archive has been accounted for. In the collections at the University of Texas alone, we have over 490 hours of interviews. The value of these is unparalleled, as many of the speakers were aged in their 80s and 90s at the time of interview, and many more still were immigrants themselves. The fluency and quality of these individuals' Czech cannot be equaled today, but this does provide a control against which to measure change in a number of communities. Unfortunately, these materials were recorded on reel tape, which is now beginning to deteriorate. In order to combat this loss of priceless data, the Texas Czech Dialect Project is currently digitizing the entire collection through the financial backing of the Texas Chair in Czech Studies at the University of Texas' Department of Slavic and Eurasian Studies.

The third field of data collection is not in the realm of spoken language, but rather textual resources. The Czech diaspora of Texas was nothing if not prolific in press. At its height, nearly 10 newspapers ran weekly, dispensing information to this "Little Czech Nation" about its brothers and sisters, both back home in Europe and in this "Nový Domov," as one publication was named. These papers transmitted news, obituaries, public announcements, serialized novels, poems, readers' letters and more in the medium of the local dialects of Texas. In the early years of publication, *spisovná Čeština* was the medium of writing, but soon vernacular began to take precedence. In this way, the earliest Texas Czechs may contribute to our understanding of the speech community as a whole. These materials offer snapshots of the ordinary in Czech Texas, the mundane comings-and-goings of a people, which may have passed away in the memories of the last speakers. The cultural mindset of the Texas Czechs is preserved across the pages of these newspapers, which served as one of the primary bonds between countrymen in this new world. Indeed, newspapers from the Czechs of Chicago, Illinois were also in wide circulation in Texas. Yet it is not only newspapers which provide data in this way. As years press on and knowledge of the language dwindles, many from the younger generations throw out materials written in Texas Czech when the older generation passes away. Thus, an active collection of such materials has begun, only hampered by the lack of storage space. These items consist of correspondence, poems, religious documents, diaries, and almanacs, which provide snapshots of life in a particular time, from the unique perspective of this community. From

reminiscences of immigration and fond memories of the homeland to experiences in the theater of war and love letters, a truly candid, intimate view of individuals is possible through their writings. These documents not only provide this kind of information, but give concrete examples of the depth and extent of education in the writing of Czech and its grammatical system. Collection continues to the present day with the last Czech weekly newspaper, *Našinec*.

Data Analysis

While the collection of such data is of critical importance, the way in which the data is processed is critical to what can be gleaned from them. Before any analysis can take place, the recordings and writings are first organized according to the speakers' communities. From that point, analysis of audio materials begins with a simple transcription of the interview, reflecting the actual pronunciation of the speaker. While this work is currently done by hand, efforts are being made to utilize the resources of the Max Plank Institute's numerous software applications for linguistic transcription, which would enable a more swift completion of the work. Following transcription, the interviews are broken down into smaller sections, based on topics and questions. These are then closely studied in order to seek out any unique grammatical structures and terms, and then run through linguistic computational programs to assess variations in pronunciation and intonation that would otherwise be nearly impossible to hear with the ear alone. Once each individual interview is studied in this way, it is grouped together with others according to similarities in their speakers, within the community and without, including familial origins, age, gender, and occupation, and other factors. In this way, we are able to determine the actual dialects and their shifts as spoken in the community.

This dialectological analysis is a large part of the work that the Texas Czech Dialect Project is dedicated to. Earlier studies have shown glimpses of archaic Czech dialects in Texas, but it has become evident that in many parts of Texas new speech patterns, termed "pseudo-dialects," emerged at some point. Evidence of these dialects is largely based on a percentile composition of their speakers' home varieties. While some scholars have presented the notion that the Frenštat-area dialect acted as a *lingua franca* in Texas, it is evident that individual communties operated in their own regional dialects. For example, two dominantly Czech towns show a low intermarriage rate with one another. Upon further investigation, informants from one town have explained that a different dialect of Czech existed in the other town, preventing easy communication. Indeed, the latter of the two towns generally spoke a dialect from Valaško, whereas the former spoke a dialect more closely associated with the Brno area. Still, within these communities, various quarters would speak a language based on many different dialects, with new terms and phrases developed after immigration. In this way, we may speak of a "Texas Czech" dialect, but at the same time, we must concede that Texas' Czech language is highly regionalized and much variation can be seen between individual communities and between families in those communities.

Interestingly, the analysis of textual resources presents a different approach to the study of Czech language in Texas. These materials, while originating across the State, were intended for the digestion of the masses, and as

such were written in the standard Czech of the time. As mentioned earlier, their formality declined over the years, and left standing the vernacular. In the earliest papers, editorials and readers' letters provide a clear "feel" for the vernacular of the time, but more interesting still is the slow assimilation of vernacular elements into the standard. This transition serves to represent the formation of a Texan Czech, even as formal education in the accepted standard persisted. It is largely in this way that textual documents are analyzed for linguistic elements they contain. As one watches the various papers change over the course of decades, as one reads the accounts of immigrants and farmers of daily life, a feel for the grand scheme of life in the community emerges. These items, more than anything else, lend socio-cultural information that is invaluable to the study of this group. These items can be collated into sets, largely based on regions, to form an account of the history of an area, the typical life of a citizen there, and the cultural practices of a region. While interviews provide wonderful accounts of past events, they often omit negatives and small details, and retrospective accounts cannot objectively convey the feelings of the time. These are only accessible to us in written accounts.

Goals

While this work enjoys the profound luck of having a mountain of data with which to work for many years to come, it is not a project conceived of solely for the benefit of providing scholars with a career. The truth is quite the opposite, in fact, as the Texas Czech Dialect Project has its motto of "Náš Jazyk, Naše Dědictví, Naše Povinnost" (Our Language, Our Heritage, Our Duty) to present a united front with the Czechs of Texas. The eventual goal of the project is to preserve the unique dialects of Czech in Texas for future generations. To achieve these lofty aspirations, three phases of the work have been outlined.

The first of these calls for the massive collection of data. This involves at once the conducting of new interviews, preservation/digitization of old interviews, and assembling/preserving textual materials for the project. Due to the rapid loss of speakers of the Texas dialects of Czech, data collection will be conducted at full-force for as many years as speakers may be found. It is estimated at this time that this could last for as little as six years from the present time, or as many as fifteen. The collection of data in a rural community is difficult, but in one as "closed" as the Czech community of Texas, it can be nearly impossible without the right connections and in-roads. Thanks largely to the native status of the director of the project, a large network of speakers have begun to emerge. Indeed, even one mono-lingual speaker of Czech, believed to have been the last such person in the state, aged 104, was interviewed as part of the project. Though he passed away before a tape-recorded session was permitted, his endorsement of the project has swayed many to support the work. At this time it is unknown how many speakers of Czech may be "hiding" in plain view in the cities, towns, and the countryside of Texas.

As the first phase could obviously last for many years to come, it is essential that the second phase begin as soon as possible. This phase, which involves the analysis of the data collected, will account for the bulk of the work. In this phase, data is examined, assembled, studied, and in the end used to create a description of Czech Texas, both in terms of culture and language.

This work is planned to be a kind of ethno-linguistic atlas of the diaspora, which would treat in minute detail the history, culture and language of the "little nation," first as a whole, then by region and community. While many believe that this sort of work is not still possible in Czech Texas, due to the sizeable loss of speakers, it is the belief of this scholar and others that if the work is done now, we may still have enough information to keep us from completely losing this battle. It goes without saying that the re-discovered archives of Svatava Pirková-Jakobsonová provide a crucial aid in the fight to preserve the language and culture of the Texas Czechs.

How should one proceed with this tome? This magnum opus of the Texas Czech people would be of little use if it stood on a shelf in a library, locked away from the world in a rare book collection. It is the ultimate goal of this work that the fruits of labor be given back to: the Czechs, Moravians, and Slovaks of Texas. For many of these individuals, sometime in the 1950s, the passage of their mother tongue to the children of the community ceased. Though many wished to learn this noble language, they were told to become more assimilated and more "American." This presents a clear break between the older generation and the younger one. With the rise of the youngest generation, many seek a return to the way of their grandparents, both in acts and speech. In the Czech language courses taught at the University of Texas at Austin, more than 80% of students, and often more, are of Texas Czech heritage. There are, however, few places to learn the language. Many older people find themselves at a loss as to how to educate young people, and give up on the endeavor altogether. It is for this very reason that the Texas Czech Dialect Project seeks to establish a network of "Czech Schools" across the Texas Czech world, centered on church parishes, both Catholic and Protestant. The impetus for such an organization is the high attendance rate of this group in their local churches. Utilizing the presence of a large number of youth in one place, weekly classes can be taught. This is further enabled by the weight of the power of suggestion of the clergy in the community, for with their approval, it is hard to believe that it would not succeed. One problem, however, remains: what will be taught? It is not the goal of this project to provide grammar texts of standard Czech, but rather to utilize the research done in the communities and regions to re-teach the general dialect and speech patterns of an area to its youth. While this method cannot account for every family dialect, it will give the people of Czech Texas a chance to have their own language back. In this way, the Czech language of Texas may enjoy a revival along the lines of the European revival of the eighteenth century.

Expectations and Work-In-Progress

This work was conceived as a labor of love, a chance to save an ethno-linguistic community from its seemingly inevitable demise. It is important, however, to admit the clear possibility that it will fail in the endeavor for which it was organized. Many obstacles stand in the way, just as they did over a century and a half ago for the Czech Revivalists. Suspicion, sloth, and lack of interest on the part of some speakers have spoiled many a potentially good interview. What is fully expected, however, is that an atlas of the Texas Czech language and culture can be accomplished. If this goal is met, the elements crucial for recreating the language and culture may be saved and preserved for

future generations to take up when the time is right. Though this outcome would involve the loss of many of the traditions that are yet extant in Texas, it is certainly better than a total loss.

Currently, the Texas Czech Dialect Project has enjoyed more than thirty interviews with speakers of Texas Czech in its first year of work. The Svatava Pirková-Jakobsonová archive is currently being digitized, and the first quarter has been completed. Publications have appeared in the newspapers of several Czech fraternal organizations, and more speakers are inquiring than time permits for interviews. It is expected that the second year of the project will see further progress and the beginnings of deep analysis of the materials already assembled.

In summation, the Texas Czech Dialect Project has established itself as a permanent entity with the cooperation and support of many people to catalogue, preserve, and reassert their culture and language. From the bells of St. Vitus in Prague to the shrine of St. Wenceslas in Hostýn, Texas, we intend to not let the saga of the Texas Czechs pass away into obscurity and generalities as the old guard of that community passes on to greener fields, but rather to seed the culture in the fertile soil of a new generation, ready to shoulder the heritage of their people.

BOOK REVIEWS

Bohuslava Bradbrook. *A Handbook of Czech Prose Writing 1940-2005.* Brighton/Portland: Sussex Academic Press, 2007. 156 pp. ISBN: 1-84519-173-0.

The colored book's jacket with its simple satirical sketches captures one's attention first. Both front and back jacket illustrations as well as the three inside (ii, ix, p.157) are by Jiří Jirásek, in *U nás* -Prager Chronik, (At Our Home-Prague Chronicle), published by Evropský Kulturní Klub-Česká Expedice (1992) or in Jaromír Hořec and Ivan Janoušek (eds), *Občanské fory* (Citizens' Jokes), published by Odeon (1990).

A casual reader might be wondering why there is so much detailed information about a few small illustrations given in a place usually reserved for mere essentials of the book to be reviewed. The point is that these witty drawings have enabled the author, from the very beginning, to set the tone for the way she chose to introduce her literary handbook to the readership. Concurring with the view about the importance of the "advocating" role of writers throughout Czech history, even more so during the Nazi occupation and four decades of the Communist rule, Dr. Bradbrook was able to delineate in this condensed volume "the two faces of Czech literature - one suppressed at home, the other, published in exile and free" (vii). She was a political refugee herself having escaped Czechoslovakia shortly after the communist take over in 1948. Dr. Bradbrook has entered her personal *odyssey* into a poignant biographical story entitled *The Liberating Beauty of Little Things-Decision, Adversity & Reckoning in a Refugee's Journey from Prague to Cambridge* (2000). As an experienced teacher, accomplished scholar and writer, she set out to compile a rather personal *vademecum* of the Czech prose that was printed in years of the declared period. And succeed she did irrespective of obvious obstacles inherent in such projects because of her elaborate yet synoptic approach and consistently applied judgement based solely on the works' literary merit.

While she had access to works published in exile (some manuscripts or copies from domestic *samizdat* editions were smuggled abroad), the books that were allowed to be printed officially in Prague, used to be sent to her by members of her family and friends. It seems obvious that such irregular selection of books could hardly result in a genuinely representative sample of authors and their work so that the final survey must have been not only incomplete, but also biased**.** But she never claimed, to be sure, that her anthology would be inclusive, let alone comprehensive.

Having reviewed numerous Czech books (from both pre and post "Velvet Revolution" production) for learned journals and encyclopaedias, she placed self in an eminent position to determine which works might be considered a literature of some respectability – "to separate grain from chaff"- to use a favourite circumlocution, and to excite interest in literary circles. Moreover, she looked at the works' suitability for translation into other languages, particularly into English, and expressed hope that future translators will be sufficiently enticed to do so should they get the scent of new, interesting materials. She listed already available English translations at the end of discussion on each author.

As to the familiarity with earlier writers' works, Dr. Bradbrook evi-

dently drew on fruits from her university studies in Prague and post graduate work in Innsbruck and Oxford. However, it has been her ongoing contact with the world of literature and primarily the exhaustive research that preceded publication of her superb monograph on Karel Čapek - the subject of her life long scholarly interest that underlines her erudite and balanced opinions. It is worthwhile here to quote William E.Harkins of Columbia University, who described her book *Karel Čapek: In Pursuit of Truth, Tolerance and Trust* (1998) as "the most comprehensive treatment of Čapek's life and work, not only in English but in any language, including Czech". That she manifests a remarkable sensitivity in recognising any real or possible affinity to features in Čapek's works or to suggestions of being somewhat akin to him in works of any Czech writer included here, is apparent throughout.

There are thirty-five authors presented in the anthology, each having their biographical essentials provided and their works listed. The relevant historical context in which the works originated, and at least one or more detailed analysis of selected, possibly pivotal work, is presented. Each original title is translated into English, and available English translations, if any, are all given along with the year of publication and publishers. If applicable, the other literary activities of the included authors- like poetry, essays, short stories, novellas, film scripts, translations from Czech into other languages and *vice versa*, as well as references to the eminent foreign *literati* that they translated into Czech - are briefly mentioned. Similarly, works that were made into drama productions or adapted into films, some of them quite renowned, are named or hinted at. The book also contains a select anthological bibliography (145-6) on the Czech fiction translated into English; bold types in the index denote works that are being discussed in a greater detail.

The handbook is linguistically clear and therefore highly readable. However brief, it is still painstakingly evaluative yet eloquent enough in style. It appears that Dr. Bradbrook has no scruples about in her views should any literary product fail to meet minimal aesthetic criteria or would be decidedly poorly written. She is a forbearing critic yet at the same time shows herself the empathetic reviewer, who does not favor harsh criticisms, to say nothing about definitive pronouncements about any literary work. It seems that she is always inclined to look for and capable of finding, irrespective of her own preferences or liking, something of value in most of works she chooses to analyse.

A few intriguing comparisons between some Czech and British authors that Dr Bradbrook suggested, such as that Vladimír Neff's style may be in a number of ways "a Czech parallel to John Galsworthy's" (82), and Jaroslav Strnad's "vivid descriptions can often be measured up with (Joseph) Conrad's" (123), Zuzana Slobodova has already noted in *British Czech and Slovak Review* (2007). Similarly intriguing could be an allusion to Lawrence Sterne's *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, a Gentleman, 1759-67* when Dr Bradbrook critically discusses S. Richterová's *Slabikář otcovského jazyka* ("A Primer of Paternal Language"(104) or hints on theoretical or evaluative positions taken by literary figures such as Graham Greene (11), T. O. Beachcroft (58), Louis Aragon (71), F. R. Leavis (96), and Robert Porter (115) when appraising the writers' mode of creation and/or their writing style.

The Handbook's author may and will likely be rebuked for the selected writers she did, possibly even works whose "importance" can be argued about, and leaving out those thought to be included. For example, if Egon Hos-

tovský was included why not Němeček? - even though he is mentioned as belonging to "professional writers among the first-phase exiles (1948-68)" (p.5), and despite striking similarities in their personal history, the major theme they focused: exile experience, and in their renown. (An excellent monograph with extensive bibliography, however, can be found in Vladimír Papoušek, *Horizonty-Zivot a dílo Zdenka Němečka*, Praha: Torst, 2002).

Admirers of other earlier, more recent or contemporary writers like Adolf Branald, Jiří Mucha, Karel Pecka, Jan Drábek, Michal Ajvaz, Jáchym Topol, Věra Linhartová, Libuše Moníková, Daniela Hodrová, or Petra Hulová, to name a few, will regret seeing them omitted. It is, of course, impossible to accommodate everyone on merely 156 pages! As touched on earlier, besides having problems in securing a regular flow of books published on the domestic front, Dr Bradbrook did admit to making her choices personal and keeping in mind the works' likelihood to stir interest in the "English-speaking world".

Also, inevitably, securing all biographical information in time of publication gets beyond control. Thus, for instance, Miloslava Holubová passed away in 2001, Viktor Fischl in 2006, and Jan Beneš in 2007. Another minor flaw has to do with missing or inconsistent information concerning the writer's places of birth, pen, original, maiden or married names. The reviewer has filled up those missing details and decided to offer to prospective readers yet another, generational perspective by listing the writers according to their chronological ages instead of alphabetically as presented in the Handbook. Ferdinand Peroutka (1895-1978); Egon Hostovský (Hronov, 1908-1973); Vladimír Neff (1909-1983); František Kožík (Uherský Brod, 1909-1997); Viktor Fischl (Avigdor Dagan, 1912-2006); Miloslava Holubová (Skrchov u Brna, 1913-2001); Bohumil Hrabal (1914-1997); Jaroslav Strnad (Jaroslav Kujeba, Vysoké Mýto, 1918-2000); Ladislav Fuks (Praha, 1923-1994); Jan Otčenášek (1924-1979); Jindřiška Smetanová, née Macháčková, Rosice u Brna, 1923-); Josef Skvorecký (1924-); Jan Křesadlo (Václav Pinkava, Praha, 1926-1995); Marie Sulcová, (Esen, Carpathian Ruthenia, 1926-); Arnošt Lustig, (Praha, 1926-); Ludvík Vaculík (1926-); Pavel Kohout (Praha, 1928-); Jan Procházka (Ivančice u Brna, 1929-1971); Hana Bělohradská, (nee Moráková, Praha, 1929-2005); Jan Trefulka (1929-); Milan Kundera (Brno, 1929-);Ota Pavel (Otto Popper, Praha, 1930-1973); Eva Kantůrková, (nee Sílová, mar.Sternová and K.,1930-); Ivan Klíma (Praha, 1931-); Miloslav Svandrlík (Praha, 1932-); Vladimír Páral (1932-); Zdena Salivarová, (Škvorecká, Praha, 1933-); Jan Beneš (Praha, 1936-2007); Václav Havel (Praha, 1936-); Ivan Kraus (Praha, 1939-); Eda Kriseová (Praha, 1940-); Sylvie Richterová (Brno, 1945-); Lenka Procházková (Olomouc, 1951-); Michal Viewegh (1962-); Irena Dousková (1964-).

The three misprints: in the name of M.Holubová (margin of p.30), in naming a western Bohemia's famous spa town Mariánské Lázně (87), and in a surname of the Nazi "butcher of Prague" R.Heydrich (117), are hardly worth mentioning.

In the reviewer's opinion, none of the miniscule insufficiencies ascertained in this modest, useful and comely book could stay in the way of awarding it the "purple patch".

Those who have waited patiently and are anxious to wade into a more inclusive and comprehensive anthology of Czech post WWII literature in English will undoubtedly welcome the work entitled *Writers Under Siege-Czech Literature since 1945* by Jiří Holý (transl. Elizabeth S.Morrison, Jiří Holý and

Jan Čulík that was published, also by Sussex Academic Press, in November 2007.

Jan Klinka

Melissa Feinberg. *Elusive Equality: Gender, Citizenship, and the Limits of Democracy in Czechoslovakia, 1918-1950*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 206. 275pp. ISBN 0-8229-4281-X.

Melissa Feinberg in her book argues that "although Czechs were emotionally attached to the idea of democracy, they were not able to deal with the perils of a system that counted equality as one of its primary political values (9)."

The newly created Czechoslovakia was in the forefront of women's rights. "In the first few weeks after Czechoslovakia came into existence the idea that democracy required women to receive the same rights as men suddenly became self-evident in the Czech lands (30)," Feinberg writes. The franchise was extended to women. Article 106 of the 1920 Czechoslovak Constitution forbade discrimination of the basis of gender or class. Giving substance to the democratic spirit of the times, universities admitted women to all departments (with the exception of theology). Secondary schools admitted female students on equal basis with males. The Czechoslovak Republic did away with the Austro-Hungarian law that required female public school teachers to resign upon marriage.

Yet another section of the Constitution presented a distinctly gendered conception of rights. Article 126 that stated "marriage, motherhood, and family are under the protection of the law." This constitutional ambiguity later manifested itself in the civil code and other legislation and administrative measure. Although Parliament did enact a bill permitting divorce as part of the marriage law of 1919, it was unable to agree on how the Austro-Hungarian civil code of 1811 was to be revised. The stumbling bloc, as Feinberg notes, was that "for most Czechs...equality for women was acceptable only to the extent that it did not disrupt their vital role in the family (72)." This view led to insistence that a married woman's citizenship was to be determined solely by that of her husband.

Czech family law considered the husband the head of the family and its breadwinner. A woman's right to work was seen as contingent on her financial need. Unlike that of the man, it was not absolute and in the need of the state's protection. In the 1930's as the impact of the Great Depression began to be felt, the advances that women had made to achieve parity with men in the civil service reached a turning point. If they were married to a fellow civil servant, women were denied the Christmas bonus. In l932, the press launched an attack against "double earners," i.e., situation which occurred when husband and wife were both civil service employees, and demanded that the woman resign or be fired. After 1933, the state did adopt overtly discriminatory policies against married women in the civil service.

Abortion proved to be a contentious issue as well. It was debated in the press and legislature. The law regulating abortion in inter-war Czechoslovakia was the Austro-Hungarian criminal code, particularly §144-148, that

made the procedure a felony for both the woman and whoever assisted her. The first bill to legalize abortions was introduced in 1920, but it like others of this ilk failed to pass. In 1932, a commission formed by the Ministry of Justice to study this issue recommended that the ban on abortions be continued, but with exceptions such as when the life of the mother was threatened or the birth of the child would cause a severe financial hardship. It also favored reduced criminal penalties and mandated that insurance companies cover approved abortions. Strenuous objections of the Catholic People's Party prevented the enactment of the Commission's draft. "Since it was a case where the rights of the individual were themselves debatable…it seemed a fair compromise to defer to the needs of some larger collective," Freiberg writes. "But if the nation or family was indeed more important than the individual, then there might come a time when other rights might be sacrificed for the common good (158)."

This is exactly what happened as the Second Republic was established after the Munich Treaty of 1938. According to Feinberg, "Czechoslovakia's new leaders did not believe that liberal democracy had the power to defend the nation, but they did not advocate turning to fascism. Instead they proposed a Czech 'third way' that would merge elements of both systems in something they called 'authoritarian democracy (162-163)." The new regime was deeply gendered: "Czech women did not belong to the nation as equal citizens; they served it as wives and mothers (165)," Feinberg notes. Married women whose husbands were also civil servants could receive severance pay or pensions if they voluntarily left their jobs. After a certain date, if they refused and their husbands earned over a certain minimum, they would be fired. Women fared even worse after 1939 Nazi invasion when Czechoslovakia was dismembered. The Czech lands became a Protectorate of the Reich and Slovakia an independent state under Nazi auspices. Originally women were bared from participation in the National Partnership (Národní souručenství), the only officially sanctioned party in the public sphere for Czechs. Later, their participation was allowed but restricted to issues dealing with culture and welfare. They were denied a say in political matters.

After the War, all the parties of the National Front claimed to be friends of women's rights. The Constitution adopted after the 1948 Communist coup stated the "men and women will have the same position in the family and in society and that they will have the same access to education, to all professions, offices and ranks (220)." However, women to their chagrin soon found out that these benefits came at the pleasure of those in charge, i.e. the Communist Party. This realization came quickly enough as the Communist regime put Milada Horáková , one of the foremost leaders of the feminist Ženská národní rada (Women's National Council) on trial and executed her.

In the last chapter Feinberg links the historical exposé with democratic theory. She argues that:

> The Czech experiment with democracy during the first half of the twentieth century was one of Europe's more successful efforts during the inter-war years, and yet it too failed on multiple occasions, sliding into "authoritarian democracy" in 1938 and Communist people's democracy in 1948.While many factors led to these events, including a global economic crisis, a devastating war and pressure from Czecho-

> slovakia's powerful neighbors, the demise of Czech democracy cannot be laid so neatly at the feet of others. Helping to tie all of these factors together was a profound sense of ambivalence from Czechs themselves, many of whom began to wonder if democracy was something they really wanted or trusted (223-224).

Feinberg continues:

> Looking how attitudes toward women's rights …changed and mutated over the two decades between the two world wars shows us one of the mechanisms by which the enthusiastic democratic Czech public of 1918 could be transformed into the willing authoritarian regime of 1938. The key difference between these two regimes…was the way in which they approached the matter of rights (226-7).

The Czech public of 1918 considered many rights to be universal and self-evident. In 1938 there prevailed a different interpretation of the state responsibility to protect its citizens' rights. Such considerations were always secondary to national security; "the nation" was placed above even the most basic requirements of democratic government. "Czech authoritarian democrats not only banned married women from the work place," Feinberg states," but also attacked the civil rights of Jews, banned the Communist Party and sucked the life out of parliamentary government by passing an Enabling Act which allowed rule by presidential decree.(227)." They hoped to save the nation, but "they in fact were in the process of hollowing out democracy itself (227)."

The author concludes:

> The Second Republic was not a result of the sudden decision or of the machinations of the Western powers at Munich. It came from a growing consensus among Czechs about what they wanted from government and from democracy: not individual freedom or equality, but national security and a form of social justice that did not threaten the gendered nature of the family…Equality, in all of these cases, seemed damaging to the nation as whole (227).

Even after WWII, that break between democracy and rights remained and was deepened. The Communists created a "people's democracy" in which Masaryk's idea of democracy was "replaced by a state where individual freedom was denied and 'equality' was achieved by force (228)."

Freiberg skillfully weaves the history of the Czech women's movement, especially the activities of Women's National Council, into her narrative, as well as comparison women's position in the United States and European countries. To her credit, Freiberg also attempts to set the gender issue within the context of Czechoslovak history and politics.

While one cannot flaw the scholarship or internal logic of Feinberg's conclusions, I would like to call attention to contextual factors that she has not sufficiently considered. In her discussion of the abortion issue, Ms. Feinberg fails to note that, in spite of § 144 remaining on the books, the procedure was generally, although privately and discretely, available to women who could afford to pay for it, i.e., middle class women. The situation did not resemble

the United States before *Roe v. Wade*. Furthermore, to understand the position of women in Czechoslovakia it would have been useful to know to what extent they were discriminated against in the private sector. Were married and single women treated differently?

Lastly, one can dispute the weight the author ascribes to the various factors that brought an end to Czechoslovak democracy. Feinberg contends that the slide into "authoritarian democracy" and Communism was due in large part to the Czechs' "profound ambivalence" toward the very concept of democracy. Czech authoritarianism, she argues, was the primary reason for the jettisoning of ideals of equality of the first Czechoslovak Republic and the creation of the Second Republic and setting the stage for the "people's democracy." Her contention underestimates the impact of the Munich *Diktat* on the Czech leaders and populace. Feinberg seems to believe that they were making choices as free agents, and as such, she faults them for espousing "national security" as their top priority. Threatened with the annihilation of their state, theirs was a Hobson's choice. Subsequent traumatic and momentous events, the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, Nazi occupation, World War II, amply justified their fears. After the War, strong position of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and the belief that it has liberated the region from the Nazi again constrained the Czechs' freedom of action, which vanished in the wake of the 1948 Communist *coup d'état*.

My quibbles non-withstanding, Melissa Feinberg has written a provocative, well-researched and argued work. *Elusive Equality: Gender, Citizenship, and the Limits of Democracy in Czechoslovakia, 1918-1950* richly deserves the attention of those interested in Czechoslovak history, democratic theory and women's rights. They should not only read this book, but also ponder its conclusions.

Mary Hrabik Šámal
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan

Paul Robert Magosci. *The People From Nowhere: An Illustrated History of Carpatho-Rusyns*. Uzhorod: V. Padiak Publishers, 2006, 120 pp. ISBN 9-6678-3896-X.

This lively, coffee-table style book—full of color, photographs, maps, and charts--grips the reader in the opening paragraph. The famous artist, Andy Warhol, is quoted as saying "I am from nowhere," a phrase which became the title of this book. Magosci discloses that Warhol was from somewhere, namely, the Carpathian Rus. The first two chapters demonstrate and illustrate that the Carpatho-Rusyns and their ancestors today live in countries as diverse as Ukraine, Slovakia, Poland, the United States and Canada. Before the ascent of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, they were confined to the Carpathian mountains and valleys of Europe, but were systematically parceled out to various nation-states as well as ethnically cleansed from them: "They do not have their own state but live within the borders of several states where they are classified as a national minority" (27).

Magosci traces the history of the Carpatho-Rusyns from the 5th century to the present in the remainder of the book. Although they use the Cyrillic alphabet and had adopted their own version of the Orthodox Faith, they felt themselves to be a distinct people throughout the centuries, albeit, always in search of a State, and they were often persecuted. Thus, a large "number of Carpatho-Rusyns estimated at about 225,000, left between the 1880s and 1914 and found employment in the industrial regions of the northeastern United States" such as Pittsburgh (p. 61). The first President of Czechoslovakia, Tomaš G. Masaryk, "did promise Carpatho-Rusyns the right to self-government" (71) but it was limited. Both Nazis and Communists interned or ethnically cleansed large numbers of Carpatho-Rusyns. The author points out, for example, that Pavel Goidych, the Greek Catholic bishop of Prešov was sentenced to life imprisonment for his defense of Rusyn rights by the Czechoslovak Communist government, and died in prison. Among his many other examples, the author notes that Communist government as part of the forced urbanization and industrialization of agricultural areas destroyed whole Rusyn villages. He also points out that many Carpatho-Rusyns settled in a region of the former Yugoslavia called Vojvodina—but Vojvodina was the scene of numerous attempts at ethnic cleansing of several minorities.

Despite this sad history, the author maintains that since 1989, a national revival of Carpatho-Rusyn cultural identity has been underway. This is the least convincing part of the book, because it is clear that any such attempts at revival have been stymied by the assimilation of Carpatho-Rusyns in bona fide nation-states, from Poland to Yugoslavia. Perhaps it is true that Carpatho-Rusyns are forming clubs and cultural centers in various nation-states. However, the crux of the issue, unexplored by Magosci, is that the Carpatho-Rusyns are one more people in search of national identity within nation-states that treat them as a minority at best. Vatro Murvar and other authors have explored this problem for the Bosnian Muslims, Kurds, and numerous other minorities. Magosci does not cite Murvar or even Daniel Patrick Moynihan and other scholars who debate this seemingly intractable issue in world affairs. In his book *Pandaemonium,*

Moynihan worries that applying Wilson's principle of self-determination to all the peoples of the world who crave it would result in complete chaos. Nevertheless, Magosci does offer a compassionate, instructive, and genuinely interesting account of a neglected people and their rich cultural heritage that should interest scholars in fields ranging from political science to Eastern European Studies.

Stjepan G. Mestrovic
Texas A&M University

Janoušek Hroznata, Jiří Seidl, Marie Štermberková. *Čeští kněží-misionáři v Nebrasce, Jan Vránek, Jan Štěpán Brož, Alois Klein. (*Czech Priests-Missionaries in Nebraska, Jan Vránek, Jan Štěpán Brož, Alois Klein*).* Rosice u Brna: Gloria, 2007. 139pp. ISBN: 978-80-86760-37-7.

This book presents the work and the life of three Czech Catholic priests who served the Czech, Polish, German and Slovak settlements in the

Great Plains. Later in their life, they ministered to parishes in Nebraska. Fathers Jan Vránek and Jan Štěpán Brož are buried in Omaha side by side. Monsignor Alois Klein is buried in Brainard, the settlement he helped to establish.

All three were pioneers, who shared the life of their parishioners in the dugouts and witnessed the gradual improvement of their economic situation. The three priests were also scientists and men of letters. Already recognized poets during their lifetimes, Vránek, Brož and Klein published in the Czech-American press, as well as in Catholic periodicals in their homeland. All three were involved in the Nebraskans' support for an independent Czechoslovakia during World War I. Alois Klein lived to see this struggle repeated during World War II.

Jan Vránek (1863-1925) was born in the Southern Bohemia near Kardašova Řečice He moved to the United States in 1890 together with his countryman, fellow priest and classmate, Jan Štěpán Brož (1865-1919). Endowed with strong nationalist feelings, the two priests suffered through the Germanizing theological seminaries in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and came to America partly to escape what to them seemed the oppressive church hierarchy there. Vránek and Brož became a part of the North American clergy that served their parishioners' cultural, educational and economic needs. They built schools in which Czech nuns taught, and erected halls for Orel, the Catholic gymnastic organization similar to Sokol, for physical exercises and theatrical productions. Under their guidance, the Catholic churches became a cultural haven for immigrants. The two clergymen became founding members of a closely knit group of Czech priests in the new world. Vránek and Brož appreciated and supported each other's work, be it service to parishioners or their own creative endeavors. In 1906 Jan Vránek published a collection of poems, *Na půdě americké*. Jan Štěpán Brož's *Z prérie*, also a collection of poems, appeared in 1913. Both men were also interested in science. For example, Jan Štěpán Brož studied Native American cultures and shared his findings with Aleš Hrdlička, the anthropologist, who taught at the University of Chicago and later worked for the Smithsonian Institution.

Alois Klein (b. 1866), the third Czech Catholic priest and poet from the Nebraska prairies, was a contributor to *Ottův slovník naučný*, the multivolume encyclopedia often called the Czech *Encyclopedia Britannica*. As a social activist, Klein was one of the founders of Catholic workers' associations in Nebraska. Moreover, Klein also kept bees and published articles in this field. His work helped to establish an economically important activity for Nebraska and Great Plains farmers.

The three of the authors discussed in *Čeští kněží-misionáři v Nebrasce* were good poets, but not outstanding ones. They wrote poetry in the Jaroslav Vrchlický and Svatopluk Čech tradition. Although clearly talented, Vránek, Brož and Klein showed no innovative trait in their verses. In addition to their literary legacy, these Czech priests have left behind their community and scientific endeavors as local historians, educators, cultural organizers and scientists.

The Czechs' renewed interest in their compatriots' emigration to the United States and Czech cultural life in American towns led to the publication of this slim volume. This interest comes in the nick of time. Today

only a few people still remember the vibrant Czech culture that produced Czech language newspapers, Czech language writers on the American soil, and these witnesses are quickly dying out. Literary works of Czech American writers from the first half of the twentieth century have been consigned to the dustbin as heirs who do or did not know Czech liquidated their parents' and grandparents' estates or are lying in dusty university archives. There the acid in the paper that they were printed on eats them away.

Míla Šašková-Pierce
University of Nebraska

Světlana Hanušová and Petr Najvar, eds. *Foreign language acquisition at an early age*. Brno: Masaryk University, 2006. 103 pp. ISBN 80-210-414-8.

Foreign Language Acquisition at an Early Age is a collection of selected papers from an international conference hosted by the Faculty of Education of Masaryk University (Brno) in March 2006. The conference was organized in response to the Czech Ministry of Education's initiative to lower the age at which children begin foreign language study. The volume synthesizes international research on language study at an early age in both second (SL) and foreign (FL) language contexts and then examines the issue within the unique educational context of the Czech Republic.

Section One, "Keynote Papers", begins with Mary Benedetti and Penny Freppon discussing the necessary alignment of educational policy with theory and research. They review approaches to FL in the elementary school and point to research indicating that unless children are provided with second language exposure very early—before age 3 or 4--they should not be taught a second language until they have matured in their first language. At age 5-7, children are maturing in their first language, and every support should be given to first language development at this time, particularly when children are not immersed in the target language. The authors conclude that successful FL policies must align with the socio-educational contexts in which they are to be implemented rather than being developed to meet perceived sociopolitical needs.

In the second paper, Gabriela Lojová points out that most of the existing research on successful early language learning has been done in SL contexts, in which children learn the dominant language of the country in which they live, rather than FL context. While little research supports the "earlier the better" notion in FL acquisition, Lojová writes, a substantial body of research supports starting later. Lojová discusses the variables to be considered in language education policy development, including the social and linguistic environment, which is the primary difference between SL and FL learning, and educational conditions, including an adequate supply of highly trained teachers, their methodologies, and the continuity of language learning throughout schooling. Lojová concludes by asking policy makers to consider if the Czech Republic is currently ready to implement the proposed policy by the Ministry of Education to lower the age at which children begin to learn a foreign language.

Section Two of the book provides discussion papers of two types: issues papers and reports of primary research. Papers related to issues in this section argue both for and against the implementation of an early-age foreign

language learning policy and direct attention to important issues in policy development. Kateřina Dvořaková discusses the lack of qualified language teachers and the problem of ensuring continuity in the language program. She points out that it is unlikely that a sufficient number of qualified educators can be found to ensure the success of the Ministry's proposed policy since many trained English teachers in the Czech Republic leave education for higher-status, more lucrative positions in other fields. Helena Havličková argues that gains in lower-order processes such as pronunciation that are better learned at an early age do not justify an emphasis on FLES (Foreign Language in the Elementary School), given that higher-order skills are better learned after puberty. Naděžda Vojtková supports the beginning of language instruction at a very early age, but also calls attention to the importance of teachers' command of and attitude toward the FL. Finally, Rita Collins and Helena Titlová address the issue of students with learning disabilities in Czech primary schools. While arguing that these learners benefit from the earliest possible language instruction, the authors point out that highly qualified teachers are the key to students' success.

Two reports of primary research conducted in the Czech Republic add power to the contention that social and educational contexts must be considered in the development of language education policy. In the first, Šárka Purdjaková discusses the results of her survey of 176 Czech adults (60 non-teacher; 80 secondary teachers; and 60 university teachers); upper secondary teachers and non-teachers favored early-age initial language learning, while lower secondary teachers and university teachers favored a later start. The author contends that policy makers should focus more on the training of language teachers and program structure than on the initial age of language learning.

In the second research report, co-editors Hanušová and Najvar present the results of the *English to Very Young Learners Project* (2004-2006), in which 1,827 prospective teachers in the Faculty of Education at Masaryk University were asked when they began their foreign (English) language training, and these data were compared to their language proficiency level as determined by the Masaryk University Entrance Exam Test of English. The results were very clear: "None of the tests carried out so far proved statistically significant correlations between the age in which the participants started learning English and their score on the university entrance English test." (p. 79) The significance of this study is that it is a large-scale research project that examines ultimate language attainment, which is, the authors note, the impetus behind the Ministry of Education proposal. Hanušová and Najvar conclude that both Czech and European educational policy makers should not overemphasize age as a factor in early language teaching.

Foreign Language Acquisition at an Early Age will be of interest not only to foreign language teachers and teacher educators, but also to those who research, develop, and implement language education policies. By reviewing previous and new research on age and language acquisition and by calling for the consideration of social and educational context in the development of policy, this volume is an important contribution to the field.

William Menz

University of Cincinnati

Contributors

Tracy A. Burns lives in Prague, where she writes articles, stories, and feuilletons in Czech, Slovak, and English. Her work in Czech has been published in three dailies, and in the weeklies *Reflex* and *Respekt* as well as in numerous literary periodicals. Her writings in Slovak have appeared in the daily *SME* and in the former bi-weekly *Mosty*. Her literary creations in English have been printed in *The Washington Post*, *The Prague Post*, *Kosmas*, *Prague Leaders Magazine*, and *Emrys Journal*, among others. Her articles in English have also appeared on the internet pages of Czech Radio. She is a contributing editor to the book *The Arena Adventure* and has edited an art catalogue for the National Gallery of Art in Prague. She also has experience as a proofreader, translator, journalist, and editor.

Jan A. Klinka, a native of Prague, was educated at Charles University and also holds a doctorate from the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada. He has worked for the Public Service Commission of BC, as a senior clinical psychologist with Adult Forensics in Victoria, and also in private practice, but is now retired. He has published articles in the *British Journal of Psychiatry* and *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*.

Charles S. Kraszewski studied under Rio Preisner for four years at the Pennsylvania State University, receiving his doctorate in Comparative Literature in 1990. Prof. Preisner directed the Czech portion of his dissertation on Czech and Polish heroic and anti-heroic literature. In 1996, Kraszewski's translation of Preisner's selected poetry (*Visuté mosty* / *Hanging Bridges*) was published in Rome and Svitavy. He is currently engaged in an annotated translation of Preisner's "O životě a smrti konzervatismu." Recently appointed Editor in Chief of *The Polish Review*, Dr. Kraszewski is currently Professor of English at King's College.

Pavel Marek is a University Professor in the Department of History of the Faculty of Arts of the Palacky University in Olomouc (Czech Republic) und the Catholic University in Ružomberok (Slovak Republic). He is mainly engaged in Czech history in the late 19th century and early 20th century, the history of political parties and church history. He is the author of numerous papers and monographs, including *The Czech Catholicism 1890-1914*; *Orthodoxy in Czechoslovakia 1918-1942*; *The Church Crisis at the Beginning of the First Czechoslovak Republic (1917-1924)*; *Prof. ThDr. Theodor Kohn, the Archbishop of Olomouc*; *Prof. ThDr. František Kordač, the Archbishop of Prague*; *Emil Dlouhý-Pokorný: The Life and Work of a Catholic Modernist.*

William Menz is a doctoral student in Literacy/TESL at the University of Cincinnati. He is also a full-time teacher in Cincinnati Public Schools. His research interests lie in the areas of Teacher Education, TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language), and Non-Native Speakers of English (NNS).

Stjepan G. Mestrovic is Professor of Sociology at Texas A&M University. He served as editor of the book series on Eastern Europe for TAMU Press over the course of fifteen years. He is also the author and editor of numerous books and articles on Eastern Europe, including *Habits of the Balkan Heart*, *Genocide*

After Emotion: The Postemotional Balkan War, and *This Time We Knew: Genocide in Bosnia*.

Václav Pačes has been President of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic since 2005. He received his RNDr. from Charles University in 1965. Three years later he was awarded his Sc. degree from the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and in 1987 his DrSc. degree. Since 1977 he has been associated with the Institute of Molecular Genetics, becoming Head of the Laboratory in 1986 and Director of the Institute in 1999. In 1992 he became a docent and in 1995 he was named full Professor. In his scientific career he has specialized in genetics and in the 1980s his team was one of the first to decode the DNA of bacterial viruses. He also carried out research abroad, including visits to universities in the US, Spain, the UK, and Japan. He is the author or co-author of more than 100 scientific papers and several books. His accomplishments have been recognized by several prizes and awards and by his being elected a member of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts.

Joseph F. Patrouch is Associate Professor of History at Florida International University in Miami, Florida. His research interests include the histories of the Habsburg lands in central Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He published *A Negotiated Settlement: The Counter-Reformation in the Habsburg Province of Upper Austria* in 2000 and recently edited and translated *Understanding Vienna: Pathways into the City* by Heinz Fassmann and Gerhard Hatz (2007).

Zdenek Salzmann is professor emeritus of anthropology at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. He came from Prague (then Czechoslovakia) in 1947. Since then he has been a guest professor at Yale University and five European universities. Among his 360 publications are books, monographs, articles, book reviews, and poetry. At present, at the age of 82, Salzmann is an adjunct professor at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff.

Mary Hrabik Šámal is the Book Review Editor of *Kosmas*. She teaches at Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan. Although a political scientist (her Ph.D. is from The Pennsylvania State University), she often writes on Czech culture.

Míla Šašková-Pierce, Associate Professor, University of Nebraska at Lincoln, holds a Ph. D. from the University of Kansas, as well as degrees from the Universities of Louvain and Brussels. Her publications on the Czech language and its teaching have appeared both in Europe and the United States.

John Tomeček is an undergraduate student at the University of Texas at Austin. After graduating in May, 2008 he will enter the graduate program in Slavic Languages and Literatures there. A native of Czech Texas, he is director of the Texas Czech Dialect Project, a research organization which seeks to preserve and study the Texas dialects of Czech.

Theresie M. West is a graduate of the University of Texas at Austin, where she earned a B.A. in Religious Studies and Czech. She has been a proud mem-

ber of the Texas Unity of the Brethren since childhood, though she now lives in Princeton, New Jersey. She works at a day program for people with disabilities and studies independently.

Advice to Contributors

Kosmas is devoted primarily to scholarly research in all relevant academic disciplines within the humanities, arts, and sciences; memoirs or creative writing may be published in some cases. Ordinarily, manuscripts should be no longer than 25-30 pages, double-spaced. Book reviews should be 500-700 words in length. Manuscripts will not be returned unless postage is enclosed.

Manuscripts may be submitted in English, Slovak, Czech, French, or German, but an English translation must accompany any manuscript in a language other than English. *Kosmas* publishes only in English.

Manuscripts should be prepared in Microsoft Word with careful attention to diacritical markings. Each author should submit two paper copies of the manuscript along with a copy on a computer diskette. The entire text should be double-spaced, including block quotations and notes. Book titles and non-English words should appear in italics. Endnotes should be used rather than the "Works Cited" format. Transliterations of Cyrillic should follow the Library of Congress method. For all additional matters of style, the current edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style* should be consulted.