KOSMAS

N° 25.2

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 Eugene Martin, Subscriptions Editor, *Kosmas*, at PO Box 1285, Highland Park, NJ 08904-1825, USA. Tel: 732-236-7013. E-mail address: <martineu@umdnj.edu>. Checks should be made out to "SVU." In the US and Canada, an individual one-year subscription to Kosmas is $32.00 ($27.00 for current members of the SVU, $43.00 for libraries and other institutions). For European and other international subscribers, the rates are $37.00, $32.00, and $50.00, 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: <maruska48@gmail.com>.

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

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

CONTENTS

Editor's Notes

We begin this issue with three articles that explore aspects of Czechoslovak history. Francis D. Raška has already published articles and a book monograph on the complex history of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, established in early 1949, one year after the Communist takeover. It was the first political organization of its type to be formed by political exiles from a Soviet-dominated European country. Readers of the Fall 2006 and Fall 2007 issues of *Kosmas* will recall previous articles by Raška on this topic, and many of you are keenly aware that the Council has a special relevance to the founders of our sponsoring organization, SVU. The new article in this issue focuses on the role played by Czechoslovak exiles in keeping alive dissident groups such as Charter 77 and pointing out violations of the Helsinki Accords by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia, helping to prepare the way for a post-communist future.

In his article Ota Konrád examines the controversial topic of the German University in Prague, abolished in 1945 by Czechoslovak President Beneš because of its "hostile stance" towards the Czech nation. Taking a close look at the history of the University's curriculum in History, Germanic Studies, and Slavic Studies, Konrád acknowledges that the prominence of National Socialist ideology and participation in Nazi war crimes by some faculty members can be seen as treasonous, but rather than relying on such generalizations his work illustrates a more nuanced study of the historical context of this situation.

As many of our readers know, Zdeněk V. David is an authority on the philosophy and political stance of Tomáš G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's first president. Most recently, in our Fall 2010 issue, David contributed a study of Masaryk's ideas about the psychological and philosophical causes of World War I. Now we are pleased to offer a new article in which he analyzes Masaryk's "humanitarian vision of the coming unification of Europe and eventually of all mankind," with an emphasis on the central importance of democracy. As David points out, Masaryk's ideas about transnationalism or globalization can be criticized, but basically he was a "sound and perceptive thinker."

We move from political and cultural history to linguistics with Andrew M. Drozd's article on the Valachian dialect of Czech. I expect that many friends and relatives here in Texas will have a special interest in this topic, because the great majority of Texans of Czech ancestry trace the origins of their immigrant ancestors to the Valachian and Lachian regions of Moravia. Drozd seeks to add to the linguistic scholarship about Valachian while making this information accessible to the general reader. Because the historical origin of the Valachs is controversial and the status of the Valachian dialect is considered problematic by some linguists, Drozd has chosen a challenging subject, and I believe readers will agree that he has met the challenge. His expansive notes illustrate the depth of his research. Because he has located so many sources of information about "Valachian" and "Valašsko," he has put together a bibliography which includes information from his endnotes as well as additional references, and I will give the Internet link here for anyone who may be interested in seeing this: <http://bama.ua.edu/~adrozd/research/index.html>.

Miloslav Rechcígl's latest contribution to Czech-American history in this journal is a survey of significant roles played by women of Czech extraction in U.S. history, from colonial times to the present. Readers have come to

expect a comprehensiveness in his historical and bibliographical studies, and this remarkable article is no exception. (I should point out that a review of *Czechmate*, his recently-published "personal memoir," also appears in this issue. Anyone interested in Rechcígl's amazing biography or the history of SVU should read this book.)

Next comes Zdeněk Salzmann's essay on the Czech poet Jaroslav Seifert, who won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1984. Seifert was a distinguished, insightful poet who spoke to the people in a direct and honest way, and I have no doubt that many readers will be profoundly touched by the several substantial quotations offered by Salzmann. It is fitting that this essay is followed by Charles S. Kraszewski's translation of Karel Havlíček's satiric poem *Tyrolean Elegies* (1852). In his commentary on the poem, Kraszewski boldly suggests that the *Elegies* may be "the most noteworthy literary production composed in Czech" in the nineteenth century, and he goes on to give a helpful interpretive summary.

Our special emphasis on creative writing in this issue continues with excerpts from the manuscript of a novel-in-progress entitled "Vagabonds in Cleveland," by Ginny Parobek. Readers familiar with Parobek's work will not be surprised to find that the story is set in the Slovak immigrant community of Cleveland. I believe that many who read these interesting passages will be motivated to read the entire novel after it is published.

In addition to the review of Rechcígl's book (and one by *Kosmas* author David as well), there are reviews of works by authors and editors Jozef Banáš, Jan Bažant, Nina Bažantová, Frances Starn, Charles Ota Heller, and Daniela Kapitánová. As usual, I am grateful to Book Review Editor Mary Hrabík Šámal for her work with the reviews, and other reviewers contributing to this issue include Josette Baer, Daniel Miller, Hugh L. Agnew, Peter Hruby, and Tracy A. Burns.

The diligent help of Managing Editor David Chroust and (new) Assistant Editors Laura C. Smith and Deborah Lorraine Elbert is also very much appreciated.

ARTICLES

The Czechoslovak Exile and the Struggle for Human Rights

By Francis D. Raška

The origins of the concept of human rights can be traced back to the adoption by the United Nations of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights in 1948. The Universal Declaration was formulated in the aftermath of the horrors of the Second World War and the Holocaust. Human rights became a major topic in the discourse between the East and West blocs from the early 1970s onward, especially after the signing of the Helsinki Final Act on 1 August 1975 and subsequent international meetings of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).[1] Numerous studies on human rights in Central and Eastern Europe during the Cold War era have been published over the past several decades. The purpose of this article is to discuss the efforts by the Czechoslovak exile in the 1970s and 1980s to point out violations of the Helsinki Accords by the Czechoslovak Communist Government and how this contributed to the restoration of civil society in Czechoslovakia.

One of the major Czechoslovak exile organizations during the Cold War was the Council of Free Czechoslovakia founded in 1949 and based in the United States with branches in Europe and Canada. In a monograph published in 2008, this writer has analyzed the activities of the Council between 1949 and 1961 when the Council split into two rival organizations.[2] In 1974, the Council reunited under the leadership of Professor Mojmír Povolný, who was determined to enhance the Council's effectiveness by cooperating closely with the newer generation of Czechoslovak exiles driven from their homeland by the Soviet invasion of 1968.[3]

Professor Povolný and other exiles were quite aware of the persecution of dissidents in post-1968 Czechoslovakia and became strongly determined to draw attention to the plight of their fellow countrymen. The so-called Helsinki Process and the ratification of the Helsinki Final Act on 1 August 1975 provided an international framework for future Czechoslovak exile activities. It deserves to be noted, however, that respect for human rights was a Council priority long before Helsinki. The new leadership of the Council immediately began debating the strategy they should adopt in light of the Helsinki process. In a memorandum dated 20 February 1975, the Council leaders pointed out violations of the spirit of the proposals presented at the Geneva Conference on European Security and Cooperation, calling for "a guarantee of basic human rights and freedoms."[4]

In a memorandum to American President Gerald Ford shortly before his departure to sign the Helsinki Declaration, they urged him:

> As the lights on human rights and freedoms go off in one country after another throughout the world, we implore you, Mr. President, as the representative of the greatest Western democracy and of our entire civilization,
> (1) to proclaim publicly and solemnly in Helsinki that the cause of human rights and freedoms in Central and Eastern Europe is, as it was thirty years ago,

> of paramount interest to the United States because it is inseparable from a genuine international détente and cooperation;
> (2) to establish a system for the monitoring of the implementation of the provisions of the Geneva declaration;
> (3) to set in motion preparations for a new conference of all the countries which participated in the Conference on European Security and Cooperation that would be concerned exclusively with the issue of specific human rights and freedoms…[5]

At this time, they also requested help from Senator Henry Jackson.[6]

A new strategy was proposed by a European member of the *Council*, Frank Uhlíř, from Munich:

> I would say that Helsinki offers a new opportunity. I am sure that you have weighed the options. What if in addition to or instead of our traditional position, we did the opposite? What if we were to jump onto the détente bandwagon, which is slowing down anyhow? The situation offers several positive openings, which could be of use to us. We could prepare a position paper for the signing of the Helsinki declaration or after it. We ought to point out, without engaging in polemics with the facts, that a new situation is emerging. We should state that while countries and governments must stick with the idea of peaceful coexistence in their relations, in the clash of ideas and cultural interpretations, however, a new competition has begun. The West refers to it as "openings to the East, whereas East European signatories speak of "the continuation of the irreconcilable ideological struggle up until the complete and final victory of socialism." In this case, I feel that the Council, as one of the small players in the West, can offer Western signatories its energy, knowledge, and experiences in the formulation of the West's response to the irreconcilable struggle of the Communists.[7]

Uhlíř urged Povolný that the Third Basket of the Helsinki Protocol should be elevated as high as "the Jewish emigration from the USSR is today."[8] Povolný summarized the position of the Council in a letter to Čeněk Torn:

> We must use the Helsinki Declaration to our advantage. As we agreed in Toronto, we will monitor its implementation in cooperation with Amnesty International. We will do our utmost to convince the Senate to adopt a position on the issue. We will

> write a fundamental statement on the entire text of the Declaration and make it available to all participating governments. The main thing is to take the offensive on this issue now because during the entire proceedings in Geneva, the West was defensive and our offensive position was not taken into consideration.[9]

The official position of the Czechoslovak Government on the Helsinki Accords, however, was best summarized by the deputy chairman of the National Front (the Communist-dominated coalition that ruled Czechoslovakia since the 1948 coup), Tomáš Trávníček, as follows: "The interpretation of Helsinki principles is the sovereign right of any state and any society. Our interpretation proceeds consistently from class positions."[10]

After the codification of the Helsinki Final Act by all signatories (including the Czechoslovak and Soviet Governments) into law, dissidents in Czechoslovakia saw an opportunity to challenge the Communist authorities on the grounds that the Czechoslovak Government was violating its own laws. In September 1976, the Czechoslovak authorities arrested the members of the music band, Plastic People of the Universe, and charged them with forming an illegal organization. Dissidents Václav Havel (a playwright) and Jiří Němec (a Catholic theologian) publicized the trial and this was followed by an open letter from a number of dissident lawyers, that the authorities were directly violating the Helsinki Accords.[11] Western leaders became aware of the matter and began to voice their concerns. Clearly sensitive to Western criticism, the Czechoslovak authorities released a number of political prisoners. This motivated dissidents to organize and on January 1, 1977, Charter 77 was founded by 242 signatories who produced a document citing human rights violations and calling for dialogue with the Communist regime on how human rights could be safeguarded.[12] Among the original signatories were former foreign minister, Jiří Hájek, the renowned philosopher, Professor Jan Patočka (who soon died in connection with harsh police interrogations), and Václav Havel (whose politically-inspired plays received much attention in the West). Charter 77 was unique in that it claimed to be neither a formal organization nor an opposition party and that its signatories came from all walks of life and harbored a variety of political opinions. In the "Founding Declaration", Charter 77 publicly announced its inception as "a free, informal, and open community of people of different convictions, different faiths, and different professions united by the will to strive, individually and collectively, for the respect of civil and human rights in our own country and throughout the world." Despite a harsh crackdown by the Czechoslovak authorities, the founding of Charter 77 was immediately publicized in the West. Charter members established contacts with political representatives and human rights activists in the West and went on to publish numerous documents that appeared in Western newspapers up until the collapse of the totalitarian regime in 1989.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia was quick to respond to the appearance of Charter 77 and closely identified itself with the ideals expressed in the "Founding Charter Document" and the plight of its signatories. For Professor Povolný and other Council members, Charter 77 was seen as a crucial partner inside Czechoslovakia that greatly aided Council efforts to expose human

rights violations in the country. The Council thus devised a public relations strategy based upon Principle VII of the Third Basket of the Helsinki Final Act and this became the cornerstone of Council Activities during the remaining years of Communist rule in Czechoslovakia.

The first main Council activity after the genesis of Charter 77 was the dissemination of the "Founding Document" to major North American newspapers.[13] The Toronto *Globe and Mail* published the full text of the "Document" and credited the chairman of the Council assembly, Rudolf Fraštacký, with providing the "Document." Likewise, the *Free Trade Union News*, the journal of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) in Washington, D.C., published the Charter's "Founding Document" with an introduction written by the Council's general secretary, Jiří Horák.[14]

The Council then issued an international appeal concerning the violation of human rights and basic liberties in Czechoslovakia, which stated that "the family of civilized nations cannot close its eyes in the wake of this new wave of repression without threatening the basis of the international order it strives for, namely a system of peace, security, freedom, and justice." This appeal was sent to numerous North American politicians and leaders of international organizations, many of whom reacted forcefully.[15] The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) requested testimony by Council representatives on the violations of the Helsinki Accords.[16] The success of the appeal emboldened the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to work harder in support of Charter 77. Other Czechoslovak exile groups and ethnic organizations also joined the effort.[17] The Czechoslovak National Council of America, a Czechoslovak ethnic organization based in Chicago (particularly its Washington representative Anna Faltus), translated Charter 77 documents into English and passed them on to the State Department and the U.S. Congress. In Western Europe, the Listy Group (led by former 1968 reformer and later European Parliament Socialist MP, Jiří Pelikán) disseminated first-hand information from Czechoslovakia provided by Western European statesmen, diplomats, and other officials who had recently visited the country.[18] The Paris-based Council of Free Czechoslovakia member, Edmund Řehák, facilitated contact between the Assembly of Captive European Nations and the Council of Europe concerning Czechoslovak matters. Exiled Charter 77 signatory, Ivan Medek (based in Vienna), kept the Council of Free Czechoslovakia as well as European institutions up to date on the latest activities of Charter 77. Ordinary Czechoslovak exiles were informed of events in Czechoslovakia by the excellent journal *Svědectví* (Testament), whose chief editor, Pavel Tigrid, was in a position to obtain reliable current information from Czechoslovakia. Fundraising activities for Charter 77 in the West were undertaken by exiled nuclear physicist, František Janouch, who founded the Charter 77 Foundation in Stockholm.[19] Attention will now be paid to Council activities surrounding future CSCE conferences.

The first CSCE meeting following the signing of the Helsinki Final Act took place in Belgrade between October 4, 1977 and March 8, 1978. In preparation for the Belgrade gathering, the Council assembly assigned the Canadian-based Czechoslovak exile, Viktor Miroslav Fic, with the task of preparing a lengthy document "Violations of Civil and Political Rights in Czechoslovakia and the Helsinki Accord."[20] Fic's work in composing the document was assisted by fellow 1948-era exiles Rudolf Fraštacký, Jiří Horák, Vladimír Kra-

jina, Martin Kvetko, Josef Pejskar, Mojmír Povolný, Jaroslav Rouček, and the 1968-era exile writer and publisher, Josef Škvorecký. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia was in constant contact with the Czechoslovak Desk at the U.S. State Department[21] and the U.S. Congressional Committee for Security and Cooperation in Europe.[22] In addition, human rights violations were reported to both Canadian prime minister, Pierre Elliott Trudeau and the Canadian parliament by pro-Charter 77 activists in Canada.[23] In order to place matters in historical context, it is necessary to note that U.S. President Jimmy Carter's administration at this time did not advocate confrontation with the Soviet Union or its European satellite states over human rights violations and the attitude of other Western governments was similar. Luckily, the U.S. Congress applied pressure on the White House and, thanks to the prominent Democratic politician and former Supreme Court justice, Arthur Goldberg, the issue of human rights and basic liberties in the Soviet bloc was presented in Belgrade despite reservations by Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, and U.S. allies in Western Europe.[24] However, thanks to power politics and lack of support from Tito's Yugoslavia, the final protocol of the Belgrade conference (the text of which required consensus among all signatories from East and West alike) contained no mention of human rights.[25] The Council of Free Czechoslovakia and other Czechoslovak exile organizations were disappointed with the outcome of the Belgrade meeting. The American delegation did not view the results of Belgrade so pessimistically. Matthew Nimetz at the State Department summarized the results of the Belgrade meeting in a long letter to Jiří Horák:

> That the Final Act, particularly its human rights and human contacts provisions, was discussed in such detail was an historic breakthrough. Building on the accomplishments of the June preparatory meeting, a precedent has been set and procedures established which should encourage future efforts to implement the Final Act more concretely and more fully. As Ambassador Goldberg said in his enclosed concluding speech, "Belgrade has tested the validity and flexibility of the CSCE process. It has not been an easy passage, but we have delineated the scope of that process and added to its depth. Most important of all, we have given our commitment to preserving the process and to making its growth our common enterprise."
>
> The CSCE process will not be an easy or quick one. It is unrealistic to expect that systems of controls developed over decades and reflecting Communist theories of the role of party, state and industry will be relaxed in a couple of years. The Final Act and the Belgrade meeting have demonstrated, however, that it is legitimate to discuss human rights and they have put the Soviet Union and other Eastern states on notice that we will not shy away from such frank discussion. Indeed, we view it as our responsibility under the terms of the Final Act.[26]

His letter continued:

> A word is in order about the negotiations which led to the final document at Belgrade. While harboring some reservations about specific provisions of a rather detailed text put forward by neutral and non-aligned participants, we and the Allies supported fully their efforts to negotiate a substantive final document that would have taken note of the review that had taken place, of the successes and failures in implementation, and mentioned the work still to be done in human rights, military, economic and other areas. The Soviets and some of their allies made it quite clear, however, that they would not accept any document that referred to failures of implementation or human rights. We made clear that without such language a detailed document would be incomplete, unbalanced and misleading.

The Council thanked Nimetz and promised to keep the CSCE commission informed of all violations of the Helsinki Final Act in preparation for the next CSCE meeting in Madrid.[27] This signified a continuation of the Helsinki Process and it was assumed that the free atmosphere in post-Franco Spain would not permit the issue of human rights to be ignored as had largely been the case in Belgrade. Escalating Cold War tensions, particularly Western dismay at the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, meant that the West was more likely to fight harder over the issue of human rights. The White House issued a statement on the disappointing results of Belgrade, which concluded: "…We intend to continue pressure on the Soviet Union to fulfill its obligations concerning human rights…" In a letter to President Carter, the Council expressed the view that this statement "is a guarantee of focused attention on the issue of human rights."[28]

The beginning of 1978 saw an initiative of thousands of democratic Czechoslovak exiles who prepared a petition to be presented to the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations on 21 August 1978 and sent to 35 signatory states of the Helsinki Accords. The text of "Petition '78" reads as follows:

> PETITION '78
> The year of 1978 has a historical significance for the nation of Czechoslovakia because it marks three important mile stones in their existence.
> 60 years ago, in 1918, Czechoslovakia became an independent state which was based upon the democratic and humanistic ideas of T.G. Masaryk.
> 30 years ago, in 1948, the democratic parliamentary order in the country was destroyed; this interrupted its peaceful and democratic evolution and led to the entrenchment of Stalinism which sapped the national will, spirit and resources for many years.

> 10 years ago, in 1968, the armed forces of the Soviet bloc invaded the country in order to arrest the process of regeneration of national culture and humanization and democratization of its public life; and this resulted in a massive violation of fundamental civil and political rights.
> REMEMBERING THESE THREE ANNIVERSARIES THE PETITIONERS
> (1) DEMAND the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and restoration of independence, sovereignty and of the right of the people to self-determination according to Articles I, II, III, IV and VII of the Helsinki Accord of 1975.
> (2) SUPPORT Charter 77 in demanding from the Government of Czechoslovakia to implement the civil and political rights as defined in the Helsinki Accord as well as in Law 120/75 adopted by the Federal Parliament on November 11, 1975.
> (3) CALL upon the Government of Czechoslovakia to desist from persecuting the Chartists and other citizens who merely demand that the government observes the Czechoslovak laws and international conventions on civil and political rights which it has signed.
> (4) CALL upon the Government of Czechoslovakia to remove or reform all laws which either violate or limit the enjoyment of civil and political rights as defined in the Helsinki Accord.
> (5) CALL upon the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations to hold the Government of Czechoslovakia accountable for periodical reports on the measure undertaken to implement the International convention on Civil and Political Rights in the country.
> (6) CALL upon all signatory states of the Helsinki Accord to hold the Government of Czechoslovakia accountable for the full implementation of the Accord and of all international agreements which the Accord invokes.
> New York, January 1, 1978

Jiří Horák urged the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to endorse "Petition '78" and proposed its further distribution.[30]

The Czechoslovak exile's fight for human rights was helped by the increasing sympathy of the U.S. Congress (in particular Erika Schlager) as well as that of U.S. Helsinki Watch Committee activist, Jeri Laber, and writer, Arthur Miller, who had taken up the cause of exiled Czechoslovak writer, Pavel Kohout. The restive labor movement in Poland (which ultimately led to the foundation of Solidarity), the election of the Polish Pope, John Paul II, and the increased persecution of dissidents in the Soviet Union also aided the struggle

for human rights in Communist Europe, including Czechoslovakia.[31] The founding in Czechoslovakia of the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted (VONS) after the Belgrade conference ended in 1978 signified that the fight for human rights continued.

On 6 November 1978, Charter 77 together with VONS sent an open letter to United Nations Secretary General, Kurt Waldheim, and to heads of state of signatories of the Helsinki Final Act.[32] The Council of Free Czechoslovakia endorsed this letter and wrote President Carter and multiple other heads of state asking that "Czechoslovakia should fulfill its international and constitutional obligations in the area of human rights and basic freedoms of its citizens…"[33]

In Europe, the cause of Charter 77 and VONS was taken up by the periodical "Listy" published in Rome by former Communist Party functionary and director of Czechoslovak state television, Jiří Pelikán, who also founded the exile organization, Listy Group. The Charter declaration was published in its entirety in the first 1977 issue of "Listy." Thereafter, "Listy" published practically all Charter 77 and VONS documents, usually in their complete form.[34] Upon closer analysis, Charter 77 activities mirrored the ideas of the 1968 Prague Spring. Pelikán believed that Charter 77 represented the most significant change in Czechoslovakia since the beginning of "normalization" (as the repressive post-1968 political arrangement in Czechoslovakia was officially referred to) and thus permitted "Listy" to be used as a forum to disseminate Chartist documents to Czechoslovak émigrés in the West.[35]

It should be mentioned that, on the 30th anniversary of the founding of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia in 1979, the Council unequivocally expressed its support for the activities of Charter 77 and VONS.[36] On 18 April 1979, the Council was invited to an informal meeting concerning the future of U.S. relations with Czechoslovakia by State Department official, Robert L. Barry. Human rights were discussed at this and similar meetings and it became obvious that the violation of human rights in the Soviet bloc would be on the agenda in Madrid.[37] Charter 77 was supported at a seminar organized by the group Opus bonum in Franken, Germany. This seminar was attended by about a hundred representatives of various factions of the Czechoslovak exile, including many exiled signatories of Charter 77.[38]

In Czechoslovakia, ten representatives of Charter 77 were arrested in June 1979 and accused of anti-state activities.[39] Subsequently, on 23 October, six members of Charter 77 and VONS were convicted on charges of "subversion of the Republic" and sentenced to prison terms.[40] A protest demonstration was held in New York on 24 October, sponsored by the international human rights organization, Helsinki Watch, and the PEN-American Center. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia also issued a protest declaration.[41]

In 1979, Jiří Pelikán was elected to the European Parliament. The leadership of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia sent a congratulatory letter to all elected European deputies, including Pelikán, along with a request to monitor human rights in Czechoslovakia and to form a committee to monitor compliance with the Helsinki Accords.[42] Pelikán thanked Povolný, Zich, and Horák of the Council for their congratulations and assured them of his interest in productive collaboration with the Council.[43] Ten days later, Pelikán explained that his proposal to form a committee for the monitoring of Helsinki compliance

failed to gain support of the European Parliament, but he pointed to the resolution adopted by the European Parliament condemning the prosecution of Charter 77 members.[44] While some Council members saw the need to work in harmony with Pelikán on the grounds that "he can advance our agenda in the European Parliament",[45] others vehemently protested. The strongest opposition came from Felix Uhl. Uhl reminded his Council colleagues of Pelikán's checkered past[46] and he even prepared a draft of a protest letter from the Council addressed to the European Parliament president, Simone Veil.[47] This draft was rejected by the Council and never sent. On the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, President Carter specifically mentioned the violation of human rights and persecution of Charter 77 members in Czechoslovakia. A number of Congressmen did the same. In addition, the Council issued an appeal from Toronto in September 1979 to world leaders and international organizations protesting the persecution of Czechoslovak dissidents.[48]

The CSCE conference in Madrid lasted from 11 November 1980 until 9 September 1983. Czechoslovak exile organizations started preparing materials for the conference already in 1979. On 24 October 1979, representatives of "East European ethnic groups in the USA" met with the advisor to the Secretary of State, Matthew Nimetz to discuss preparations for the 1980 Madrid conference. Czechoslovaks were represented by the Czechoslovak National Council of America, namely by Anna Faltusová. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia, however, was not invited.[49] This fact prompted Council member, Jaroslav Zich, to analyze the situation and to point out a number of tactical errors made by the Council. He summarized these in a letter to his fellow Council members, namely Povolný, Kvetko, and Horák. Zich wrote:

> I believe it is imperative to start preparations for Madrid somewhat more specifically. So far, at our meetings we have had only general discussions. Over the year, we have formed a special committee, but, overall, we have accomplished nothing…[50]

In a New Year's message to Czechoslovakia, the Council reiterated its intention to prepare for the Madrid meeting "to determine whether international law can assure human dignity and respect for human rights even when laws and regulations of a specific country are in conflict with this international agreement."[51]

Already in January 1980, the Czechoslovak National Council of America issued a "Situation Report on the Compliance in Czechoslovakia with the Helsinki Accords."[52] This document systematically identified violations of individual principles of the agreement, most notably of Principle 7: Respect for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The "Report" focused on the recent trial of six Charter 77 signatories and members of the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted (VONS) as well as on breaches of Czechoslovak "justice" abroad by stripping human rights activists of their Czechoslovak citizenship. An even stronger document, "Czechoslovakia since Belgrade," was published in April.[53]

A memorandum to the signatories of the Helsinki Final Act was also sent by the exile group, Czechoslovak Advisory Committee in Western Eu-

rope, represented by Dr. Rudolf Václavík.[54] This document contained two parts: 1) Persecution of Chartists 77 and their Sympathizers; and 2) Withdrawal (sic.) Czechoslovak citizenship. Appended to this document were multiple verdicts or refusals by Czechoslovak courts and officials.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia appealed on 29 September to all democratic Czechoslovak exile organizations around the world to prepare a joint appeal to the Madrid Conference, which would be made public at the conference of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in Washington on 17 October. The proposed appeal was prepared by Mojmír Povolný. Povolný concluded:

> We bring this appeal as representatives of the Czechoslovak democratic tradition. We are aware that we speak for all our brothers and sisters in Czechoslovakia, that fulfillment of the obligations and promises of the Final Act by all signatories is of vital significance for the well-being of every citizen, that the question of human rights and liberties is an international question and that the fate of Europe and our civilization rests on compliance with it and its defense. [55]

The appeal was signed by twenty one Czechoslovak exile organizations.
On 9 October 1980, the Council addressed all states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe[56] and appended a 21-page document compiled by Charter 77 entitled "Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Czechoslovakia."[57] Particular attention was also devoted to a letter from Charter 77 to Czechoslovak President Gustáv Husák. In this letter, Marie Hromádková and Miloš Rejchrt asked that "the state of which we are citizens contribute in a positive way to negotiations concerning the problems of human rights and fundamental freedoms and of the so-called Basket Three in general…"[58]

The Czechoslovak exile representation at the Madrid Conference included Mrs. Betka Papánek (member of the Czechoslovak National Council of America), who was an official member of the American delegation. Mrs. Papánek was accompanied by her husband, the former Czechoslovak ambassador to the United Nations, Ján Papánek. Mojmír Povolný was granted observer status at the conference. Povolný reported to the Council on his experience in Madrid.[59] In the report, Povolný emphasized the contribution of Pavel Tigrid, the Czechoslovak National Council of America, and the Czechoslovak National Association of Canada.

Future events in Madrid would be influenced by the fact that President Carter lost his bid for reelection in November 1980 and his successor, Ronald Reagan, was determined to pursue a tougher line against the Soviet Union and its satellite states. Thanks in part to an appeal by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, the final protocol of the Madrid conference did mention human rights violations and called for a special conference of CSCE human rights experts to be held in 1985 in Ottawa. United States Secretary of State George Shultz's speech at the closing of the Madrid conference praised as heroes Polish workers, Czech intellectuals, East German clergy, and Soviet dissidents from all walks of life who risked their lives and livelihoods for freedom.

It can be said that Madrid represented clear progress in the West's will to fight for human rights and Czechoslovak dissidents as well as the Czechoslovak exile in the West were encouraged by the results.[60]

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia soon began its preparations for the next CSCE conference in Vienna. On the occasion of the Ottawa CSCE meeting of human rights experts in 1985, the Council supported the intervention of the Czechoslovak National Association of Canada, which documented once again human rights violations in Czechoslovakia. On the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Accords, the Council issued an appeal to the CSCE to insist on the upholding of human rights in Czechoslovakia.[61] On 10 September 1985, the Council sent a memorandum to President Reagan prior to his meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, which stated:

> …The Communist authorities in Czechoslovakia harshly repress the Czechoslovak people's civil and political rights, persecute members of Charter 77 and of the Committee for the Defense of the Unjustly Prosecuted and, in general, maintain a repressive internal system seriously violating every citizen's freedom of conscience, religion, expression, and association.[62]

The letter urged Reagan to demand that Gorbachev begin to work with the United States in order to achieve the end of these violations.

The Council was not alone in advancing the issue of human rights. The first 1985 issue of the periodical "Listy" contained sixteen pages of Charter 77 documents entitled "Eight Years of Charter 77."[63] In the United Kingdom, the issue of Czechoslovak human rights violations was addressed by at least two émigré organizations. The first was Palach Press, founded in 1974 by Jan Kavan to provide "prompt and accurate information on developments in Czechoslovakia", especially obtained from a variety of Czechoslovak non-governmental sources, to Western journalists, human rights organizations, etc.[64] From January 1978 Palach Press published "Information on Charter 77." The full texts of all Charter 77 documents were disseminated as were VONS statements. An official British note to the Prime Minister's office on Palach Press stated:

> Among its directors are Mr. Jiří Pelikán, a former Director-General of Czechoslovak Television and a leading émigré living in Rome, and Mr. Jan Kavan, a leader of the Czech student movements in 1966. The latter is apparently the real driving force behind this organization.[65]

Another organization that brought attention to human rights violations was the Free Central European News Agency headed by Josef Josten. It was Josten who brought the issue of the VONS to the attention of the British Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.[66] In an official British note, Josten was characterized as "a Czech Jewish refugee and an able organizer and

businessman." The Information Research Department, however, concluded:

> Although his heart is unquestionably in the right place, we keep him at arm's length because his emotionalism tends to be counter-productive here and he does not always check his material with sufficient care and discrimination.[67]

Another significant act undertaken by the Council was the initiation of negotiations with the London-based Polish Exile Government, which resulted in a joint memorandum of January 19, 1986 pledging that both organizations would work together to fight Communism. Both the Council and the Polish Exile Government also held a press conference on November 3, 1986 in Vienna reiterating their determination to collaborate with one another.

The CSCE meeting in Vienna took place between November 4, 1986 and January 19, 1989. Czechoslovak exile organizations made careful preparations for the Vienna conference. On 21 May 1986, the designated leader of the U.S. delegation invited Mojmír Povolný to a CSCE forum organized jointly by the State Department and the Appeal of Conscience Foundation at St. James Church in New York on 5 June 1986.[68] The Czechoslovak National Council of America prepared a memorandum dated 10 June 1986.[69] That very month, another document appeared entitled "Situation in Czechoslovakia since the Madrid Review Meeting concerning Compliance with the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid Concluding Document", which was prepared by the Committee for the Support of Human Rights in Czechoslovakia.[70] Human rights were also addressed in several articles in the New York Times. The opinion article by Warren Zimmerman, "Making Moscow pay the Price for Human Rights Abuses", was most decisive, but contained no specific information on Czechoslovakia.[71]

The Czechoslovak National Council of America suggested that the Council of Free Czechoslovakia organize a public demonstration in Vienna on the occasion of the opening of the CSCE conference on 4 November. Mojmír Povolný appealed to dozens of democratic exile organizations around the world to participate.[72] The gathering took place on the evening of 3 November and was broadcast by Austrian television. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia also organized a press conference at the Presse Club Concordia on 3 November. Besides the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, the Polish Government-in-Exile, the Ukrainian Government-in-Exile, and Free Romanians were represented. There were Hungarian and Byelorussian representatives as well.[73] The conference was disrupted, however, by Slovak separatists and Sudeten German representatives.

The Council of Free Czechoslovakia presented the Conference with a "Joint Memorandum of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and the Polish Government-in-Exile."[74] The "Joint Memorandum" urged the participants to consider eight points designed to guarantee Czechoslovak and Polish citizens their human rights and civic freedoms. They also asked for the establishment "within the framework of the CSCE of an institution to which dissident groups could address their grievances and through which they could seek redress."

In addition, the Czechoslovak National Council of America prepared a conference within the Sakharov Institute entitled "An Invisible Oppression: Methods of Social Control in a Mature Totalitarian System." The speakers

included Francis Schwarzenberg, Vlastislav Chalupa, Ivan Gaďourek, Mojmír Povolný, Jiří Němec, and Dagmar Vaněček.[75]

The Council together with the Czechoslovak National Council of America and another sixteen exile organizations presented the CSCE meeting with a joint petition calling for the withdrawal of the Soviet army from Czechoslovakia and the recognition of Charter 77 as a non-government monitoring organization overseeing the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the Helsinki Final Act.[76]

The Executive Committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia met in December 1986 to evaluate the results of the Vienna conference and issued a memorandum demanding that all democratic signatories of the Helsinki Final Act ensure that commitments regarding human rights and basic liberties be adhered to in Czechoslovakia.[77]

On 7 January 1987, the Council together with the Czechoslovak National Council of America sent a special memorandum to American Ambassador Warren Zimmerman.[78] The memorandum addressed specific violations of the Helsinki Final Act in Czechoslovakia, but also pointed out:

> We have also observed that on the part of the West European, American, and Canadian delegations to the Vienna follow-up meeting there has been a tendency to focus their eyes on Soviet violations, while its violations and disregard by the Central and East European Communist states fail to receive the same attention…

In January 1987, the U.S. Commission on CSCE nominated Charter 77 for the Nobel Peace Prize. The nomination letter was signed by Steny Hoyer (chairman) and the fourteen senators and congressmen who were members of the commission. [79]

In March 1987, the Council protested against the persecution of the Jazz Section, Jan Dus, and Petr Pospíchal by the Czechoslovak justice system.[80] Also in 1987, the Council of Free Czechoslovakia sent several letters to President Reagan ahead of Reagan's upcoming meeting with Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev.[81] The last letter sent after the summit meeting expressed the Council's disappointment with the meeting:

> …We are, however, especially disappointed that on no occasion in your meetings with General Secretary Gorbachev the question of Soviet domination of Central and Eastern Europe was raised. This is even more disappointing since the centerpiece of this summit meeting was the removal of intermediate and short-range missiles from Europe, that is, in political terms, the question of Europe, European security, and European order…

In addition, the Czechoslovak National Council of America sponsored a "Joint Statement of Czechoslovak Organizations in the Free World":

> …It is in the West's power to support the democratization efforts of the disenfranchised population of the communist states through information, culture exchange, and diplomatic action; withhold economic help and technical assistance to such an extent as would pressure communist governments to expand their citizens' rights and fundamental freedoms; pursue vigorously the development of a strong defense capability, especially the S.D.I. [Strategic Defense Initiative], effectively assist democratic liberation movements to block the Soviet Union from consolidating its conquests in the contested areas." The statement offers specific recommendations "based on past, recent, and present experiences of our members with the communist regime in Czechoslovakia…
>
> The statement is signed by the following organizations: Alliance of Czechoslovak Democratic Associations in Australia and New Zealand; American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees; Association of Czechoslovak Legionnaires; Council of Free Czechoslovakia; Czechoslovak Association of Canada; Czechoslovak National Council of America; K-231 Club of Former Czechoslovak Political Prisoners; National Alliance of Czech Catholics U.S.A.; National Council of Women of Free Czechoslovakia; Naarden Movement, United Kingdom; and Permanent Conference of Slovak Democratic Exiles.[82]

In March 1988, the Council of Free Czechoslovakia pointed out the renewed severity and brutality of the measures with which the Communist authorities in Czechoslovakia responded to Czechoslovak citizens' calls for greater religious freedom.[83]

On the 20th anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia (21 August 1988), President Reagan issued the following statement:

> …Brave men and women within the country, such as the signatories of Charter 77, continue to struggle for freedom and long-overdue reforms which remain the fervent hopes of Czechs and Slovaks. We take the occasion of this anniversary to salute those people and to express firm agreement with their conviction that, in the end, truth will prevail…[84]

The Czechoslovak government proposed that the economic follow-up meeting of CSCE take place in Czechoslovakia. The head of the American delegation, Zimmerman, rejected this proposal because of the suppression by the Czechoslovak authorities of the Prague symposium "Czechoslovakia 88."[85] The Council of Free Czechoslovakia also endorsed the American conditions for a possible CSCE meeting in Moscow in 1991.[86] In Vienna, the attitude of the U.S.

delegation was even more sympathetic than had been the case in Madrid.

On the twentieth anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Council of Free Czechoslovakia published a proclamation demanding the removal of Soviet armed forces from Czechoslovakia and an end to all discrimination against dissidents. At the end of 1988, the Council issued a proclamation to Czechoslovak citizens urging them to demand the renewal of democracy in Czechoslovakia.[87]

The Vienna conference ended on 19 January 1989. Three days prior to the end of the meeting, the *New York Times* wrote: "35 Nations issue East-West Pact to protect Broad Human Rights."[88]

The situation in Czechoslovakia, however, despite some advances of perestroika in the Soviet Union, was not encouraging. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia sent a letter to president-elect George H.W. Bush asking for assistance with fourteen points "which, we are convinced, are in harmony with the interests of the United States."[89]

For human rights activists in Czechoslovakia, the year 1989 did not begin well. In January, a demonstration in commemoration of the twentieth anniversary of Jan Palach's self-immolation was brutally suppressed by the police. On 21 February, Václav Havel was sentenced to nine months in prison for "antistate activities." A day later, seven human rights activists were also convicted of participating in the January ceremony in remembrance of Palach.[90] In the meantime, the United States Helsinki Commission nominated Václav Havel for the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize.[91]

In early April 1989, Radio Free Europe aired the declaration of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia on recent developments in Czechoslovakia. The declaration condemned the attitude of the Czechoslovak Communist Party towards calls to investigate police brutality connected with the civic demonstrations commemorating the anniversary of Jan Palach's death and asked for the release of all those imprisoned after this event. [92]

Eastern Europe was rapidly changing in 1989. The critical step took place in Prague when East German and Czechoslovak officials decided to permit East German refugees who had taken refuge in the West German Embassy in Prague to leave for West Germany. On 9 November, the Berlin Wall came down. The conservative Czechoslovak Communist government, however, held its ground. On 17 November, the police attacked a government-sanctioned demonstration by university students commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the murder of medical student, Jan Opletal, by the Nazis. This resulted in mass demonstrations calling for the resignation of the Communist authorities. The Council of Free Czechoslovakia held a meeting in New York on 17 November and a cable was sent to Prime Minister Ladislav Adamec. The text reads as follows:

> The Council of Free Czechoslovakia protests against the brutal attempt to suppress the manifestation for freedom and democracy in Prague on 17 November…We demand that those responsible for this act be immediately suspended and members of the security forces who committed brutal acts be punished.[93]

The Communist regime in Czechoslovakia collapsed on 24 November when the general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, Milouš Jakeš, resigned in a live television address to the nation.

On 28 November, the Council of Free Czechoslovakia sent a letter to the leader of Civic Forum, Václav Havel. The letter concluded:

> …We are happy that our position, in principle, agrees with your demands and thus brings evidence of unity of our thoughts…Your success has to be a great encouragement and source of strength for future activities…You can count on our full support and willingness to help wherever we can…[94]

The Council continued to follow the unfolding events in Prague and deplored the composition of the "new government" on 3 December.[95] Later, it endorsed the caretaker government led by Marian Čalfa and congratulated Václav Havel on his election to the presidency.[96] Four decades of Communist totalitarian rule had come to an end and the dream of the Czechoslovak exile for a free country had materialized.

Though it cannot be claimed that the democratic Czechoslovak exile played the main role in the collapse of the Communist government in Czechoslovakia, the exile helped to keep alive dissident groups like Charter 77. By bringing all repressive actions of the Czechoslovak Communists to the attention of the Western public and politicians, Czechoslovak exile organizations stimulated the interest of Western governments in improving civil liberties behind the Iron Curtain.

NOTES

1. Daniel C. Thomas, *Helsinský efekt: Mezinárodní zásady, lidská práva a zánik komunismu* (Prague, 2007).

2. Francis D. Raška, *Fighting Communism from Afar: The Council of Free Czechoslovakia* (Boulder, Colo., 2008).

3. Centrum pro československá exilová studia (CČSES), Univerzita Palackého, Olomouc, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, M. Povolný to E. Řehák, 25 February 1975.

4. Ibid., Declaration by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, 20 February 1975.

5. Ibid., M. Povolný and R. Fraštacký to President G. Ford, 22 July 1975.

6. Ibid., M. Povolný to Senator H.M. Jackson, 26 July 1975

7. Ibid., F. Uhlíř to M. Povolný, 17 July 1975.

8. Ibid., F. Uhlíř to M. Povolný, 19 July 1975.

9. Ibid., M. Povolný to Č. Torn, 31 July 1975.

10. Ibid., *Czechoslovak Newsletter* no. 2 (April 1976).

11. Barbara J. Falk, *The Dilemmas of Dissidence in East-Central Europe* (Budapest, 2003), 84-87.

12. H. Gordon Skilling, *Charter 77 and Human Rights in Czechoslovakia* (London, 1981).

13. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, Charter 77 Declaration (English translation).

14. Ibid., *Czechoslovak Newsletter* III/1 (20 January 1977) and III/2 (31 January 1977).

15. Ibid., *A Memorandum on the Non-Compliance by the Government of Czechoslovakia with the Provisions of the Final Act of Helsinki*, 14 May 1977.

16. Ibid., D.B. Farrell of the CSCE and Congress of the United States to V. Ryšavý, 29 April 1977.

17. Ibid., *Zprávy československého svazu křesťanských pracujících Švýcarsko*, January/February 1977.

18. Franceso Caccamo, *Jiří Pelikán a jeho cesta socialismem 20. století* (Brno, 2008), 52-65.

19. *Václav Havel-František Janouch Korespondence 1978-2001* (Prague, 2007), 12-15.

20. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, *Violations of Civil and Political Rights in Czechoslovakia and the Helsinki Accord: Report presented to the 2nd session of the CSCE, Belgrade, Yugoslavia, June 1977.*

21. Ibid., M. Povolný to M. Nimetz, 1 September 1977.

22. Ibid., C. Cosman to J. Horák, 10 November 1977.

23. Ibid., C.L. Cacca to L. Urban and J.G. Corn, 19 December 1977; L Urban and J.G. Corn to P.E. Trudeau, 17 March 1977.

24. Ibid., M. Nimetz to J. Horák, 8 November 1977.

25. Mojmír Povolný, *Zápas o lidská práva: Rada svobodného Československa a helsinský proces* (Brno, 2007), 167.

26. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, M. Nimetz to J. Horák, 3 April 1978.

27. Ibid., J. Horák and M. Povolný to M. Nimetz, 5 May 1978.

28. Ibid., Council of Free Czechoslovakia to President Carter, 8 March 1978.

29. Ibid., *Petition '78*, 1 January 1978.

30. Ibid., J. Horák to the leadership of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, 30 January 1978.

31. Povolný, *Zápas*, 168-173.

32. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, Open letter from Charter 77 and VONS to Kurt Waldheim and the heads of state who signed the Helsinki Declaration, 6 November 1978.

33. Ibid., *Solidarita s Chartou 77*, Council of Free Czechoslovakia Press Release IV/24, 4 December 1978.

34. Dušan Havlíček, *Listy v exilu* (Olomouc, 2008), 41.

35. Caccamo, *Jiří*, 56.

36. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, *Projev předsedy výkonného výboru RSČ na schůzi zastupitelstva v New Yorku*, 24 February 1979; *Prohlášení zastupitelstva RSČ*, 25 February 1979.

37. Povolný, *Zápas*, 176-186.

38. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, *Seminář o Chartě 77 ve Frankenu 29.3-1.4.1979*; Council of Free Czechoslovakia Press release V/12, 6 June 1979.

39. Ibid., *Nová persekuce v Československu*, 6 June 1979.

40. Ibid., *Czechoslovak Newsletter* 4, no. 9-10, p. 8.

41. Ibid., *Declaration by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia*, 24 October 1979.

42. Ibid., Council of Free Czechoslovakia Press Release, V/15, *Dopis poslancům evropského parlamentu*, 17 July 1979.

43. Ibid., J. Pelikán to M. Povolný, J. Zich, and J. Horák, 7 July 1979.

44. Ibid., J. Pelikán to M. Povolný, 17 July 1979.

45. Ibid., E. Řehák to M. Povolný, 11 September 1979.

46. Ibid., F. Uhl to M. Povolný and R. Fraštacký, 5 September 1979.

47. Ibid., Draft of an unsent letter from the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to Simone Veil, 30 September 1979.

48. Povolný, *Zápas*, 190-192.

49. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, Minutes of Czechoslovak National Council of America meeting, 6 November 1979.

50. Ibid., J. Zich to M. Povolný, M. Kvetko, and J. Horák, 15 December 1979.

51. Ibid., Council of Free Czechoslovakia press release V/24, *Novoroční pozdrav domovu*, 11 December 1979.

52. Ibid., *Situation Report on the Compliance in Czechoslovakia with the Helsinki Accords*, Czechoslovak National Council of America, January 1980.

53. Ibid., *Czechoslovakia since Belgrade*, Czechoslovak National Council of America, 2 April 1980.

54. Ibid., Memorandum of the Czechoslovak Advisory Committee in Western Europe, 21 March 1980.

55. Ibid., Letter from the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to 20 democratic Czechoslovak exile organizations throughout the world, 29 September 1980.

56. Ibid., Memorandum of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia, 9 October 1980.

57. Ibid., *Violations of the Helsinki Accords in Czechoslovakia*, Charter 77 document.

58. Ibid., Letter from Charter 77 to President G. Husák, 17 September 1980.

59. Ibid., *Zpráva předsedy výkonného výboru Mojmíra Povolného o účasti na konferenci o bezpečnosti a spolupráci v Evropě v Madridu*, 23 March 1981.

60. Povolný, *Zápas*, 221-222.

61. Ibid., 225-229.

62. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, Letter from the Council of Free Czechoslovakia to President R. Reagan, 10 September 1985.

63. Ibid., *Listy* 15, Attachment to no. 1 (1985).

64. London School of Economics (LSE) Archives and Rare Books, European Nuclear Disarmament (END) Collection, *Palach Press Infoch Summary and Subscription Order Form*.

65. National Archives (London), Public Record Office (PRO), File FCO28/3298, Background note to letter from Tom McNally (political advisor to the Prime Minister) to Karen Ingall of Palach Press, 8 August 1978.

66. Ibid., FCO28/3717, J. Josten to P. Blaker, 1 November 1979.

67. Ibid., FCO28/3717, Confidential report on Mr. Josef Josten prepared by Merwyn Jones, IRD, 4 March 1975.

68. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, Invitation to M. Povolný from W. Zimmerman, 21 May 1986.

69. Ibid., Memorandum on the Vienna meeting of the CSCE by the Czechoslovak National Council of America, 10 June 1986.

70. Ibid., Committee for the Support of Human Rights in Czechoslovakia, *Situation in Czechoslovakia since the Madrid Review Meeting Concerning Compliance with the Helsinki Final Act and the Madrid Concluding Document*, 30 June 1986.

71. Ibid., W. Zimmerman, "Making Moscow Pay the Price for Human Rights Abuses," New York Times, 1 August 1986.

72. Ibid., Letter and questionnaire to Czechoslovak exile organizations, 10 September 1986.

73. Ibid., Invitation to the international press conference at the Presse Club Concordia, 3 November 1986.

74. Ibid., Joint Memorandum of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and the Polish Government-in-Exile for the Review Meeting of the CSCE, Vienna, 3 November 1986.

75. Ibid., Invitation to the scientific symposium *Invisible Oppression, Methods of Social Control in a Mature Totalitarian System*, 6 November 1986; Memorandum prepared by Czechoslovak National Council of America on *Invisible Oppression in Czechoslovakia*, 6 October 1986.

76. Povolný, *Zápas*, 258.
77. Ibid., 265-269.
78. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, *A Memorandum on the Early Phase of the Vienna Follow-Up Conference of CSCE*, 27 December 1986.
79. Ibid., CSCE News Release, *Helsinki Commission Nominates Charter 77 for Nobel Peace Prize*, 30 January 1987.
80. Ibid., *The Real Violations of Human Rights in Czechoslovakia: The Jazz Section, the Reverend Jan Dus, and Petr Pospíchal*, 15 March 1987.
81. Ibid., M. Povolný and R. Fraštacký to President R. Reagan, 1 September 1987, 11 November 1987, and 14 December 1987.
82. Ibid., *Czechoslovak Newsletter* no. 12 (134) (November 1987).
83. Ibid., Letter from Council of Free Czechoslovakia to President R. Reagan, 20 March 1988.
84. Ibid., The White House, *Statement by the President*, 20 August 1988.
85. Ibid., M. Povolný to R.H. Frowick, 28 December 1988.
86. Ibid., M. Povolný to W. Zimmerman, 1 December 1988.
87. Povolný, *Zápas*, 275-283.
88. "35 Nations Issue East-West Pact to Protect Broad Human Rights," New York Times, 16 January 1989.
89. CČSES, "Letter to President-elect George Bush," *Czechoslovak Newsletter* 14, no. 1 (148) (4 January 1989).
90. Ibid., *Czechoslovak Newsletter* 14, no. 2/3 (149/150) (February/ March 1989).
91. "Helsinki Commission Chairman Nominates Czechoslovak Human Rights Activist for Nobel Peace Prize," *Congressional Record* 135, no. 12 (7 February 1989).
92. Povolný, *Zápas*, 287-289.
93. Ibid., 294-295.
94. CČSES, Rada svobodného Československa Collection, Council of Free Czechoslovakia to Václav Havel, 28 November 1989.
95. Povolný, *Zápas*, 296.
96. Ibid., 296-298.

An Inveterate Enemy within the Heart of the State? History, Germanic Studies and Slavic Studies at the German University in Prague in the Years 1918-1945

By Ota Konrád

On 18 October 1945, Czechoslovak President Edvard Beneš signed a decree abolishing the German University in Prague. This act, which ended the history of a significant scholarly and politico-cultural institution of the German minority in Bohemia and Moravia, was justified by the president due to the hostile stance adopted by the university towards the Czech nation. An explanatory note attached to the presidential declaration states the following:

> Even though the German University in Prague had served as the main vanguard and disseminator of pan-German ideas rather than as a real university, after the changes of 1918, the Czechoslovak state wished to forget old grievances and therefore allowed the German University to continue functioning. However, the assumption underlying this democratic favor was that the German University would appreciate this benevolent gesture and find its own way to achieve productive coexistence of Czech and German scholarship in Prague. The actual course of events (similar to that of our Hussite forefathers) was such that the Germans abused the privileged position of their university to wage first a latent, and later an open battle against everything Czech and Slavic. German professors turned students against the Republic and disseminated the most reactionary fascist opinions from Prague throughout the world. In the summer of 1938, the German University openly served as a bastion of German betrayal. Czech universities were subsequently forcibly closed, their property pillaged, and Czech students were murdered or sent off to concentration camps. Not a single German professor protested against this unprecedented violation of not only academic, but also human rights. The crimes of the German University in Prague against the Czech nation will never be forgotten. Therefore, the liberated Republic, a national state of Czechs and Slovaks, must forever rid itself of this inveterate enemy in the heart of the state in order to guarantee a prosperous future.[1]

This quote understandably reflects the tense atmosphere of the immediate postwar period. At the same time, however, it claims that it would be a mistake to perceive the German University in Prague merely as a scholarly and educational institution. On the contrary, the history of the German University is significant from the perspective of the German minority in Bohemia and

Moravia and that of Czech-German relations in general.

Scientific disciplines of course mirrored high politics and its changes. History, Germanic studies, including German ethnography, and Slavic studies are discussed in this article because, as disciplines, these fields were among the major ones at the German University in Prague both in terms of faculty and student numbers. These fields also deserve attention because it is important to comprehend what perspectives on history as well as German and Czech literature and culture German historians, Germanists, and Slavists presented to their numerous students in lecture halls and to the wider public in their books during the period of the First Czechoslovak Republic and, more importantly, during the German occupation of Bohemia and Moravia. The social, cultural, and political roles played by the interpretation of history and culture, especially in the nationally mixed and politically tense environment of the Czech Lands, directly lends itself to the study of these significant humanities disciplines from the perspective of the integration of high politics into the topics and methodology of scholarly research.

This article examines the development of three scientific disciplines in the space between science and politics from the perspective of two determining factors. First, we shall examine the connections between research and the space for dealings and experiences utilized by historians, Germanists, and Slavists to formulate their political and scholarly views. Subsequently, we shall examine the development from the point of view of contemporary methodological trends and thematic challenges. The combination of both perspectives allows us to comprehend scholarship in the three selected humanities disciplines as a type of cultural, social, and political activity.

The article is divided into two parts. The first part, dealing with the period between 1918 and 1938, discusses the development of the German University in Prague during the so-called First Czechoslovak Republic and its position towards the new country in the broader context of the issues addressed. Subsequently, the article analyzes the development of historiography, Germanic studies, and Slavic studies. The second part addresses the period between 1938 and 1945 with attention paid to the political context of the development of the three disciplines. Then, the issue of how these traditional scholarly disciplines were adapted to the ideological challenges and needs of the National Socialist regime in the period between September 1938 until March 1939, when the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia was established.

The fact that some German professors of the German University in Prague used their knowledge to aid the German occupiers provokes the question of continuities and discontinuities of interwar Sudeten German scholarship and the subsequent period between 1938 and 1945.

German higher education with the German University at its head formed the backbone of German scholarship in Czechoslovakia.[2] The position of this key institution towards the Czechoslovak Republic, proclaimed on 28 October 1918 among the ruins of the Habsburg Monarchy, was controversial. Similarly to other German political and cultural elites in the Czech Lands, the professors and associate professors of the German University in Prague viewed the defeat of the Central powers with unconcealed fear. They saw their future in attaching the university to a German-Austrian state (*Deutschösterreich*) which would unite all German-speaking regions of former Cisleithania.[3]

These ideas concerning the future of the university proved completely

illusory given the international and internal political realities, as did the wishes of a sizable number of German academics to relocate from the center of the developing national state of Czechs and Slovaks to closed German-inhabited areas. Czechoslovak political representatives rejected such ideas not only for financial reasons, but also because they feared that moving the university would strengthen Sudeten German separatist tendencies.

The relationship between the German University in Prague and the new state was further burdened from the outset by the so-called "Lex Mareš." The law of 19 February 1920 concerning the relationship between both Prague universities proclaimed the Czech University as the only legal successor to the old Prague University and its name reverted from Charles-Ferdinand University to Charles University. The tradition of the German University, now called the German University in Prague, was to be traced no further back than 1882, the year when the university was divided into respective Czech and German parts. The request made by Charles University rector, Karel Domin (1882-1953) that the insignia of the old Prague University be returned by the German University in Prague to the Czech one as stipulated by the law of 1920, resulted in public unrest, namely the insignia crisis of 1934, which represented the climax of national confrontation not only between the two Prague universities, but also between the two main ethnic groups in Czechoslovakia, in the interwar period.

However, this law was not decisive for day-to-day university administration, overall decision-making or official ties between both universities. Despite several attempts, the Czechoslovak state did not change the nature of higher education, which was transferred from the Austrian Monarchy in the form that had been adopted over the course of the nineteenth century. The law of 1919 regarding conditions for university faculty codified earlier norms, thus helping to solidify university autonomy and the specific standing of the university partly as an autonomous entity, partly as a state institution. The German University in Prague profited from being a *de jure* equal part of the Czechoslovak higher education system.

More significant than legal norms was the reality that the German University in Prague became from one day to another a minority university in a state dominated by another nationality. The establishment of new borders in Central Europe excluded the university from the organic scholarly and higher education system that had existed under the Habsburg Monarchy. Hiring professors from Austria and even Germany (something on which the university insisted for the sake of prestige) became increasingly difficult. From the perspectives of students and faculty alike, the university became dependent on the German minority in Czechoslovakia.

To summarize, it is evident that the situation after 1918 represented both an opportunity for the development of the German University in Prague, but this reality also was tempered by doubts of future developments of this top scholarly and cultural institution of Czech (Czechoslovak) Germans in a state that had been founded from the outset as a national "Czechoslovak" state. The development of the university and its stance towards the republic is characterized by an oscillation between more positive and completely negative perceptions of the Czechoslovak state.

Following the immediate postwar years, which were characterized by a basically negative attitude towards the Czechoslovak state, the situation be-

gan to change. It became increasingly clear that the German University in Prague had no other option than to adapt to the new situation by accepting the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic, which quickly managed to consolidate itself politically and economically and establish itself within the Versailles system. German participation in meetings of rectors of Czechoslovak universities and minutes of the respective dealings indicate that the German University in Prague did find common ground with its Czech partners. The search for consensus and common professional interests outweighed national conflicts. A number of professors at the German University in Prague became representatives of Sudeten German political activism and cooperated within the framework of the Czechoslovak Republic even on political matters.[4]

This more positive attitude towards the state was however shaken in the first half of the 1930s. The first problem was the economic crisis, which negatively affected higher education. The consequences in university and scholarly life were indirect at first, but these indirect consequences, such as cuts or even withdrawal of state support for higher education and scientific research in general as well as an increasing number of unfilled professorial posts, affected all Czechoslovak universities equally.[5] In the case of the German University, however, one cannot overlook the ideological influence of the National Socialist movement in neighboring Germany and the related conflict over the insignia of Charles University as one of the climaxes of the Czech-German conflict or the electoral success of Henlein's Sudetendeutsche Partei in 1935.

The increase in nationalistic sentiment at the university in the mid-1930s was, at the same time, accompanied by an increase in anti-Semitism. After the Steinherz affair of 1922,[6] anti-Semitism behind the walls of the university remained hidden only to emerge again in relation to the election of the new rector in 1932 and 1933.[7] A number of immigrants from Nazi Germany were confronted with anti-Semitism on the part of faculty and students alike. Nevertheless, a few individuals such as lawyer Hans Kelsen (1891-1973) and philosopher and aestheticist Emil Utitz (1883-1956) received university positions despite objections from some of their future colleagues.

Attempts to calm relations between the state and the university were made in 1935 and 1936 during the term of Catholic theologian and leader of the activist Deutsche Christlichsoziale Volkspartei, Karl Hilgenreiner (1867-1948). In spite of this, the second half of the 1930s witnessed the growing influence of Nazi Germany. A key role was played by Nord und Ostdeutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (NOFG), which used the precarious financial situation in which a number of Sudeten German scientific projects found themselves in thanks to the economic crisis as well as the desire of many professors to relocate to more prestigious universities.[8] Contacts between Berlin and a part of the faculty at the German University and Sudeten German researchers outside the university enabled the NOFG not only to map the Sudeten German scholarly environment, but also to influence directly the everyday positions of university professors and decisions taken inside the university. This inevitably resulted in the strengthening of nationalistic ideas and anti-democratic positions. The most open display of this was a gathering of "national professors and students" in the German House on 25 March 1938 where, under the leadership of Germanist Herbert Cysarz (1896-1985) the Austrian Anschluss was enthusiastically welcomed. The demands sent by those professors and students

to President Edvard Beneš amounted to the legitimization of Nazi ideology at the university.[9]

It would be a mistake to think that the strengthening of the nationalist discourse, mainly in the völkisch form, at the German University in Prague in the mid-1930s was only a consequence of the influence of the emerging Nazi regime in neighboring Germany. Without a doubt, the Nazi influence was significant even decisive, but it cannot be overlooked that, among German intellectual elites in Czechoslovakia, the atmosphere lent itself to such nationalist radicalism. The beginnings of nationalist, undemocratic positions hostile to the post-World War 1 order in Central Europe originated in the immediate postwar years. Insofar as the German University in Prague was concerned, fears that the university would become marginalized thanks to a separation from German spiritual and scholarly life inspired notions of pan-German mutuality. The political and economic crisis, coupled with growing intolerance between nationalities, encouraged pan-German ideas and a pan-German discourse, which was reflected in historical and literary concepts originating at the German University in Prague in the 1930s. Visibly present were negative attitudes towards cooperation with the Czech majority and the Czechoslovak Republic's administrative and political representatives. Especially after January 1933, democratic, illiberal, and nationalistic ideas became more in vogue.

The political and mental contexts represent an external framework for the interpretation of Sudeten German scholarship after 1918. Equally significant, however, were internal aspects of scholarly development, namely methodological impulses and scientific innovation in individual disciplines. Also in Prague, the humanities found it necessary to update from the positivism that had dominated from the turn of the century. In the case of German literature, a methodological innovation was conceived in Prague: the concept of Germanist, August Sauer (1855-1926), which placed literary history in a regional "tribal" context.[10] Sauer's successor, the already mentioned, Herbert Cysarz, brought to Prague the impulses of the human scientific turn (geisteswissenschaftliche Wende) in the study of newer German literature. In the 1930s, Herbert Cysarz combined Sauer's concept (which was open to new reinterpretation in the spirit of the phrase "blood and soil") with an irrational and vitalistic approach. The fruit of this combination, which accompanied the politicization of the young Prague professor, was Cysarz's integrating concept of Sudeten German literature. For the first time ever, this concept united all German-speaking literature in the Czech Lands under one name. No longer was this literature perceived as German literature of Bohemia and Moravia as a part of old Austrian literature, but rather it was declared to be an independent category. At the same time, the essence of Sudeten German literature was rooted in pan-germanism. Cysarz's concept thus became unavoidably normative. The term Sudeten German literature was traced back in history and excluded from its tradition any connection with "Bohemism" (cultural and literary trends primarily before 1848 based upon supraethnic regional identity) or German-language Prague Jewish literature.[11]

Also, one cannot interpret German historiography in Prague without taking into account contemporary methodological discussions. The methodological development from the nineteenth century until the interwar period can be described as a path from the perception of history concentrating on the state and dynasty to the discovery of the nation (Volk) as the decisive historical ac-

tor.[12] This development was influenced by two factors. Firstly, there was the autochtonous tradition of German historiography in the Czech Lands, which, due to the transformation of the state and political framework, discovered the nation as the subject of its interest. Equally significant, however, was the influence of contemporary discussions among German historians primarily from the perspective of the increasingly significant concept of Volksgeschichte. Even this concept of multidisciplinary historiography concentrating on the German nation and its respective parts outside the national borders of Germany itself is incomprehensible without taking into consideration the political framework within which it existed. Among the predecessors of German Volksgeschichte of the 1920s and 1930s was the prewar interest in regional and settlement histories (Landes- und Siedlungsgeschichte) embodied in the research of Rudolf Kötzschke of Leipzig.[13] Only the results of the First World War uncovered the scholarly and political potential of a similar, initially marginal approach. The newly emerging Volksgeschichte thus became a significant, though not exclusive, trend in contemporary German historiography.

Apart from its own traditions and the influence of Volksgeschichte, post-1918 historiography at the university in Prague was influenced by personal and professional contacts with Austrian historians, most notably Hans Hirsch and the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung (IfÖG) in Vienna. [14]

These impulses were most elaborately integrated in Josef Pfitzner's (1901-1945) concept of Sudeten German history, which contains many parallels with Cysarz's concept of Sudeten German literature.[15] Similarly to Cysarz, Pfitzner, professor of East European history at the German University since 1930, perceived the term Sudeten German as a unifying label for Bohemian and Moravian Germans alike and projected the newly-created concept of Sudeten German history into the past. One of the main factors underlying Sudeten German history was its pan-German nature: "The first and foremost strength and reality of our history is that the Sudeten Germans, divided into individual tribes, are an essential component of the pan-German nation. For this reason, the German culture of the Sudeten regions, which is now consolidating itself from individual tribal cultures into a united Sudeten German culture, is an inseparable part of pan-German culture and Western Europe."[16]

In addition, Pfitzner saw Sudeten German history as part of the history of Germans in Eastern Europe. In direct and conscious opposition to contemporary concepts of German Slavic studies, which emphasized the equality of the Slavic and German worlds,[17] Pfitzner claimed that the German nation in Eastern Europe had the role of a Kulturträger (bearer of culture) in an initially undeveloped, primitive space.[18]

The concept of Germans as bearers of culture was crucial in the research of ethnographers Bruno Schier (1902-1984) and Josef Hanika (1900-1963), who emphasized the lack of originality of Slavic national culture and its dependence on higher German examples. What became an essential aspect of German ethnography (Volkskunde) was its radical anti-modern nature, which stressed the unearthing of allegedly original civilizations and their associated negative cultural and social forms.[19]

To summarize the scholarly approaches and concepts discussed above, it becomes clear that Germanic studies, literature, historiography, and ethnography in the interwar period possess a number of common characteris-

tics not only in scholarly discourse, but also in personal and political attitudes:

The Germans in Czechoslovakia, who up until 1918 did not share a common identity, were perceived as a fateful community (Schicksalgemeinschaft) who later came to be known as Sudeten Germans. The Sudeten Germans were not meant to constitute an independent nation or a national minority. On the contrary, in light of the perceived danger posed by being divided from the "mother nation" after 1918, cultural, political, and ethnographic ties to the German nation were stressed. The Sudeten Germans were to consider themselves as an integral part of the pan-German nation. As "border Germans" (Grenzdeutsche), the Sudeten Germans had a specific task: They were to spread superior Germandom politically, culturally, and economically to Eastern Europe, more specifically, the Bohemian and Moravian space. This task not only legitimized the presence of Germans in the Czech Lands – and it was no coincidence this provided an interpretation of German colonization in the Middle Ages – but it could be used to justify German dominance. The scholar, namely the historian, Germanist, or ethnographer, thus not only could interpret the national past in its elite and folk expressions, but also could become the co-creator of the national past. This constructivist approach, to a certain extent inherent in all historical and cultural research in the 1920s and 1930s, allowed for the politicization and instrumentalization of scholarship. With this in mind, it is possible to comprehend the impact of the election of the Sudeten German Party of Konrad Henlein (1898-1945) in 1935 on the attitudes of Sudeten German scholars. Pfitzner perceived the electoral victory, as a demonstration of the united will of the Sudeten Germans and their subscription to a pan-German fate. The electoral victory of Henlein's party thus became for him the climax of Sudeten German history: "Konrad Henlein's movement stands in agreement with nearly one thousand years of growing Sudeten German history and, thanks to Konrad Henlein, the Sudeten Germans have experienced the steepest climax in their history."[20]

I would like to characterize this interpretation of history as "Sudeten German scholarship" in the narrower sense. This is both a scholarly and political/cultural concept based upon the construct of a united Sudeten German tribe as the subject of its historical, literary, and ethnographic interest. At the same time, it consciously placed itself in the service of the construct itself by historically and culturally legitimizing it and identifying itself with it in private and public pronouncements. This Sudeten German scholarship functioned not only by adopting its own fields and their extra-scientific significance, but also by creating a common social and institutional milieu. It is not surprising that a number of professors and associate professors involved in this sort of Sudeten German scholarship could remain at the university after 1938/39 after the university's takeover by German organs.

Is this picture of interwar scholarship in Czechoslovakia, which depicts Sudeten Germans as facing Berlin with their backs turned to Czech colleagues, complete? Despite the fact that scholarly and personal contacts between both scholarly environments tended to be more the exception than the rule, they are worthy of more than scant mention. The Slavic Studies Department at the Prague German University led by Franz Spina (1868-1938) discovered through collaboration between Czechs and Germans the essence of its field, which transformed itself from a peripheral linguistic discipline into one of the largest fields at the Arts Faculty in the 1920s. From the point of view of

internal scholarly development, Slavic Studies under Franz Spina and Gerhard Gesemann (1888-1948) changed from concentrating on mere positivist philology to becoming an integrating cultural science dealing with the Slavic world.[21]

It is also important to examine the cooperation between German and Czech philosophers in interwar Czechoslovakia as demonstrated by the Eighth International Philosophical Congress in Prague in September 1934. Both examples indicate that in addition to the dismissive attitude towards the Czechoslovak Republic posed by Sudeten German scholarship, there existed other significant alternative concepts that stressed cooperation between Czechs and Germans in line with the view that it was necessary to react positively and actively to the post-1918 reality.

However, in the second half of the 1930s, Spina's interpretation of Slavic Studies became increasingly irrelevant. This failure was caused not only by growing tensions between Czechs and Germans, but also by Gesemann's increasing political orientation towards the Sudetendeutsche Partei, growing financial problems facing Slavic Studies journals, and increased nationalism within the University. Consequently, the alternative scholarly and social environment presented by the network of Czech-German scholarly contacts collapsed.[22]

The political events of 1938 significantly affected scholarship in Czechoslovakia, particularly the Czech Lands. Whereas Czech scholarship faced increasing existential difficulties after the establishment of the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia and the closure of Czech universities, German scholars were given new institutes which were adapted to Nazi ideas, norms, and ideology and Sudeten German scholarship increasingly came under the influence of the National Socialist scholarly paradigm.

Even the German University in Prague was forced to conform to the new Nazi regime. In the first place, enormous personnel changes occurred.[23] It is crucial to emphasize that changes in faculty according to political and racial criteria began already in the autumn of 1938 after the Munich Agreement and the winter of 1939. Once the Protectorate was established in March 1939, the university was incorporated into the Reich administration. The University was renamed German Charles University, a step, which, along with the forced handing over of university insignia, was meant to symbolize a rectification of the "injustice" done to the University by the law of 1920 and the previous "Czech rule." Thus, Reich German university norms came into effect. This meant that those professors and associate professors allowed to remain at the University were repeatedly investigated for political reliability. This process ended in 1941. At the same time, those places vacated by politically or racially unsuitable individuals were filled by new professors, mainly newly arrived scholars from the Reich. Similarly to German universities after 1933, the Prague German University lost its traditional autonomy and self-governance. The new, unelected rector became the leader (Führer) of the university and personnel policy was determined not only by professional qualifications, but also by individual state and party offices who were either interested in the given subject of research or were trying to force their will on a given department.

During the interwar period, the University reacted angrily to any attempts at interference in its affairs by the Czechoslovak state and its representatives. However, after March 1939, the radical restriction of the University's traditional rights as well as party and state interference in the administration

received no criticism. On the contrary, the University's subjugation by the Reich authorities raised expectations of massive expansion even in humanitarian disciplines. Despite the efforts and expectations, the expansion of the University would take a long time to be realized. Even at the beginning of 1940, the Arts Faculty still had a number of unfilled professorships.[24] Evidently, the role played by the Prague German University in the greater German higher education system was not as large at the outset as many professors and associate professors had imagined between September 1938 and March 1939.

For German scholarship in the Czech Lands after 1939, not only the Prague University was significant, but also non-University scholarly institutes, which at this time were gaining in importance. The newly founded scholarly institutes offered the possibility of being ideologically conformist (both in terms of structure and personnel) from the outset.

This held true for the Sudeten German Institute for Regional and National Research (Sudetendeutsche Anstalt für Landes- und Volksforschung in Reichenberg), which was founded as the main scholarly institution of the Reichsgau Sudetenland in 1940.[25] The areas of research covered at this new institute were meant to be the Sudeten Lands (a phrase meant to be substituted for Czech Lands) as well as Eastern and Southeastern Europe. This institute was meant to devote itself primarily to issues "posed by the party and administration" to aid or realize, by means of scholarly discoveries, certain plans and directives.[26] This snug dependence on politics was basically reflected by the internal organization of the new institute, namely leading capacities, who saw themselves as representatives of the scholarly world as well as top functionaries of the state and party administration in the Reichsgau Sudetenland.

Another scholarly institution, the Reinhard Heydrich Foundation (Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung, Reichsstiftung für wissenschaftliche Forschung), had a closer relationship to the German University in Prague. The tasks of the foundation were to prepare the Germanization of the Czech Lands, the strengthening of the Prague German University in the scholarly life of Southern and Southeastern Europe as well as the preparation of the university's 600th anniversary in 1948. The foundation's scholarly activity was based primarily on the methodology of racial research as well as social and national psychology (*Sozial- und Völkerpsychologie*).[27]

From the perspective of personnel and due to the fact that it was founded by occupation authorities, Heydrich's foundation was less rooted in the Sudeten German scholarly milieu than was the Prague University and was open to radical ideas and scholarly concepts originating in the Reich itself. Therefore, it is appropriate to pose the question just how scholarly the main representatives of ideological scholarship were. A more detailed view can be seen in the scholarly approach not only of Hans Joachim Beyer (1908-1971), but also Rudolf Hippius (1905-1945), who like Beyer came to Prague from Poznan in order to establish the Heydrich Foundation, and Karl Valentin Müller (1896-1963), who was a professor of social anthropology in Prague since 1941.

Their common stance was the perception of a particular ethnic group as a biological unit and their scholarly interest was primarily in the process of "mixing" with other nationalities on the basis of natural scientific laws. Another common stance was the a priori idea of the differing levels of "value" or "quality" of individual nations, the highest of which was associated with the

German nation. Eastern Europe was perceived as original German national soil, which as a consequence of unfortunate historical developments had lost its German character. This "assimilation" represented a process that could be stopped and even reversed with appropriate political interventions. The final consequence was seen as finding appropriate strategies for far-reaching and forced Germanization of Eastern Europe.[28]

If we enquire about the extent to which Sudeten German scholars, who worked at the German University in Prague continuously since the interwar period, adopted the methodology of Beyer, Hippius, and Müller, it is obvious that the level of conformity to these radical concepts differed according to discipline. This raises the question concerning the extent and causes of the subordination of Sudeten German scholarship to ideology after 1938/39.

Let us begin with the field that was initially introduced last. The situation for Slavic Studies, from the point of view of personnel, was mainly favorable after 1938/39. With the exception of Franz Spina, who almost symbolically died in September 1938 when the idea of the democratic and free First Republic was in ruins, and the departure of Associate Professor Ferdinand Liewehr (1896-1985) to Vienna in 1940, the staff remained the same. Gerhard Gesemann, who after Spina's death became the main representative of the discipline, tried to use Slavic research and that of related disciplines to promote German expansion in Southeastern Europe. However, Gesemann's project was not without internal contradictions because Spina's ideas on the mission and tasks of Slavic Studies were noted. For example, in a memorandum dated March 1939, Gesemann counted on the voluntary attractiveness of German culture in Eastern Europe. According to Gesemann, Czechs could be won over to German culture through "exemplary institutes at the German University in Prague, its good lecturers, and its nationally and scholastically disciplined student body." At the same time, according to Gesemann, there had to be congeniality on the German side as well. "However, this will be possible only so long as we Germans can devote our attention to Czech culture (which it deserves) and acknowledge Czech culture when such acknowledgment is called for."[29]

The activities of the remaining Slavic Studies professors after 1938/39 can be described as ambivalent. Their statements, as well as pedagogical and scholarly work seem to have been motivated more by opportunism than by conscious, goal-oriented attempts to subjugate their field to Nazism.[30] Apparently, it proved difficult for them to meet the demands of the "new" German Slavic Studies since preparing materials in support of the concept that Slavic nations were culturally dependent on the German example was against Spina's interwar idea.[31]

The politicization and subordination to ideology of Germanic Studies was in line with that of Slavic Studies. Ernst Schwarz (1895-1983), professor of ancient German language and literature, continued his dialectological and onomatystic research even after 1938/39. This research (ongoing since the 1920s) was initially motivated by cultural and political efforts to strengthen Sudeten German identity. However, after 1938/39, Hans Joachim Beyer did not find Schwarz's research in tune with the times. In 1943, Beyer complained: "Professor Schwarz who has certain accomplishments in civic education and philology is an unmusical type…he even judges poetry philologically, which is wrong."[32]

One also cannot speak of any growing radicalization of research in

modern literary history. Erich Trunz (1905-2001) succeeded Herbert Cysarz who moved to Munich in 1938. This young Germanist at first seemed to be an acceptable replacement for Herbert Cysarz for scholarly and political reasons. From September 1933, Trunz was a German lecturer at the University of Amsterdam. He joined the Nazi party in April 1934 and he participated in the formation of Nazi foreign propaganda.[33] In Prague, Trunz's enthusiasm for Nazism waned as can be seen in the topics of dissertations he agreed to supervise.[34] The reasons for his alienation from the Nazi regime were quite practical. Trunz was dissatisfied with his salary and living conditions in Prague. He did not hesitate to make a complaint to the Reich Ministry of Education in Berlin.[35]

On the other hand, historiography and ethnography were very much influenced by ideology imported from Nazi Germany. Even after 1938/1939, Josef Pfitzner remained a university professor, but centered his activities at the office of the Prague magistrate where as a vice-mayor he participated directly in German occupation policies in Prague. Pfitzner's colleagues at the university did not choose this sort of politicization, but their scholarly work demonstrated their willingness to place the field of history into the political services of the new regime.

The doyen of Sudeten German historiography, Wilhelm Wostry (1877 -1951), could expect the favor of the new political masters that provided him with plenty of individual benefits.[36] Wostry, a member of the Sudetendeutsche Partei since April 1938 and a Nazi since 1939, was among the collaborators of the Heydrich Foundation and he significantly participated in the activities of the Historical Commission of the Reichenberg Institute (*Sudetendeutsche Anstalt für Landes- und Volksforschung in Reichenberg*.) The State Minister for Bohemia and Moravia, Karl Hermann Frank, was primarily interested in Wostry's plan to write a three-volume history of Bohemia and Moravia.[37]

In Wostry's case, he was important not only because of these projects and the organization of scholarly work. In his broad study, *Germania, Teutonia, Alemania, Bohemia*, Wostry tried to use historical arguments to justify German domination of the Czech Lands.

> Today, in 1942, the German Reich is a reality and the Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia is established. What was a reality nearly a thousand years ago has through the fulfilled dreams of a united pan-German empire once again become reality in the present day. The Czech-German space has once again been included in the Reich. We who in 1938 still lived in the state of Mr. Beneš, are today essentially contemporary fellow travelers of Charles IV, even Otto the Great…just like a thousand years ago and during these thousand years, Bohemia was and still is in the German living space. Unchangeable territorial relations have remained and, in our time, the ancient historical bond has been newly established in a matter suitable for our time. Today as before the following holds true: "Bohemia Germaniae portio est".[38]

Even more obvious is the activity of Heinz Zatschek (1901-1965). His research was meant not only to serve the cause of propaganda emphasizing Czech subservience to their German neighbor, but actually came close to racial ideology.[39]

Zatschek's activity after March 1939 included three aspects. Similarly to Wostry, Zatschek placed his scholarly knowledge in the service of political and ideological propaganda. In his book *England und das Reich*, which was published in 1942, Zatschek presented the ongoing war between Germany and Great Britain as the climax of a one thousand-year enmity between the two powers. According to Zatschek, England was always an empire determined to prevent the establishment of a strong center of Europe under German leadership. England therefore historically was an enemy of German unification. This constant German-English antagonism was, however, according to Zatschek, not able to be explained merely by the power-driven interests of England, but also was anchored in a different world view. The English supposedly shared "along with the Jews faith in the supremacy of their own nation" and therefore became "servants of Judaism, an intellectual milieu whose goal it was to destroy every healthy nation."[40] In contrast to the English, the German task was to look after security and order in Europe. This German historical role justifies even the German demand for a leading position in Europe:

> As a nation tested and hardened by work that in the past and today thinking of how to secure small nations their right to life and space, which they deserve in the European family, the capable…should give to the less capable and lead them in the spirit of a higher order, the Germans should justifiably devote themselves to the task, which no other nation can fulfill. The incompetence of the Slavic group of nations needs no further proof and the significance of English hegemony and French bossiness are well known.

For Zatschek, the old historia magistra vitae holds true:

> The goals of the present struggle between the Reich and England are becoming more evident. History teaches us that European peace can only be guaranteed by a strong center. A prerequisite for this is that flanking powers will have to move to the second category.[41]

Also significant was the continuation of research from the 1930s dealing with the German contribution to the political, cultural, and economic elites of the Czech state in the Middle Ages. Zatschek painted a picture of Czech history acknowledging at best that the Czechs were passive beneficiaries of cultural, political, and economic influences from Germany facilitated by the Sudeten Germans:

> Today we can say that not only were towns German

> in the Middle Ages, but that a contiguous Czech national area did not exist even in the countryside. Prior to Hus, Moravia was nearing the point at which it would be divided by German wedges and separated from Bohemia and the Czechs would then have had an existence similar to the Sorbs in Lusatia. However, we know that the Czechs cannot claim to have prevented the total embedding of the Sudeten regions in Germandom. It was rather the plague of 1348 and its consequences. The plague killed so many people in Germany that there were not sufficient people available for the total absorption of the Czechs. This had far-reaching consequences, which cast aside the picture of history which Palacký had created for the Czech nation and of whose accuracy Palacký had been convinced. The last remnants of this misleading account need to be removed so that the Czechs can become accustomed to the position accorded them in the framework of the German living space in the past, present and future.[42]

Similar theses were not far removed from the direct application of racial research of the Middle Ages. Together with Karl Valentin Müller, Zatschek wrote a study about the "biological lot of the Přemyslids." Already in the introduction, the reader finds the main thesis of both authors, which represented the radicalization of the premises of interwar Sudeten German historiography:

> We find profound cultural differences even between Germans and their neighbors in the Southeast, also the Czechs, who were not capable of an independent development of the higher division of labor. This inability, acknowledged by Czech rulers and their advisors, forced the invitation of the Germans to settle and establish German towns. Only thanks to extensive borrowing from generations civilized by Germans, could these nations copy civilizational forms of Western civilization and become latecomers in Western cultural development.[43]

This historiographical discourse demonstrates the voluntary politicization and ideological pressure placed upon the scholarly discipline in an undemocratic regime. The research of Josef Hanika leads us to similar conclusions. Hanika did his Habilitation in Prague in 1937 in the field of German ethnography. He joined the Sudeten German Party in June 1938 and in November 1938, he was admitted to the Nazi Party. After 1938, Hanika became the director of the ethnographic museum in Cheb, led the Cheb branch of the institute in Reichenberg and was a member of its ethnographic commission. The director of this institution was Hanika's old friend, Bruno Schier, who was habilitated

at the German University in Prague in the field of German ethnology in 1931 and henceforth served as a professor at the University of Leipzig. Schier described the basis of post-1938 Sudeten German ethnography as follows:

> It is especially important to emphasize that Sudeten German ethnography has special tasks because of the Sudetenland's frontier position. The Czechs, with their folk culture, are a part of neighboring German tribes, a fact which is recognizable thanks to certain attributes. The inclusion of the Protectorate and its Slavic regions in the field of Sudeten German ethnography is therefore highly crucial, especially as future political decisions will need to be prepared.[44]

In this context, Hanika's study of the Chods emerged.[45] The Nazi occupiers needed a scholarly study to justify the subjugation of the Czechs by disintegrating the Czechs' national identity. Hanika's "Volkskundliche Wanderungen zu den Chodenbauern" was meant to prove "that this tribe, which is generally seen as the purest form of Czechness, is in reality from the point of view of blood and culture undeniably influenced by Germans."[46]

In another research study after 1938 entitled "Sippennamen und völkische Herkunft im Böhmisch-Mährischen Raum", Hanika subordinated his specialist knowledge to ideology. Hanika's goal in this work was to determine the amount "of German blood in the Czech nation." He presumed that by researching family names, he would be in a position to identify those Czechs who were of German origin (Deutschstämmige fremder Volkszugehörigkeit). Hanika was aware of the practical consequences of his research because unspecified political decisions elevated the significance of the amount of German blood in the Czech national body.[47] In the autumn of 1942, Hanika was appointed head of the Department of Ethnography and Tribal History of Moravia at the German University in Prague. The new department was established on Heydrich's orders and was to devote itself to "ethnographically focused regional sociology of Czechs primarily in Moravia."[48]

Besides heading the new department, Hanika became chairman of the ethnography department, which was vacated by the death of Gustav Jungbauer (1886–1942). In a letter to Karl Hermann Frank professing that Hanika was an appropriate candidate for the job, Hanika summarized his opinions on the basis and tasks of German ethnography in the Czech lands:

> German ethnography in Prague, apart from usual tasks such a professorship entails, requires special tasks that have come to the forefront as a result of political decisions… Now it is necessary to expand research on the Czech nation and German ethnography in Prague must take over the leadership of Czech ethnographic work and transfer it from the present Czech-Slavic focus to Czech-German connection which can be achieved by the research of folk culture.[49]

The reception of racial research, the national interpretation of history in a pan-German context and the historical and ethnographic legitimization of Czech dependence on the culturally and politically more developed German center represent the main signs of the convergence of disciplines in 1938/1939-1945 not only with National Socialist ideology in general, but in accordance with the demands of the German occupation authorities in the Protectorate.

In a number of humanitarian fields at the German University in Prague, namely historiography, Germanic Studies, and ethnography as well as in a number of Sudeten German scholarly and educational clubs and organizations, a specific understanding of scholarship and its tasks emerged after 1918. At the same time, this scholarship helped form a specific Sudeten German identity whose basis was the idea that Bohemian and Moravian Germans were united by the experience of 1918 in a "community of fate" (Schicksalgemeinschaft) and as "border Germans" (Grenzdeutsche) were an integral part of Germandom as such (Gesamtdeutschtum). This interpretation opened the door to scholarly reception of Volksgeschichte and völkisch positions and for the integration of German national thoughts in historiographical, literary, and ethnographical research. In the 1920s and 1930s, it was possible to counter such approaches at the German University in Prague by offering an alternative scholarly, cultural, and political discourse based upon scholarly and political cooperation between both main nationalities in the Czech Lands. By the second half of the 1930s, this was no longer possible thanks to the worsening international and domestic political situation.

For this reason, the events of 1938 and 1939 had no great influence on the scholarly work of those deemed racially fit to remain at the German University in Prague. What changed after the Munich Agreement and the establishment of the Protectorate was the political and ideological conditions for scholarly research. Research by Sudeten German scholars was no longer defensive, but rather it consciously became dangerously close to aggressive plans of German occupiers in Central Europe (especially the Czech Lands) for Germanization and overall hegemony.

Was the German University in Prague really "an inveterate enemy directly within the heart of the state"? If so, in what sense? These words, formulated after the collapse of German occupation of the Czech Lands, represent the Czech perspective identifying the Czechoslovak state as a national state of Czechs and Slovaks (or even Czechoslovaks) with no room for a German minority after 1945, a minority which not only destroyed the republic in September 1938, but participated in occupation policies between 1938/39 and 1945. In this context, the German University in Prague could indeed be labeled as a "bastion of German treason."

However, with the passage of time, the answer to this question appears more complicated. The unquestionable turn to National Socialist ideology, undertaken by the politically and racially "cleansed" faculty of the university at the end of the 1930s as well as moral and intellectual guilt of a number of professors and associate professors who participated in Nazi crimes in the Czech Lands and in Central and Eastern Europe generally, were the result of a complicated process that was influenced by both external and internal factors. Only by keeping this in mind is it possible to avoid generalizations and declarative statements on the one hand and to understand the openness of the given

historical situation and to offer alternative scholarly, individual, and political perspectives on the other.

Index to abbreviations:

AAV ČR	Archiv Akademie věd České republiky (Archives of the Czech Academy of Sciences)
AKPR, KPR	Archiv Kanceláře prezidenta republiky, Kancelář prezidenta republiky (Archives of the Office of the President of the Republic, Office of the President of the Republic)
AUK, FF NU	Archiv Univerzity Karlovy, Filozofická fakulta Německé univerzity (Archives of Charles University, Arts Fakulty of the German University)
AUC HUCP	Acta Universitatis Carolinae – Historia Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis
AUK, RNU	Archiv Univerzity Karlovy, Rektorát Německé univerzity (Archives of Charles University, Rectorate of the German University)
BArch	Bundesarchiv
NA, ÚŘP	Národní archiv, Úřad říšského protektora (National Archives, Office of the Reichsprotektor)
REM	Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung
IfÖG	Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung

NOTES

1. Explanatory report on the decree of the President of the Republic abolishing the German university in Prague. Addendum to the letter to the Prime Minister's office from the office of the President of the Republic, Prague, 13 October 1945, AKPR, KPR sign. D 15334, Box 304.

2. The development of the university as an institution in the interwar period and its position in the Republic has only been addressed in a chapter in Jiří Pešek, Alena Míšková, Petr Svobodný and Jan Janko, "Německá univerzita, " in *Dějiny Univerzity Karlovy*, eds. Jindřich Bečvář, Břetislav Fajkus and Jan Havránek (Prague, 1998), 4:181-212. For more recent perspectives see now my book: Ota Konrád, Dějepisectví, germanistika a slavistika na Německé univerzitě v Praze 1918-1945 (Prague 2011) too. This article is based upon the research, summarized in this book.

3. This transpired already on 26 October 1918, two days prior to the official proclamation of the independent Czechoslovak state. See "Aufzeichnung über die Versammlung der Lehrkräfte der deutschen Universität in Prag am 26. Oktober 1918 um 5 Uhr nachmittags im Karolinum," AUK, RNU, Box 82.

4. Among the most notable representatives of Sudeten German "activism" at the German University in Prague calling for political cooperation within the framework of the Czechoslovak state were lawyer Robert Mayr Harting (1874-1948), one of the leading personalities in the Christian Social Party (Deutsche Christsoziale Volkspartei), who was justice minister from 1926 to 1929, and Slavist Franz Spina (1868-1938), leader of the Sudeten German Agrarian Party (Bund der Landwirte*)*, who from 1926 until 1938 participated as a minister in Czechoslovak governments.

5. Most affected by funding cuts were the Arts Faculty and the Law Faculty, which had to subsist on a third of the subsidies available in 1931. See "Dotace univerzity: Indexní čísla podle r. 1931, " in "Zápis jednání IV. Konference rektorů čsl. vysokých škol, 16 April 1934, " AUK RNU, Box 34.

6. The Steinherz Affair refers to anti-Semitic unrest at the German University in Prague in response to the election of Jewish historian Samuel Steinherz as rector of the university. Steinherz, who was elected in line with the tradition of the longest-serving faculty member, did not refuse the rector's position as had other Jews before him. For more on the affair, see Alena Chlupová, "K volbě rektora a prvnímu otevřenému vystoupení nacistických studentů na Německé univerzitě v Praze roku 1922," *AUC HUCP* 18 (1978), 79-90.

7. For more on the 1933 election of the rector, see Ota Konrád, "Eine lange Feindschaft: Die Prager Professoren Erich Gierach und Gerhard Gesemann in der Tschechoslowakischen Republik und im Nationalsozialismus," *AUC HUCP* (2003), 173-192.

8. See BArch, Fond R 153.

9. To the office of the Czechoslovak President, Prague, 25 March 1938, AKPR, KPR, sign. D 12372/38, Box 133.

10. August Sauer, *Literaturgeschichte und Volkskunde* (Prague, 1907). This methodology was primarily put into practice by Sauer's student, Josef Nadler (1884-1963). See Josef Nadler, *Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften*, 4 vols. (Regensburg, 1923-1928).

11. Cysarz's conception of "Sudeten German literature" is contained primarily in his shorter texts from the 1930s. Cysarz published the most important of these in 1935 and 1938: Herbert Cysarz, *Dichtung im Daseinskampf: Fünf Vorträge* (Karlsbad, 1935); Ibid., *Deutsche Front im Südosten* (1938). See also Cysarz's introduction to a collection of poems by "Sudeten German students.": *Wir tragen ein Licht: Rufe und Lieder sudetendeutscher Studenten* (Munich, 1934), 5-21.

12. Michael Neumüller, "Die deutsche philosophische Fakultät in Prag um 1882 und die Geschichtswissenschaft, " in *Die Teilung der Prager Universität 1882 und die intellektuelle Desintegration in den böhmischen Ländern*, ed. Ferdinand Seibt (Munich, 1984), 111-127, specifically p. 125.

13. What had a primarily programmatic charakter was Kötzschke's study from the 1920s: Rudolf Kötzschke, "Landesgeschichte und Heimatgedanke," *Neues Archiv für Sächsische Geschichte* 48, no. 1 (1927), 1-30.

14. For more on Hirsch and his contacts with Sudeten German historiography, see Andreas Zajic, "Hans Hirsch (1878-1940): Historiker und Wissenschaftsorganisator zwischen Urkunden- und Volkstumsforschung," in *Österreichische Historiker*, by Hruza (2008), 307-418; Pavel Kolář, "Eine Brutsstätte der Volksgeschichte? Überlegungen zur Geschichte der Prager deutschen Historiographie 1918-1938 im Gesamtkontext der deutschsprachigen Geschichtswissenschaft," in *Geschichtsschreibung zu den böhmischen Ländern im 20. Jahrhundert: Wissenschaftstraditionen, Institutionen, Diskurse*, eds. Christiane Brenner, K. Erik Franzen, Peter Haslinger and Robert Luft (Munich, 2006), 109-136. For more on Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, see Manfred Stoy, *Das Österreichische Institut für Geschichtsforschung 1929-1945* (Vienna and Munich, 2007).

15. For more on Pfitzner, see Frank Hadler and Vojtěch Šustek, "Josef Pfitzner (1901-1945): Historiker. Geschichtsprofessor und Geschichtspolitiker," in *Prager Professoren 1938-1948: Zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik*, eds. Monika Glettler and Alena Míšková (Essen, 2001), 105-135.

16. Josef Pfitzner, *Sudetendeutsche Geschichte* (Reichenberg, 1935).

17. See Heinrich F. Schmid and Reinhold Trautmann, *Wesen und Aufgaben der deutschen Slawistik: Ein Programm* (Leipzig, 1927).

18. See Josef Pfitzner, "Die Geschichte Osteuropas und die Geschichte des Slawentums als Forschungsprobleme," *Historische Zeitschrift* 150 (1934), 21-85.

19. In this context, see the definition of ethnography in one of the first ethnographical textbooks by Prague German studies professor Adolfa Hauffen (1863-1930): "Ethnography is a science whose aim is to research and depict the physical phenomenon, lifestyle, moral and legal basis, language, and faith of a given nation by following these phenomena and their historical development in relation to their relationship with other nations…all that is typical for lower, mainly rural classes of people belongs to the field of ethnography so long as they are affected as little as possible by international education and culture." After discovering all traditional national and folk expressions of the lower classes, it is the task of ethnography to distinguish between the true expressions of folk culture from "foreign and bogus" expressions. Adolf Hauffen, *Einführung in die deutsch-böhmische Volkskunde nebst einer Bibliographie* (Prague, 1896), 11-12. For more recent perspectives, see Petr Lozoviuk. *Inte-*

rethnik im Wissenschaftsprozess: Deutschsprachige Volkskunde in Böhmen und ihre gesellschaftlichen Auswirkungen (Leipzig, 2008).

20. Josef Pfitzner, *Sudetendeutsche Einheitsbewegung: Werden und Erfüllen* (Karlsbad and Leipzig, 1937), 101.

21. Compare the work of both main representatives od Slavic studies at the German University in Prague during the interwar period: Franz Spina and Gerhard Gesemann, *Fünfundzwanzig Jahre Slawistik an der Deutschen Universität Prag (1903-1928): Eine Denkschrift, Privatdruck der slavischen Seminare und Proseminare an der deutschen Universität in Prag* (Prague, n.d.). For Gesemann, see Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers, "Gerhard Gesemann (1888-1945), Slawist: 'Prof. Gesemann hatte große Pläne...,' Slawistische Forschung im politischen Kontext der dreißiger und vierzieger Jahre," in *Prager Professoren 1938-1948: Zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik*, eds. Monika Glettler and Alena Míšková (Essen, 2001), 351-379.

22. The following studies are devoted to this issue: Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers, "Die Slavische Rundschau 1929-1940: Porträt, Programm und Entwicklung einer Prager Zeitschrift," *Brücken: Germanistisches Jahrbuch Tschechien-Slowakei* 5 (1997), 149-204; Klaas-Hinrich Ehlers, "Die Gründung der Germanoslavica: Vorgeschichte des deutsch-tschechischen Zeitschriftneprojekts 1929 bis 1931," *Germanoslavica: Zeitschrift für germano-slawische Studien* 8, no. 1 (2001), 83-103; Klass-Hinrich Ehlers, "Agonie und Nachleben einer deutsch-tschechischen Zeitschrift: Dokumente zum Ende der Germanoslavica aus den Jahren 1932 bis 1942," *Brücken: Germanistisches Jahrbuch Tschechien-Slowakei* 8 (2002), 179-222.

23. On the whole, racist purges at the German University affected 34 percent of its faculty. Details regarding personnel changes at the German University can be found in Alena Míšková, *Die Deutsche (Karls-) Universität vom Münchner Abkommen bis zum Ende des Zweiten Weltkrieges: Universitätsleitung und Wandel des Professorenkollegiums* (Prague, 2007).

24. According to a letter from the dean to the rector regarding the staff situation at the faculty dated January 1940, only 17 out of 31 professorial chairs were occupied (11 internal, 6 external). Furthermore, newly-arrived professors from the Reich were temporarily charged with heading individual departments and local associate professors who were in charge of open chairs received no compensation. Dean to rector, Prague, 25 January 1940, AUK RNU, Box 107.

25. For more details on the institute, see Ota Konrád, "Die Sudetendeutsche Anstalt für Landes- und Volksforschung 1940-1945: 'Wissenschaftliche Gründlichkeit und völkische Verpflichtung'," in *Die 'sudetendeutsche Geschichtsschreibung' 1918-1960: Zur Vorgeschichte und Gründung der Historischen Kommission der Sudetenländer, Vorträge der Tagung der Historischen Kommission für die böhmischen Länder in Brünn vom 1. bis 2. Oktober 2004*, eds. Stefan Albrecht, Jiří Malíř and Ralph Melville (Munich, 2008), 71-95.

26. Ansprache am 13. Oktober 1940 anlässlich der feierlichen Eröffnung der Sudetendeutschen Anstalt für Landes- und Volksforschung, AAV ČR, Sudetendeutsche Anstalt für Landes- und Volksforschung, Reichenberg, Box 89.

27. For more on the foundation, see Andreas Wiedemann, *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung in Prag (1942 - 1945)* (Dresden, 2000). For more on

race studies at the German University, see Alena Míšková, "Rassenforschung und Oststudien an der Deutschen (Karls-) Universität in Prag," in *Erzwungene Trennung: Vertreibungen und Aussiedlungen in und aus der Tschechoslowakei 1938-1947 im Vergleich mit Polen, Ungarn und Jugoslawien*, ed. Detlef Brandes (Essen, 1999), 37-52.

28. This metodology was conceived by Beyer a Hippius primarily on the basis of their research on the "Polish question." See Hans-Joachim Beyer, *Das Schicksal der Polen: Rasse, Volkscharakter, Stammesart* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1942). Rudolf Hippius, Volkstum, *Gesinnung und Charakter: Bericht über psychologische Untersuchungen an Posener deutsch-polnischen Mischlingen und Polen. Sommer 1942* (Stuttgart and Prague, 1943). Beyer's and Hippius's research is characterized by Andreas Wiedemann in *Die Reinhard-Heydrich-Stiftung in Prag*. In addition, see Karl Heinz Roth, "Heydrichs Professor: Historiographie des 'Volkstums' und der Massenvernichtungen, Der Fall Hans Joachim Beyer," in *Geschichtsschreibung als Legitimationswissenschaft 1918-1945*, ed. Peter Schöttler (Frankfurt am Main, 1997), 262-342; Eduard Kubů, "Die Bedeutung des deutschen Blutes im Tschechentum: Der ''wissenschaftspädagogische' Beitrag des Soziologen Karl Valentin Müller zur Lösung des Problems der Germanisierung Mitteleuropas," *Bohemia* 45 (2004), 93-114.

29. Gerhard Gesemann, "Wissenschaftliche und kulturpolitische Aufgabe der Deutschen Universität in Prag," s. d., AUK, FF NU, Box 92.

30. This evaluation has been arrived at in studies on two other professors of Slavic studies at the German University: Martin Zückert, "Edmund Schneeweis (1896-1964): Slawist und Volkskundler, Anpassung als Wissenschaftsstrategie?" in *Prager Professoren 1938-1948*, eds. Monika Glettler and Alena Míšková, 191-204; Daniel Kraft, "Eugen Rippl (1888-1945): Slawist. 'Für eine wissenschaftliche Publikation darf es keine Verwässerung und Verfärbung geben...' Ein Fachmann auf dem Gebiet der Sondersprachenforschung," in *Prager Professoren 1938-1948*, eds. Monika Glettler and Alena Míšková, 323-349.

31. Kurt Knoll, rector of University of Vienna, spoke of the new German Slavic studies meant to counter any earlier Slavophile focus in order "to be in sync with the interests of the Reich" in his extensive report on "the new focus of Slavic Studies at the University of Vienna." The aim of this report was to support politically and ideologically the Slavic studies scholar Ferdinand Liewehr who came to the University of Vienna from the German University in Prague in his dispute with another professor in Vienna, Rudolf Jagoditsch. According to Knoll, the group around Liewehr should develop "an ever clearer new direction in Slavic filology, which could be described as German Slavic studies." The basis of this new direction, according to Knoll, was in the understanding that research was a "political task, whose aim is to rethink past scientific discoveries falsified by Slavic studies scholars hostile to the Reich. In order to aid the Reich's struggle against the Slavs. " Dr. Kurt Knoll, Gaudozentführer, "Bericht über die Neuausrichtung der Slawistik an der Universität Wien," s.d., April 1943, BArch, NS 15/235.

32. "Besetzung der zweiten (ausserordentlichen) Lehrkanzel für ältere Germanistik (deutsche Literatur)," s.d., AUK, RNU, Box 107.

33. "Curriculum vitae Erich Trunz, opis," s.d. [1937?], BArch, R 31/449.

34. Hans-Peter Kunisch, "Erich Trunz (*1905): German Studies scholar, von Lobwasser über das Gegenwartsschriftum zu Goethe," in*Prager Professoren 1938-1948*, eds. Glettler and Míšková, 299-311, specifically 308.

35. REM (i. A: gez. Harmjanz) an Kurator der deutschen wissenschaftlichen Hochschulen in Prag vom 26. 9. 1941, BArch, R 31/449.

36. For more on Wostry, see Nina Lohmann, "Wilhelm Wostry und die sudetendeutsche Geschichtsschreibung bis 1938," *AUC HUCP* 44 (2004), 45-145; Karel Hruza, "Wilhelm Wostry a Wilhelm Weizsäcker: vzorní mužové, řádní učenci a věrní vlasti synové? " in *Německá medievistika v českých zemích do roku 1945*, eds. Pavel Soukup and František Šmahel (Prague, 2004), 305-352.

37. See "Entwurf der Gleiderung des Werkes Die Geschichte Böhmen -Mährens," Abschrift, o. D., NA, ÚŘP, 109-12-214. Greater political significance was to be attached to Wostry's work "in relation to the fight against the Czech national myth (Palacký)." Reichsprotector to Reich Minister of Education, Prague, 19 March 1942, BArch, R 31/700.

38. Wilhelm Wostry, *Germania, Teutonia, Alemania, Bohemia* (Prague, 1943), 3 and 52.

39. For more on Zatschek, see Karel Hruza, "Heinz Zatschek (1901-1965): 'Radikales Ordnungsdenken' und 'gründliche, zielgesteuerte Forschungsarbeit'," in *Österreichische Historiker 1900-1945: Lebensläufe und Karrieren in Österreich, Deutschland und der Tschechoslowakei in wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Porträts*, ed. Karel Hruza (Vienna, 2008), 677-792.

40. Heinz Zatschek, *England und das Reich* (Brno, 1942), 40.

41. Ibid., 86.

42. Heinz Zatschek, "Urkundenforschung und Volksforschung," *Deutsches Archiv für Landes- und Volksforschung* 5 (1941), 570-579, specifically 579.

43. Heinz Zatschek and Karl Valentin Müller, "Das biologische Schicksal der Přemysliden: Ein Beispiel für aufartende Wirkung deutscher Erblinien in fremdvölkischen Blutskreisen," *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschaftsbiologie* 35 (1941), 136 -152, specifically 136.

44. "Verhandlungsschrift über die erste Sitzung der Kommission für Volkskunde, 1940," AAV ČR, Sudetendeutsche Anstalt für Landes- und Volksforschung, Reichenberg, Box 105.

45. Josef Hanika, *Volkskundliche Wanderungen zu den Chodenbauern* (Reichenberg 1943).

46. "Vermerk, betr.: Herausgabe von Josef Hanika, Volkskundliche Wanderungen zu den Chodenbauern, Reichenberg, 5. 5. 1942," AAV ČR, Sudetendeutsche Anstalt für Landes- und Volksforschung, Reichenberg, Box 110.

47. Josef Hanika, *Sippennamen und völkische Herkunft im Böhmisch-Mährichen Raum* (Prague, 1943), 8.

48. Vermerk, Prag, 17.3.1945, Vertraulich!" AUK, RNU, Box 107.

49. Hanika to K.H. Frank, 4 November 1943, NA, ÚŘP, 109-4-952.

Tomáš G. Masaryk on the Unification of Europe and the World[1]

By Zdeněk V. David

Thomas Mann stated in his article "In Memory of Masaryk": "One might… say he lived a hundred years too soon. May his like again be represented on Earth, no matter in what personal or national guise, when a European Confederation of States is looking about for a head!"[2] George Bernard Shaw was once asked by Emil Ludwig "Who could be the first President of the United States of Europe?" To this Shaw replied, "I know of only one man – that is Masaryk."[3] In this context, I will focus in my article on Masaryk's humanitarian vision of the coming unification of Europe and eventually of all mankind, a process which he mainly attributed to the rising tide of democracy. It is also essential to consider his response to the challenge posed by the emergence of the totalitarian regimes in the 1930s, as well as his persistent faith in the future of democratic governments.

The Rise of Democracy

Writing especially after World War I in the mid-1920s, Masaryk maintained that the objective of humanity's development was now to attain "internationalism" and "inter-statism" (*mezistátnost*), – that is, an effort to organize not only Europe, but the entire world, in as unified a way as possible. He suggested that an era of cultural synthesis was arriving, which would bring together the cultural elements of different nations.[4] This denouement was made possible by the rise of democracy in the wake of the war. He stressed that the global conflict had destroyed three regimes based on "theocratic" absolutism (Russian, Prussian, and Austrian), and in their place republics and democracies emerged, which were able to introduce new principles into international politics. Democracy, which originated as an internal political system of individual countries, could now leave its isolation and be applied in external affairs as well, and thus it would rise from the level of a domestic actor to that of an international one. Masaryk particularly focused on the League of Nations, which had acquired an institutional reality, and the program of which was endorsed by all modern truly democratic politicians and statesmen. In Masaryk's opinion, the "United States of Europe" stopped being a utopian concept, and a peaceful community of all nations and states was, in fact, becoming realized.[5] Masaryk recalled that during the War he had already participated in laying the more concrete foundations for the forthcoming unification in Europe. While he stayed in the United States in 1918, he maintained contacts with exile representatives of various nations, mainly from Central Europe, and established the Mid-European Democratic Union of which he was elected President. The Union held a culminating meeting in Philadelphia October 23-26, 1918 in Independence Hall. Altogether eleven nations were represented.[6]

Masaryk continued to assert his belief (in the coming unification) into the last stages of his presidency in the first half of the 1930s. In an interview with a British reporter in 1933, who questioned this proposition, Masaryk answered that Europe was more united in 1933 than ever before, and the process was continuing. If he were fifty years younger, he would gladly undertake a leading role in advancing the idea of forming the united states of Europe (*utvoření spojených států evropských*). He did not advocate speed or compulsion. Each state would have a large sphere of autonomy, and mutual economic

and political relations would be governed by appropriate treaties. Perhaps a coordinating directory (*directorium*) would be created, such as existed in the government of Switzerland.[7] Masaryk also retained his faith in the utility of the League of Nations. It brought together people from all the countries of the world so that they could engage in discussions through their leading statesmen and build mutual trust. Even World War I was in a way, paradoxically, the beginning of a European Confederation: two blocks closely cooperated for the first time in history. From cooperation for war sprang cooperation for peace.[8]

As a precondition to the unification, Masaryk rejected the idea that some nations were superior to others. It was true that some nations developed politically and technologically faster than others, but that had no importance in the long run. Thus the Russians were relative latecomers. The Russian peasant still led a pre-industrial existence, but Russia had produced outstanding authors, such as Pushkin, Gogol, Turgenev, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Gorky, who were no worse, and even arguably better than writers of western Europe.[9] Elsewhere, Masaryk suggested that the coming unification of mankind would serve as a replacement for the medieval ideal of Christian universalism, which had failed. In the Middle Ages, a universal idea existed, the Catholic Church, acknowledged by most of Europe. It became perverted by the introduction of the Inquisition and casting heretics into flames. Contemporary Europe needed a generally accepted program, based on a shared vision of reality and the world.[10]

Critique of Totalitarian Regimes

In order to maintain his optimism about the future of democracy and thus world harmony, Masaryk had to take a stand toward the totalitarian regimes which also emerged in Europe after World War I; first, Soviet Communism in 1917, then, German National Socialism in 1933.

Leninism

As for Soviet Communism, Masaryk had personal experience of Lenin's revolution in Russia in 1917 and 1918. He could also draw on his pre-War substantial research in Russian thought and in Marxist ideology. His profound knowledge of Russia's intellectual history stemmed mainly from the preparation and writing of his outstanding work, *Russland und Europa* (Russia and Europe), originally published in 1913, and later known in the Anglophone world under the title, *The Spirit of Russia*.[11] Earlier, he had undertaken a many-faceted analysis of Marx's philosophy, politics, sociology, and economics in the two-volume magisterial opus, *Otázka sociální. Základy marxismu filosofické a sociologické* (The Social Question: Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Marxism), originally published in 1898.[12] Masaryk continued to be a consistent and ardent critic of Bolshevism until Lenin's death in 1924. His overall view was that the regime – established by Lenin – was vitiated both by Russia's past traditions, and by a misapplication of Marx's teaching.

Referring to the baneful Russian revolutionary heritage, Masaryk maintained that Lenin and his followers derived their principles – of a violent revolution, and elitist relations to the popular masses – from Mikhail A. Bakunin and the *narodniki* (populists), like Sergei G. Nechaev and Petr N. Tkachev. Similarly, as an extension of the Russian tradition of religious dogmatism, the Bolsheviks were convinced of possessing the absolute truth, and treated Marx's writings as a sacred or biblical text; they practiced a scholasticism in its

most trivialized sense. In addition, the cultural split between the educated elite and the common people was perpetuated. In Tsarist Russia, the educated aristocracy accepted all the achievements of Europe, but the masses lived in their medieval culture. Lenin and his associates also adopted Western, mainly German socialist, thought, but the Bolshevik masses remained uneducated and unprepared for a modern industrial civilization.[13] Most repugnantly, rather than overcoming the Tsarist despotism, this became an inspiration for the terroristic character of Lenin's regime.[14] Thus, the punitive measures of Lenin's Bolshevism resembled those of Ivan the Terrible. The immediate result of the Bolshevik Revolution was a desperate economic anarchy, with prevalent poverty and even famine.[15] Lenin in his speeches often admitted committing errors – and the need to learn from errors; but in practice these "errors" meant thousands upon thousands of unnecessary deaths.[16]

Furthermore, according to Masaryk, Lenin was wrong in declaring his Communist program to be real Marxism. Marx went through several stages in the formulation of his own ideology. In the process, Marx abandoned the revolutionary penchant of his youth and adopted an evolutionary approach prior to his own death. Eventually, Engels gave up the revolutionary approach entirely.[17] In addition, Marx thought of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in a benign sense – as better than the capitalist state – which could even assume a parliamentary form.[18] Hence, he and Engels expected the proletariat to be highly cultured, educated in German philosophy (especially as avid readers of Fichte and Hegel), trained in science, and in possession of administrative skills. Lenin, on the contrary, expected to carry out the final social revolution with an uneducated illiterate population.[19]

As a result of his mixture of Russian anarchism and misrepresentation of Marxism, Lenin's seizure of power was not a socialist revolution, but a coup d'état by a small group of conspirators, and the so-called Dictatorship of the Proletariat turned out to be an aristocracy maintained by an elitist group. As for the seizure of power, the Constituent Assembly, in which Bolsheviks were a minority, was overthrown on November 7, 1917 by a revolution of a Party, carried on by military and naval forces, which had nothing to do with socialism. The peasant masses were neither Bolshevik, nor did they participate in the Bolshevik revolution.[20] In brief, Masaryk did not see in Russian Bolshevism true Marxism, not its affirmation, but rather its refutation.[21]

Nazism

The virulence of Soviet Communism subsided after the introduction of NEP (1924) and until the onset of Stalin's terrorism in the mid-thirties (1936). In this hiatus, a new challenge to democracy – which Masaryk addressed during the last phase of his active life – was the rise of Hitler's Nazism in 1933-34. Masaryk did so most consistently in his review of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, written in April 1933, and in later interviews for newspaper articles.

Masaryk condemned unequivocally what he considered the two cardinal pillars of Hitler's ideology: racism and anti-Semitism. Simply said, pure races were not found anywhere in Europe, or anywhere else in the world. Scientific anthropology and ethnography of Germany showed that the German population east of the Elbe was Slav and, in East Prussia, Baltic. Even the Bavarians, whom Hitler extolled, had much Slavic and Celtic blood.[22] Despite claiming to be a socialist, Hitler – relying on his visceral anti-Semitism – tried

to discredit Marxism as a form of Judaism. According to Masaryk, this was blatantly incorrect since the principal teachers of Marx were the German gentiles Ludwig Feuerbach and Hegel, and the Englishman David Ricardo.[23]

Masaryk cited two primary sources of Hitler's weltanschauung: materialism and Pan-Germanism. Although Hitler condemned materialism in his critique of Marx, his own world view propagated nothing else but materialism. Marx's derivation of social reality from economics was not the sole example of materialism. Its variant was every movement which used force and compulsion to express itself. Hitler's all-powerful blood was no less material than Marx's economic conditions. Force attained its goals mechanically or materialistically.[24] As for Pan-Germanism, Masaryk pointed out that he had studied this virulent form of German nationalism, and written about it, before and during World War I. At that time it was more a theory, but in the 1930s it was gaining a practical application. It became known as National Socialism or racism. Its intellectual foundation, however, was still the views of Georg Schönerer, Heinrich von Treitschke, Paul de Lagarde, Theodor Mommsen, and Eduard von Hartmann.[25]

Turning to Hitler's personality, Masaryk pointed out two principal characteristics. The first one was an absolute self-confidence in his own leadership abilities. It led him to assert that World War I would have been won by Germany, if he had been in charge. He believed in his supernatural mission; the program of his party was to him a religion or rather a religious fanaticism. The second characteristic was a combination of this fanaticism with a rejection of compassion; he was unscrupulous and heartless. According to Masaryk, one might even say that "this pride á la Nietzsche had a distinct trait of a certain pleasure in suffering." He felt, however, that this aspect of Hitler's personality was best left for psychoanalysts to explore.[26]

Faith in the Future of Democracy

With the totalitarian regimes on the rise in the early 1930s, Masaryk was frequently asked, especially by journalists, his opinion about the survival of democracy. It was under attack mainly for two reasons: (1) by the Right, that it was unable to assure sufficient authority to the state, or (2) by the Left, that it was unable to abolish social inequalities. Masaryk's response was invariably optimistic. He commented: firstly, democracy was still a young institution. It began only with the French Revolution of 1789, while authoritarian regimes were as old as the world. Greeks and Romans had a certain form of democracy, but it was based on slavery. Secondly, while not perfect, democracy was stronger than the "old regime," which it overthrew. Hence the authoritarian governments were weaker, not stronger than democracy. If democracy had its faults, modern dictatorships had even greater ones. Thirdly, World War I had aroused fierce emotions, as had the current Great Economic Depression of the 1930s. Therefore, some sought a salvation in dictatorship for political or economic reasons. Masaryk counseled patience in order to await a decrease in tensions, and see what the future brings. Fourthly, democracies were not so weak as sometime maintained. In addition to Switzerland, which was the oldest, there were France, England, Belgium, Spain, Holland, the Scandinavian lands, and also Czechoslovakia. Fifthly, Masaryk made the paradoxical observation that even the modern dictators had to make a bow toward democracy and claim the consent of the people. Their authority was not monarchistic,

based on Providence, or on dynastic prerogatives. Rather, they attained power thanks to their energy and personal qualities. They instituted a political regime, which they attempted to make acceptable to the nation.[27]

In the long run, civilization zigzagged – sometime it even went slightly back – but on the whole, it moved forward. The period of the 1930s was one of a particular crisis, but that was only a transitional condition. The time would be eventually ripe for further advancement and, therefore, patience and sangfroide were needed in the meantime. Asked by Edgar A. Mowrer, reporter for the *Chicago Daily News* in July 1933, how democracy, once lost, could be restored as fast as possible. Masaryk responded: "Be governed by your conviction. Do not just talk about politics, but live it. Always speak the truth, and do not steal. Above all, do not be afraid of death."[28] Ultimately, to bolster his confidence in democracy as the highest calling of humanity, Masaryk tipped his hand into a spiritual direction. He stated that it was his firm belief that God, who created the world and its inhabitants, would not allow his handiwork to perish.[29] Thus, despite his overt opposition to traditional Churches, whether Protestant, Catholic, or Orthodox, Masaryk – as the bottom line – revealed his residual faith in a theistic religion.

Critique of Masaryk's Globalism

As a coda, it needs to be pointed out that Masaryk's globalism did not escape criticism either during his lifetime or subsequently. Masaryk was criticized in 1926 by the eminent Czech scholar and public intellectual, Arne Novák, for looking to all-human humanitarian motives (not national-liberating ones) in both *Česká otázka* (Czech Question)[30] and *Světová* revoluce (World Revolution). He had the soldiers of all nations fight for abstract ideals of democracy and humanity, while actually they struggled and died for tangible national interests.[31] More recently, at an emblematic conference on Masaryk's idea of democracy and contemporary Europeanism (*T. G. Masaryk, idea demokracie a současné evropanství)* in the millennial year 2000, Václav Klaus stated accusingly: "Masaryk [advanced] normatively construed European and global visions and concepts, and these were supported ... by popular and influential journalists and writers... As a result, national interests remained virtually unguarded..."[32]

Despite these criticisms, however, it would seem that Masaryk was a sound and perceptive thinker in his vision of humanity's progress from nationalism to trans-nationalism. More modern terminology might call this movement "globalization," but it is essentially the same phenomenon.

NOTES

1. This article is based on a lecture delivered at "A Celebration of 161st Anniversary of the Birth of T. G. Masaryk," organized by the Washington Chapter of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences, at the Embassy of the Czech Republic, March 6, 2011.

2. Thomas Mann, "In Memory of Masaryk," *The Nation* 145, no. 15 (October 9, 1937), 374.

3. W. Preston Warren, *Masaryk's Democracy: A Philosophy of Scientific and Moral Culture* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), 1.

4. Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Světová revoluce za války a ve válce, 1914-1918*, Spisy 15 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2005), 375-376. His war memoirs are also available in a somewhat abridged English translation, as Tomáš G. Masaryk, *The Making of a State: Memories and Observations, 1914-1918*, ed. Henry W. Steed (New York: George Allen and Unwin, 1927).

5. Ibid., 295-96.

6. Ibid., 197-98.

7. "Prezident Masaryk o věcech evropských a o sobě," *Lidové noviny* (Prague), March 19, 1933, p. 3, in Tomáš G.Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV,* Spisy 36 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 1997), 343-45.

8. "Demokracie neselhala," published as "There Be No New War," *Morning Post* (London) October 9, 1933, in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 382.

9. "Masaryk o demokracii a diktatuře," originally in *Právo lidu* (Prague), October 1, 1933, [based on interview for French reporter for *Quotidien*] in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 375.

10. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 387.

11. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia: Studies in History, Literature, and Philosophy*, tr. by Eden and Cedar Paul, and W. R. and Z. Lee, 2d ed, 3 vols. (London: Allen & Unwin, 1961-67).

12. See Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Otázka sociální: základy marxismu filosofické a sociologické*, 2 vols. Spisy 9-10 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000). A shortened English-language version is available as *Masaryk on Marx: An Abridged Edition of T. G. Masaryk, The Social Question: Philosophical and Sociological Foundations of Marxism*, ed. and tr. Erazim V. Kohak (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1972).

13. The Slavophiles would say that the Bosheviks were the most extreme Westernizers; Dostoevsky would see in Bolshevism a confirmation of the brutality foreseen in *The Possessed* [*Besy*]. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, Spisy 34 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2007), 19.

14. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 20-21.

15.Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie I,* Spisy 33 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2003), 175.

16. Ibid.

17. In reality, Lenin's Bolshevism is more a revolutionary anarchism. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie I*, 175.

18. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 20-21.

19. Lenin is mistaken in his assertion that the economic transformation would be easy, because Russia had few capitalists. See Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 18.

20. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie II*, 15-16.

21. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie I*, 175.

22. Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Masarykova recenze Hitlerovy knihy *Mein Kampf*," in Masaryk, Tomáš G., *Cesta demokracie IV,* 352.

23. Ibid., 351-352.

24. Ibid., 355.

25. "Masaryk o demokracii a diktatuře," in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 374. Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Masarykova recenze Hitlerovy knihy *Mein Kampf,* " 355. Concerning Masaryk's interpretation of radical

German nationalism, see also Zdeněk V. David, "Masarykův vztah k nacionalismu: střety s Paulem Antonem de Lagardem," *Filosofický časopis* (Prague) 58 (2010), 325-350; idem, "Masaryk on the Psychological and Philosophical Causes of World War I," *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 24, no. 1 (Fall 2010), 1-21.

26. Tomáš G. Masaryk, "Masarykova recenze Hitlerovy knihy *Mein Kampf*," 354.

27. "Masaryk o demokracii a diktatuře," in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 375-76.

28. "Prezident Masaryk o demokracii a diktaturach," first published as Edgar A. Mowrer, "Masaryk, Sage of Prague," *Chicago Daily News*, July 5, 1933, p. 6, in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 364.

29. Here is a rare instance of Masaryk's revealing the basis of his ultimate hope in the durability of democracy. "Prezident Masaryk o vývoji demokracie," first published in *Lidové noviny* (Prague), June 20, 1933, p. 3, in Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Cesta demokracie IV*, 360.

30. Tomáš G. Masaryk, *Česká otázka; Naše nynější krize; Jan Hus*, Spisy 6 (Prague: Masarykův ústav AV ČR, 2000). An English-language version is available as Tomáš G. Masaryk, *The Meaning of Czech History*, ed. René Wellek, tr. Peter Kussi (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1974).

31. Arne Novák, "Světová revoluce," *Lumír* 53 (1926) in Novák, *Nosiči pochodní: kniha české tradice* (Prague: Literární odbor Umělecké besedy and Kruh českých spisovatelů, 1928), 216-217. Novák also criticized Masaryk for attributing, in his war memoirs, the humanitarian impulse in world politics to the influence of the French Revolution. Prior to World War I he had seen its source primarily in the philosophy of Johann G. Herder. Ibid., 222-23.

32. Václav Klaus, "Projev předsedy Poslanecké sněmovny Parlamentu ČR," in Emil Voráček, ed., *T.G. Masaryk, idea demokracie a současné evropanství*, *sborník mezinárodní vědecké konference, Praha, 2. - 4. března 2000*, 2 vols. (Prague: Filosofia, 2001), 1:17-18.

The Valachian Dialect of Czech: Problems and a Description

By Andrew M. Drozd

In recent years there has been more scholarly interest in the Czech diaspora, especially the so-called Texas Czech community. While there has been a fair amount of research on this community in English,[1] work on its original homelands is rather scarce. Many Americans of Czech descent, especially the Texas Czechs, can trace their ancestry to the Valašsko region of today's Czech Republic and the Valachian dialect is one of the two major sources for Texas Czech speech.[2] However, any scholar or curious layman looking for basic information in English on this region will be greatly disappointed.[3] With regard to the dialect of the region, the situation is even more dire.[4] A survey of the major databases reveals that there is remarkably little description of the Valachian dialect available in English.[5] Moreover, for reasons that will be discussed below, information on this dialect is not necessarily easily available in Czech language sources. As a result the current article seeks to satisfy two constituencies: to provide a sophisticated enough description of the dialect to be of use to linguists without being too abstract for non-specialists of Czech descent who are seeking more information on their origins. However, before proceeding to a description of the dialect itself, there are several collateral issues that must be dealt with first. For the region of Valašsko bears a veritable host of baggage that simply cannot be ignored.[6]

The Geographical and Historical Setting

The geographical location of the Valachian dialect, the region known in Czech as Valašsko, is not an official administrative unit in the Czech lands. Officially it is part of the Zlín region (*Zlínský kraj*) and is located in the far eastern end of Moravia on the border with Slovakia. Until relatively recently the region was characterized by its poverty and often lagged behind more developed areas.[7] Because it has lacked official status, defining the territorial extent of Valašsko is a rather difficult matter and has been the source of some controversy. Several different criteria have been used to delimit the region (folk costume, economic forms, linguistic data, consciousness of the local community) which invariably produced differing boundaries.[8] This problem is abetted by the fact that the region began to assume its distinctive nature only in recent centuries and by the fact that the terms Valach and Valašsko only recently came to be widely accepted by the local population.[9] Almost all observers agree that the following towns are included in the region: Rožnov pod Radhoštěm, Vsetín, Valašské Klobouky, and Valašské Meziříčí. However, authors differ over whether to include Zlín[10] (Gottwaldov in the Communist era) and the Frenštát region within the confines of Valašsko.[11] Whatever its exact extent, Valašsko is a mountainous, rather scenic region that was settled extensively only relatively late and remained somewhat isolated well into the twentieth century.

Although the Czech lands were settled by the Slavs beginning in the 6th century, Valašsko itself remained rather sparsely populated for several centuries after their arrival. Since the region has little good agricultural land the initial Slavic settlers simply bypassed it for greener pastures. As the population density grew in the western areas, however, pressure began to mount to settle the marginal areas. The first extensive settlement of Valašsko occurred in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries with the focus mainly on the western half of

the region where there is some arable land available.[12]Although this settlement long gave rise among scholars to all sorts of theories as to the origins of these settlers, archival research revealed that the majority came from adjoining areas in Moravia. As a result of the influx, the western half of Valašsko was already well settled by the 16th century and most villages in existance in the region today date from that time.[13] The eastern half of Valašsko, however, is much more mountainous and rocky and much less suitable for agriculture. For many centuries it was only very sparsely populated and the property there was given very little attention by its owners.[14] In the 17th century agricultural settlement in the eastern areas began in earnest and continued into the 18th century with the village of Velké Karlovice founded as late as 1714. This settlement pattern is often referred to as the *pasekářská* colonization and involved the establishment of new agricultural fields located at higher elevations than previously.[15] While the Valachian colonization (see below) did introduce a new economic form into the area, it was the *pasekářská* colonization, which came from the native settled farming population, that was the most signficant element for populating the mountainous areas of Valašsko.[16]

Given the lack of arable land in Valašsko the local population had to find alternatives to traditional agriculture.[17] One economic form that became extremely important for the regional economy was *salašnictví*, the so-called Valachian method of animal husbandry.[18] This method was first introduced at the end of the fifteenth century and all evidence indicates that it came from the east, from beyond the Czech lands.[19] While animal husbandry was by no means unknown in the Czech lands before that time, the Valachian method of raising of sheep involved substantial differences. Instead of raising sheep for wool and meat, the emphasis was on the production of milk products and a different breed of sheep was employed for this purpose.[20] While traditional methods involved the raising of animals on one's property as supplement to agriculture, the Valachian method differed in that the animals were kept outside the confines of the village often at significant distances and thus their upkeep was a time-intensive occupation. Once this method was brough to Valašsko it allowed for a much deeper utilization of the land and allowed for a much higher population density. As a result much of the population in the region adopted this economic form and it began to assume a distinctive identity from the other regions of the Czech lands. Part of the distinctive identity, however, was the poverty that characterized the region until the advent of industrialization.[21] The Valachian method reigned supreme for several centuries but eventually fell out of use under the pressure of modern development.[22] Although the region now bears the name Valašsko and the local population refers to itself as Valach, there is little today that remains of the economic form that gave rise it to all.

Are the Czech Valachs Actually Slavicized Romanians?

The Czech word *Valach*[23] bears no small resemblance to the term *Vlach/Vlakh*,[24] the general Slavic term for speakers of Latin, and its derivatives *Wallach* and *Wallachia* and, as a result, gave rise to much speculation that the inhabitants of Valašsko are Romanian in origin.[25] Although there were some predecessors in this regard, the major figure in sponsoring the Romanian theory was no less than Franz Miklosich. Based largely on the presence of words of Romanian origin in the lexicon of the Valachian dialect as well as the name *Valach*, Miklosich came to the conclusion that the Moravian Valachs most

likely represented the descendants of a mixed population of Slavs and Romanians.[26] Given Miklosich's scholarly standing, his views were accepted by many scholars, including the pioneering Czech dialectologist František Bartoš.[27] Although there were some dissenters,[28] the majority of scholars to some extent accepted Miklosich's view which predominated well into the twentieth century.[29] Indeed, this theory became particularly popular with Romanian figures, with T. Burada even arguing that there were 150,000 Romanians living in Moravia and that it was an important task to awaken them to a Romanian national consciousness.[30] As part of this process, any word in the Valachian dialect or place name in the region that was of unclear origin was automatically assumed to be Romanian.[31]

The late 1930's saw this view come under serious challenge and led to an extremely bitter polemic in Czechoslovakia with scholars accusing one another of being insufficiently educated or well read in the necessary fields, of misrepresenting positions and misquotation, and, during the Communist years, of being insufficiently Marxist-Leninist. In large part, this change resulted from a more skeptical attitude regarding the philological evidence. Machek, for example, acknowledged that there were a certain number of words of Romanian origin (or of unclear origin) in the Valachian dialect, but that it was an open question as to whether true Romanians settled there and were Slavicized or whether just the words moved along together with the spread of a particular type of pastoralism.[32] One of the major figures in this polemic was Dmitr Krandžalov whose 1938 book, *Romanian Influences in the Carpathians with Special Reference to Moravian Valašsko*, represented a serious challenge to the Romanian theory.[33] In addition to providing a survey of previous literature on the topic, Krandžalov undertook a philological analysis of all the supposed Romanianisms, not only in Valašsko, but throughout the Slavic Carpathians. As a result of very exacting criticism, for which he was often harshly criticized,[34] Krandžalov reduced the number of supposed Romanianisms in the Valachian lexicon of Moravia to a mere 26 words, almost all of which dealt with a specific type of animal husbandry.[35] For a theory that had been founded almost solely on philological evidence this was a very serious challenge. Based on this analysis, Krandžalov would argue repeatedly that there simply was no valid evidence, be it linguistic, historical, etc., that Romanians ever migrated to Moravia in significant numbers.[36]

Krandžalov's work produced a rather rapid reaction in the work of V. Davídek, who took it upon himself to verify the former's conclusions with archival research.[37] Although Davídek's focus was on the Těšín region, not Valašsko, his book, *The Settlement of Těšínsko by the Valachs*, also constituted a serious blow to the theory of the Romanian origin of the Valachs. In his book Davídek subjected personal names found in archival sources as well as place names to scrutiny and determined that there was no trace of Romanian names.[38] Based upon his own research as well as those who came before him, Davídek boldly proclaimed that the theory that the Valachs of the Těšín region were Romanian was a mere fable and that all evidence indicated that they are a Slavic people.[39] Like Krandžalov, Davídek too would come under criticism for various aspects of his arguments.[40] However, the efforts of these two scholars left the Romanian theory in a much weakened position and it would never recover its former position.[41]

In the post-WWII era several scholars challenged Krandžalov's many

assertions, including the philological analysis of the Valachian lexicon.[42] Although Krandžalov's explication of several words was challenged, most scholars, however reluctantly, were forced to accept his position that the Romanian component of the Valachian lexicon was very small and very limited.[43] Indeed, if one were to use lexicon and local place names as the criterion, one would have an easier time arguing that the Moravian Valachs were of German origin, for the German component of the Valachian lexicon is larger than the Romanian one.[44] Moreover, Czech dialectologists who did intensive field work in eastern Moravia in the post-war era came to the conclusion that the only area in which any Romanian influence could be detected on the Valachian dialect was in the lexicon of the pastoral profession. The Romanian language had absolutely no influence on the phonological or grammatical structure of the Valachian dialect.[45] The linguistic evidence simply did not support the notion of a large-scale influx of Romanian immigrants into eastern Moravia. Given that the theory had arisen based almost entirely on linguistic arguments, this was indeed a very serious blow.[46]

The Romanian theory was also called into question by historical research that was done in the post-WWII era. In particular, as a result of the confiscations of 1945 and 1948, numerous materials that had previously been in private hands suddenly became available for study.[47] As Czech scholars (particularly Josef Macůrek in his monograph *The Valachs in the Western Carpathians in the 15th-18th Centuries*[48]) worked through these materials and, as the result of archeological work, many old assumptions fell to the way side. Whereas the Valašsko region had previously been viewed as empty until its colonization by the Valachs, the various sources revealed that much of the area had been settled by the native population of Moravia before the arrival of the Valachs.[49] Moreover, the historical sources demonstrated that while there were indeed some non-Czechs among the Valachs, they were not Romanian, but primarily Slovak, with some Polish and Rusyn elements.[50] Regardless of their ethnic origin, the sources show that foreign Valachs were a very small portion of the population and that many of the so-called Valachs were actually native Czechs who had taken up the pastoral lifestyle.[51] Indeed, even the colonization of the eastern highland areas of Valašsko, which took place in the 17th and 18th centuries, is easily documented to have come from the local Czech population.[52] But perhaps most relevant is the fact that the sources showed that the Valachs, of whom there had been so much talk, existed in rather small numbers.[53] As a result of these developments by the 1970s most Czech scholars, even those who had battled Krandžalov on various issues, had rejected the validity of the Romanian theory.[54] The historian Josef Macůrek, who was perhaps the most reluctant to let go of the theory,[55] stated in response to Krandžalov's attacks, that the native population was clearly the primary element.[56] Likewise, the linguist Antonín Vašek stated that the Romanian theory was both flawed in the methodological foundations upon which it was built as well as factually.[57] Finally, the ethnographer Jaroslav Štika clearly states in his most recent work that the Romanian ethnic element never penetrated beyond eastern Slovakia and that the domestic Czech element clearly played the primary role in Moravian Valašsko.[58] While almost all agree that the Valachian method of animal husbandry originated in modern-day Romania, few at this point view the Valachian population of eastern Moravian as Romanian in origin.[59]

Is Valachian Czech or Slovak?

No less problematic was the issue of whether the population of Valašsko consisted of the descendants of Slovak colonists and whether the Valachian dialect was a branch of Slovak, not Czech. Indeed, in many ways the issue is much thornier because Valašsko and Slovakia border each other and there was much interaction between eastern Moravia and western Slovakia over the centuries. While some Czech scholars who researched the Valachian colonization either rejected or minimized the role of an ethnic Romanian element, they still stressed the foreign nature of the Valachs[60] and some saw the Valachian colonization as essentially a Slovak one.[61] Scholars working in various fields have clearly demonstrated that eastern Moravia had a close relationship with western Slovakia. Even in this regard, however, the foreign nature of the Valachs should not be overstressed. As noted above, the actual number of foreign newcomers of whatever origin was quite small and the majority of "Valachs" in Moravia were native Czechs who had taken up the Valachian lifestyle.

While many scholars were arguing over the ultimate origins of the Valachian population in Moravia, Czech dialectologists had a different issue to face with regard to the current state of the language spoken in the region. For, to even the most casual observer, it was quite obvious that the Valachian dialect, like the other dialects of eastern Moravia, bore a strong resemblance to Slovak.[62] As Czech dialectologists have routinely noted, drawing a boundary between eastern Moravian and western Slovak is extremely difficult and many opted for the political boundary by default.[63] In the early days of Czech dialectology it was simply taken as a given that the east Moravian dialects had more in common with Slovak than with the other dialects on Bohemian and Moravian territory.[64] As a result the term Moravian Slovak was routinely applied to this group of dialects.[65] So strong was this attitude that in Bohuslav Havránek's 1934 study of Czech dialects, to which almost all Czech dialectologists routinely paid homage,[66] Valachian is left out along with the other east Moravian dialects. Rather, since these dialects were considered to be a part of Slovak, they fell under the rubric of Václav Vážný's study of Slovak dialects that appeared in the same year.[67] Czech scholars were quite comfortable with this scheme due to the prevailing notion of Czechslovakism, that is, that Czech and Slovak were two branches of one language. It would come to haunt the Czechs in the post-Munich era, however, when some Slovak nationalists argued that the border of Slovakia should be adjusted to the west in order to incorporate these "Slovak" territories.[68]

Unsurprisingly, in the post-war era Czech linguists began to lose their enthusiasm for Czechoslovakism and the designation Moravian Slovak. While duly recognizing the validity of Slovak as a separate language, much emphasis was now placed on the fact that the dialects of eastern Moravia were a part of the Czech national language.[69] In addition, due to the intense amount of fieldwork done in the post-war era a better picture of the dialects of eastern Moravia began to emerge.[70] With the exception of the Kopanice district in Slovácko, very little Slovak influence could be ascertained on these dialects.[71] In particular, these dialects showed no specific Slovak innovation (e.g., the first person singular verb ending *–em* for verbs of the type *nesu*) while they had the very Czech feature *ř*.[72] Czech linguists continued to recognize that this group of dialects had many similarities with Slovak and that they formed a transitional zone between Czech and Slovak,[73] but that this was due to their archaic nature,

not the direct influence of Slovak.[74] Now viewing these dialects as archaic Czech,[75] not Slovak, Czech linguists, led by Jaromír Bělič, began to push for a new term for this group of dialects: East Moravian.[76]

Is There a Valachian Dialect?

Surprisingly enough, information on the Valachian dialect is not as easily available as one would expect. Even with regard to Czech language sources, the information on the dialect is rather difficult to obtain.[77] In part this can be traced to the long-held notion that Valachian was a part of Slovak outlined above. However, even in sources from the post-WWII era information on the dialect could be difficult to find. The problem is furthered by the manner in which some specialists choose to treat the dialect. Rather than treat the dialect in isolation, specialists would usually deal with it only in relation to the east Moravian dialects as a whole. As a result, although the information is there, it is not presented in a manner that is quickly accessible to the non-specialist.

This situation can be clearly linked in large part to the controversy over the supposed Romanian origin of the Valachs. Because of this Czech dialectologists developed what can only be described as an allergic reaction to the very concept of a separate Valachian dialect. For example, Skulina argued that the term "Valachian dialect" was an ethnographic term, not a linguistic one and that since the dialect in the region contained absolutely no Valachian (i.e., Romanian) grammatical features, it should be abandoned.[78] While some of the first Czech dialectologists were amenable to the concept of a Valachian dialect,[79] in the post-WWII era, Czech dialectologists seemed determined to avoid the term at all costs. A good example is the work of Jaromír Bělič whose two books on Czech dialects provide quite good information, but in a manner that makes it difficult to sift out the defining characteristics of the Valachian dialect. For example, in his 1988 survey of Czech dialects (*Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*) he treats the East Moravian group as a whole and only then deals with each subgroup, giving the features that differentiate it from the main group. With regard to Valachian he labels it as the "northern subgroup of the east Moravian dialects" and only grudgingly provides the term "Valachian" in parentheses.[80] Post-war linguists also avoided focusing on the Valachian dialect in isolation by treating all the northern area of East Moravian as one zone. Areas not traditionally considered a part of Valašsko were lumped together with the traditional territory to create a rather unwieldy object. For example, in both of his surveys of Czech dialects Bělič lumped together both the eastern and western areas of northern East Moravian as did Skulina in his excellent monograph.[81] The dialects of the areas to the west of Valašsko (Hranicko, Kelč, etc.), while still a part of East Moravian, are transitional in nature and are not quite as archaic as Valachian. Treating all these dialects together helped to obscure the unique nature of Valachian within Czech. Perhaps the most flagrant example, however, was Jan Chloupek's proposal that the traditional isoglosses dividing the regions of Valašsko and Slovácko (that is, the existence of the *y* and the soft labials in Valašsko), be replaced by the isogloss of third-person plural verb forms. Chloupek's scheme was in no way better than the traditional one; indeed, in many ways it was worse. But it did provide the advantage of allowing him to divide East Moravian into three zones instead of two and thus dispense with the traditional labels.[82] Throughout his many works on East Moravian Chloupek consistently declined to treat either the Valachian dialect or the dialect of Slovácko in isolation. Chloupek's readers are presented

with some extremely detailed material, but would have to perform some rather careful sifting in order determine what is specifically Valachian.[83]

Thus, most Czech dialectologists preferred simply treat the eastern Moravian group as a whole, although they would periodically refer to the archaic kernel (i.e., Valachian) within it.[84] Of all the Czech dialectologists in the post-war era only Antonín Vašek displayed any willingness to recognize a separate Valachian dialect.[85] Vašek, perhaps motivated by regional pride,[86] identified some 29 features that more or less separate Valachian from its immediate neighbors and make it a viable entity.[87] Despite the quality of his work, which by and large was accepted by other Czech linguists, these same linguists continued disregarding Valachian as a separate dialect.[88]

Valachian's Place within Czech

As specialists in Czech are well aware, the linguistic situation in the Czech lands is anything but simple. The complications in large part are due to the fact that there is often a considerable amount of distance between the literary language used in books and the mass media and the actual utterance of any Czech, regardless of socio-economic status. Foreigners studying Czech are routinely confronted with the fact that what they have learned in class or from a textbook differs significantly from what they will hear in conversation and often require a significant period of adjustment. This discrepancy can be traced to the decisions made by the activists during the Czech National Awakening to use an older form of the literary language pre-dating the Battle of White Mountain (1620) despite the fact that the Czech language had continued to develop in the interval. As a result, there has been a perpetual battle between Literary Czech and so-called Colloquial Czech for the past two centuries.[89]

As complicated as this description sounds, which is often the extent presented in traditional discussions, it by no means exhausts the issue and is something of an oversimplification. For one thing, even specialists in Czech are by no means agreed on what is Colloquial Czech and there have been several terms used to catch various nuances of the issue: Colloquial Czech, Common Czech, etc. For example, the term Colloquial Czech has sometimes been used to describe any form of spoken Czech that differs from the literary language. The problem is, however, that there are many varieties of spoken Czech and these have varying sources. Just how to define all these varieties accurately is an issue that I in no way intend to revisit here for it has been quite well discussed in the literature.[90] But it should be noted that the discussion most accurately applies to Bohemia, the westernmost province of the Czech lands. That is, so-called "Colloquial" or "Common" Czech and its divergence from literary Czech is actually a "Bohemian" phenomenon.[91] The discussions of Literary Czech versus "Colloquial Czech" are often conducted as if the province of Moravia (and Czech Silesia) and the corresponding regional dialects did not exist.

Generally, speaking the various dialects of Moravia tend to be more conservative linguistically than those of Bohemia. The further east one goes, the more archaic the dialects become. In the far eastern part of Moravia, as we have already seen, many of the most archaic dialects bear much in common with Slovak. Since Literary Czech itself is an archaic form, the distance between spoken Czech in Moravia and Literary Czech is less than that between spoken Czech in Bohemia and the literary language. Indeed, it is often a source of pride for Moravians to point out that their speech is closer to the norms of

literary Czech.[92] In some ways the decision to adopt a more archaic form of the language as the literary norm was a fortunate one that may have very well headed off a split between Moravia and Bohemia in the nineteenth century.[93]

The Czech lands are typically divided into four basic dialect zones.[94] Traditionally these were labeled Bohemian, Hanak (central Moravia, including both Brno and Olomouc), Lachian, and Moravian Slovak. More recently, however, the latter three have been replaced by the terms Central Moravian, Silesian and East Moravian.[95] Czech linguists separate these groups based on several key isoglosses. In Literary Czech the term "good neighbor" is rendered as *hodný soused*. In the dialects, the term is rendered thus:

Bohemian	*hodnej soused*
Central Moravian/Hanak	*hodné sósed*
Silesian/Lachian	*hodny sused*
East Moravian/Moravian Slovak	*hodný súsed* [96]

In the Bohemian group Old Czech *ý* and *ú* have gone to *ej* and *ou* respectively. In Central Moravian/Hanak they have gone to *é* and *ó*. In Silesian/ Lachian and East Moravian/Moravian Slovak there has been no vowel shift; however Lachian is distinguished by the loss of quantity (i.e, the distinction between long and short vowels).[97] As this example indicates, the East Moravian/Moravian Slovak group is the most conservative of the four with no change whatsoever from Old Czech.[98]

Valašsko falls in the zone of Moravian Slovak/East Moravian and, like the rest of the region, its dialect shares numerous features in common with Slovak. However, the region has long politically been a part of the Czech lands, not Slovakia. As a result, when schools were introduced into the region, it was literary Czech that was taught not Slovak; Czech was used as the language of the mass media; and so forth. As a result, despite the very close similarity of the Eastern Moravian dialects to Slovak, the inhabitants of the region think of themselves as Czech and it is literary Czech that has prestige status in the region.[99]

Although some linguists regard Valachian as a mere subgroup (*podskupina*) of a larger dialect, we will treat it here as a separate entity. This is a good time to stress, however, that the dialects of Moravia form a continuum and that Valachian shares many features in common with its Czech neighbors.[100] It should also be emphasized that even within the relatively small region of Valašsko itself, there is a considerable amount of variation. Indeed, some of studies have been careful to list almost every feature that occurs even if isolated to just a few villages.[101] In this discussion, however, we are primarily concerned with features that characterize the region as a whole and differentiate it from literary Czech.

Finally, it should be emphasized that the situation that prevails in Valašsko as well as all of eastern Moravia today is very different from that of the nineteenth century when the first studies in dialectology were done. That is to say, urbanization and industrialization led to the breakdown of the traditional isolation of the villages and a leveling of the dialects has taken place.[102] It was once assumed that the local dialects would quickly die out and be replaced by Literary Czech (or Common Czech) but this did not happen.[103] Rather, the local dialects began to be replaced by interdialects.[104] With each passing decade, Czech linguists were forced to acknowledge that regional speech was proving more resistant than expected.[105] Indeed, in some cases the formation of an interdialect was taking the local speech further away from Literary Czech.[106] Be that as it may, however, years of schools teaching literary Czech and the mass media using it have had an effect on the local speech.[107] As a result, "pure" Valachian so to speak no longer exists and each successive generation is more literary in its speech.[108] Features of Literary Czech have replaced certain features in the local speech and a hybrid has resulted. As stated, however, the situation is rather complicated because not only has literary Czech reached

the region, but so has "Colloquial" Czech. Although "Colloquial" Czech does not have the same prestige as Literary Czech, the inhabitants of Valašsko are routinely exposed to it via popular music and television.[109] Thus, despite "Colloquial" Czech's lack of status, it cannot be discounted when describing the current linguistic situation of the area.[110] Unlike the situation often described with regard to Prague where the situation is that of two competing varieties of Czech, in Valašsko there are three. However, perhaps counteracting the influence of "Colloquial" Czech is the resentful attitude that many Moravians take toward Prague and the "Colloquial" Czech associated with it.[111]

Three competing varieties might sound chaotic enough, but that still is not the entire story.[112] As discussed above Valachian shares a lot in common with Slovak and although Literary Czech is the prescribed norm, Slovak has by no means ceased to be relevant. Indeed, an interesting question for an enterprising linguist is to what extent Slovak has played a role in moderating the influence of both Literary and Colloquial Czech. With the establishment of Czechoslovakia in 1918, there was much interaction between the Czech and Slovak cultures. Residents of Valašsko, like other Czechs, were routinely exposed to literary Slovak via Czechoslovak television and radio.[113] Even with the separation that took place in 1993, the border is rather permeable. More importantly various elements of Slovak culture continue to be available to all Czechs. Even after 1993 Slovak popular music continues to be regularly featured on Czech radio, Slovak performers regularly appear on Czech television and tour the country. Indeed, in many music stores, Slovak popular music is not even considered foreign: it is placed in the native (*domácí*) section (as opposed to the foreign, *zahraniční*, one). In addition, many Czechs have access to Slovak television via cable services and in Valašsko some areas are able to receive Slovak television via the airwaves. So while Valachian does not have prestige status, the question is: does the fact that it is so close to something that does have prestige in any way raise the prestige level of the local speech? Similar to the possible moderating influence of Slovak, the linguist should also consider the moderating influence that folk music plays. As Lamprecht once noted, the prestige associated with folklore contributes the resistance of the local dialect.[114] In Valašsko traditional folklore does have much prestige and folk bands continue to perform traditional songs that use the older dialectical forms. In addition, regional publications help to keep the traditional dialect alive at some level.[115]

Phonology

Valachian shares much in common with Literary Czech in terms of phonology but it does have several significant differences. For example, Literary Czech has an inventory of ten vowels: five short (*a, e, i, o, u*) and five long (*á, é, í, ó, ú*). Literary Czech makes use of the symbol *y* for historical reasons but it does not represent a different sound (*y=i*, *ý=í*). In Valachian, however, the vowel inventory is arguably larger for *y* and *ý* represent distinct sounds (compare with Russian *u* versus *ы*),[116] giving a total vowel inventory of twelve. Most Czech dialectologists do not regard the *i* and *y* as separate phonemes because of the preservation of the soft labials in Valachian. That is, the sound *i* always follows soft consonants in Valachian, whereas the *y* always follows hard ones. Thus, they are viewed as variants of one basic phoneme.[117] One should note, however, that the occurrence of the sound *y* in Valachian does not

always coincide with the spelling of *y* in LC. In Valachian those things that are *i* in LC tend to be pronounced as *y* when following certain consonants, especially those letters containing a *haček* (*ž*, *š*) or after sybilants. Thus, the second-person singular form of the verb "to be" appears as *jsi* in LC but is pronounced as *sy* in Valachian.[118]

Generally speaking, Valachian has tended to be rather conservative regarding vowel shifts compared to Literary Czech or most other Czech dialects. Thus many vowels inherited from the prehistoric period tend to remain. The various vowel shifts took place in most Czech dialects in the 12th-16th centuries[119] but most never occurred in Valašsko. Two prominent vowel shifts (Czech *přehláska*) relevant for Literary Czech are *a* > *e* and *u* > *i*. *Přehláska* took place after consonants that were historically soft (*ď, ť, ň, č, ž, š, ř, c, j*).[120] Thus, in LC those words containing the old *a/á* (including those coming from Proto-Slavic *ę*) which occurs after a hard consonant, continue to have this vowel in the modern language: *had* (snake), *obraz* (picture), *dávno* (long ago). Here LC and Valachian match up very well. After historically soft consonants, however, the absence of *přehláska* in Valachian leads to some significant differences: LC *ležet* (to lie) versus Valachian *ľežať* (cf. Slovak *ležať*), LC *pršet* (to rain) versus Valachian *pršať* (cf. Slovak *pršať*), LC *práce* (work) versus Valachian *práca* (cf. Slovak *práca*), and so on.[121] Valachian is also more archaic regarding the old *u*/*ú* (including that which developed from Proto-Slavic *ǫ*). These vowels are preserved after both hard and soft consonants. Thus Valachian matches up well with LC when *u/ú* follows hard consonants: *dub* (oak), *ruka* (hand). However, due to the fact that Valachian does not have the *přehláska u* > *i*, there are significant divergences with LC after historically soft consonants: LC *jih* (south) versus Valachian *juh* (cf. Slovak *juh*) or LC *lidé* (people) versus Valachian *ľudé*.[122] LC also had one other development with the old long *ū* (including that which developed from Proto-Slavic *ǭ*) which changed to the diphthong *ou* in every position except initial.[123] Again, the change is absent in Valachian because of the conservative, archaic nature of the dialect: *ú* is used instead.[124] Thus Literary Czech *mouka* (flour) appears in Valachian as *múka* (cf. Slovak *múka*), *soused* (neighbor) as *súsed* (cf. Slovak *sused*), *moudrý* (wise) as *múdrý* (cf. Slovak *múdry*), and so on. Finally, the shift (*užení*) *é* > *í* is present in LC but not in Valachian. Thus the old *é* remains in Valachian *kamének* but compare with LC *kamínek* (flint, stone). The lack of these vowel shifts has enourmous significance for morphology which we will discuss below.

Although the lack of vowel changes cited above make Valachian look strikingly different from LC in some respects, the two do share some vowel changes in common. For example, as in LC, the shifts *ie* > *í* and *ó* > *uo* > *ů* took place in Valachian.[125] Thus in both LC and Valachian the Proto-Slavic *ó* has gone to *ů/ú*: LC *kůň* (horse), *dům* (house), Valachian *kúň, dúm* and so on.[126] Likewise in both LC and Valachian *ie* (derived from the Proto-Slavic long *ě*) has shifted to *í*: *míra* (measure), *písek* (sand), *hřích* (sin).[127]

Regarding vowel quantity (i.e., long versus short vowels) Valachian speech usually matches up well with Literary Czech. However, it exhibits a loss of vowel quantity in certain situations. For example, feminine nouns that are monosyllabic or disyllabic usually have a short vowel: LC *bába* (old woman), *vrána* (crow) but Valachian *baba*, *vrana*. However, neuter nouns ending in *–ní* often have a root vowel that is long. Thus, LC *psaní* (writing), but Valachian *psáňí*.[128] In some areas of Valašsko there is also the tendency to lengthen

the *e* before the *–ní* in these types of nouns: thus LC *kamení* (stone), *stavení* (building), *znamení* (sign) become *kaméňí*, *stavéňí*, *znaméňí*. With certain verbs there is a tendency to have a long *ó* before *j*: *dójiť* (LC *dojit* "to milk"), etc. In some areas the *j* drops out before *i* but the long *ó* remains: *dóiť*, *stóiť*. [129]

There are also significant differences between Literary Czech and Valachian when it comes to the consonants. Literary Czech has an inventory of 24 consonants plus one semivowel with phonemic status.[130] The inventory in Valachian is much larger with 33 consonants because of the archaic nature of the dialect.[131] Perhaps of most importance is the preservation of the soft labials before vowels. Thus, in Valachian [b'], [f'], [m'], [p'] and [v'] exist as separate phonemes. For example, in Valachian the phrase (*ona) była* (she was) is easily distinguished from (*ona) b'iła* (she hit) in terms of phonetics. In LC the two phrases [*(ona), byla*, *(ona) bila*] sound alike and are distinguished by context. Unlike Literary Czech these are true soft consonants and are not to be confused with the situation in Literary Czech when the labials are followed by the symbol *ě*. Thus the *pě* in *pěkný* is pronounced [pje] in LC but [p'e] in Valachian.[132] With regard to *ť*, *ď*, and *ň* the situation in Valachian is the same as in LC. That is, these consonants have gone from being palatalized to being palatals.[133]

Further increasing the consonant inventory in Valachian is the existence of two different *l* sounds. In Literary Czech the old distinction between a hard and soft *l* has not been maintained. In fact, both the hard *l* and soft *l* have been lost in LC and a "middle" *l* has replaced both. Valachian, however, retained both the older sounds.[134] To designate the hard *l* Czech dialectologists use the symbol *ł*.[135] Thus, words that appear with a standard *l* in Literary Czech *lasička* (weasel), *lavička* (bench) appear as *łaska*, *łavečka* when representing Valachian speech. To designate the soft *l*, the symbol *l'* is used: Valachian *ml'éko* vs. LC *mléko* (milk).[136] In Valachian the *l* sounds have phonemic status; that is, the pronunciation of a hard versus a soft *l* can change the meaning of a word: *l'ep'iť* (to glue) vs. *łep'iť* (to strike lightly).[137] In Literary Czech both *l* and *r* are vocalic when occurring between two other consonants *vlk* (wolf), *strč* (push). This occurs also in Valachian, but unlike LC the sounds can also be long (indicated by the symbols *ĺ* and *ŕ*): for example, the diminutive form for wolf: *vĺča* (compare with LC *vlček*).[138] For *ŕ* compare Valachian *kŕmiť* with LC *krmit* (to feed).[139] Finally, one should note that the *ĺ* is always soft.[140]

Valachian has two sounds that exist in Literary Czech but which do not have phonemic status: *ʒ* and *ǯ*. Both of these sounds occur in Literary Czech because of the assimilation of voiceless consonants by voiced consonants in a consonant cluster either within a word or over a word boundary. Thus, in Literary Czech *c* goes to *ʒ*: *noc byla* [noʒbila]. Similarly, LC *č* goes to *ǯ*: *meč byl* [meǯbil].[141] In Valachian, however, the sound *ʒ* occurs as an independent phoneme, either in words of onomatopoeic origin or in words representing a survival of Proto-Slavic **dj*.[142] In most forms of Czech the reflex was *dj* > *dz'* > *z* (**medja* > **medz'a* > *meze*).[143] However, in Valachian this development was never completed. Thus LC *cizí* (foreign), *mez* (limit) is [*cuʒí*], [*meʒa*] in Valachian (cf. Slovak *cudzí*, *medza*).[144] The sound *ǯ* also exists in Valachian, especially in words of onomatopoeic origin and in words derived from Proto-Slavic **zdj*. Thus LC *opožděný* (delayed), *ujíždět* (to leave) but Valachian [*opožǯený*], [*ujíǯǯať*].[145] Valachian also has one allophone of *n* which does not appear in LC. In LC before the velars *k* and *g*, the sound *ŋ* occurs.[146] In this environment in Valachian a similar phenomenon takes place,

but it is the nasal *ń* that occurs instead.[147]

In both Literary Czech and Literary Slovak the stress is on the first syllable of a word (that is, in words that have stress). Traditional Valachian departs radically from this pattern, resembling the Polish model with stress on the penultimate syllable. However, Czech dialectologists have been somewhat divided on just how widespread this phenomenon was. Bartoš, for example, saw this feature as limited to just a few areas.[148] But the fieldwork done in the post-WWII era revealed that the feature was more widespread than previously believed.[149] Czech dialectologists were also divided regarding the origin of this feature. Many assumed that the feature of penultimate stress was simply due to Polish influence,[150] while others argued that it was due to the influx of settlers from Lachian regions.[151] But Trávníček, for example, argued that Polish was not likely to have rendered much influence since the Valachian territory shares no border with the Polish. Citing analogs elsewhere in the Slavic world, he argued that the feature could easily have arisen independently.[152] Havránek, in contrast, while agreeing that Polish influence was not an issue, argued that given the archaic nature of the dialect, it was quite likely that penultimate stress was the original feature and first-syllable stress was a later development that did not occur in Valašsko.[153] Although Havránek's argument was mostly a hypothesis, some twenty years later, Romportl produced a study indicating that Havránek's hypothesis was valid.[154] As a result, this is yet one more indication of the archaic, conservative nature of the Valachian dialect.

These are many of the main phonological features that distinguish Valachian from LC but by no means exhaust the list. Lesser items include voicing assimilation in unexpected situations. Thus, for example, voiceless consonants will voice before vowels and sonorants: *jsme* [*zme*], *kupme* [*kubme*], *nemluvme*.[155] This feature is particularly evident with regard to the voicing of prepositions, especially if the following word begins with a vowel. Thus, *k mostu* [*g mostu*], *k akátu* [*g akátu*], *k uchu* [*g uchu*], *s okna* [*z okna*]. Likewise *se*, whether as a preposition or a prefix, is typically pronounced [*ze*]: [*ze súsedem*]. Moreover, the consonant *v* can often cause assimilation over word boundaries: thus *k vašemu* [*g vašemu*].[156] As throughout much of Moravia, the combination *sh* does not have progressive assimilation as in LC. In LC the cluster is pronounced as *sch*. Thus the common phrase *na shledanou* (goodbye) is pronounced in LC as [*naschledanou*] but in most Moravian dialects the assimilation is regressive: [*nazhledanou*].[157] Valachian also preserves the consonant cluster *šč* whereas LC has *št*: Valachian *ščekať*, *ščetka* versus LC *štěkat* (to bark), *štětka* (brush).[158] Finally, another significant distinction that makes Valachian appear closer to Slovak than to Literary Czech concerns the initial *j*. As in Slovak, in Valachian the *j* is lost at the beginning of many words, especially when followed by the front vowel *i*. Thus Literary Czech *jídlo* (food) is *ídło* in Valachian, *jiný* (other) is *iný* (cf. Slovak *iný*), *jít* (to walk, to go) is *ít* (cf. Slovak *ísť*), and so on.[159]

Morphology

Although the concept of *přehláska* discussed above properly belongs to the realm of phonology, the lack of the shift of *a* > *e* and *u* > *i* has tremendous importance for Valachian morphology. In Literary Czech this vowel shift took place after historically soft consonants, which when it comes to declension, means a different set of endings for many soft-stem nouns. Thus for feminine nouns which typically ended in *-a*, this gave rise to a whole class of femi-

nine nouns ending in *–e*. For example, hard-stem *kniha* (book), *sestra* (sister) but soft-stem *ulice* (street), *práce* (work)*, vůle* (will). Since this vowel shift never took place in Valachian, the nominative case forms for the latter words end in *–a*: *uľica*, *práca, vúľa* (cf. Slovak *ulica*, *práca, vôľa)*.

This also carries over into other cases. In Literary Czech the vowel shift *u* > *i* has greatly complicated the singular accusative case forms of the soft-stem feminine nouns. Thus *kniha* has the traditional ending *–u* (*knihu*) but the soft stems have *–i*: *ulici*, *práci, vůli*. By comparison however, Valachian retains the traditional *–u* ending, thus *uľicu*, *prácu, vúľu*. As a result, because of the lack of *přehláska* the Valachian declensional system can easily be described as much simpler than that of Literary Czech. Although the declension of hard and soft stems is by no means identical, a look at Figure 1 readily confirms this fact:

Figure 1
Literary Czech

Nominative	žena (woman)	duše (soul)	práce (work)
Genitive	ženy	duše	práce
Dative	ženě	duši	práci
Accusative	ženu	duši	práci
Locative	ženě	duši	práci
Instrumental	ženou	duší	prácí

Valachian[161]

Nominative	roba (woman)	duša	práca
Genitive	roby	duše	práce
Dative	robě	duši	práci
Accusative	robu	dušu	prácu
Locative	robě	duši	práci
Instrumental	robú	dušú	prácú

The lack of the dipthong *–ou* also has significant effect on declensional endings in Valachian. In Literary Czech hard-stem feminine singular adjectives in the accusative case end in *–ou*. In Valachian this is simply *–ú*, which is also the ending for the instrumental singular of hard-stem and soft-stem feminine nouns and adjectives. As Figure 1 demonstrates, this produces a leveling of forms and further simplifies the declension of feminine nouns in Valachian. The result of Valachian declension is often a string of words ending in *–u/-ú*: LC *Má dobrou duši* versus Valachian *Má dobrú dušu*.

Unlike LC Valachian has preserved many more soft-stem masculine nouns: LC *den* (day), *jelen* (deer) versus Valachian *deň, jeľeň*. As with soft feminine nouns, soft masculine (and neuter) can differ substantially from LC in their declensional patterns. For example, Valachian masculine soft *deň*, *jeľeň*, *kúň* look rather different from their LC counterparts in certain oblique cases.

Figure 2
Literary Czech

Nominative	den	jelen	kůň
Genitive	dne	jelena	koně
Dative	dni/dnu	jelenovi/jelenu	koňovi, koni
Accusative	den	jelena	koně
Locative	dni/dnu	jelenovi/jelenu	koňovi, koni
Instrumental	dnem	jelenem	koněm

Valachian[162]

Nominative	deň	jeľeň	kúň
Genitive	dňa	jeľeňa	koňa
Dative	dni	jeľeňovi	koňovi
Accusative	deň	jeľeňa	koňa
Locative	dni	jeľeňovi	koňovi[163]
Instrumental	dněm	jeľeněm	koněm

Likewise, the soft neuter nouns in Valachian look very different from their LC counterparts in certain case forms, particularly those ending in *-ní*:

Figure 3
Literary Czech

	Singular		Plural	
Nominative	pole	psání	pole	psání
Genitive	pole	psání	polí	psání
Dative	poli	psání	polím	psáním
Accusative	pole	psání	pole	psání
Locative	poli	psání	polích	psáních
Instrumental	polem	psáním	poli	psánímí

Valachian[164]

	Singular		Plural	
Nominative	poľe	psáňí	poľa	Psáňí [165]
Genitive	poľa	psáňá	poľí	psáňí
Dative	poľu	psáňú	poľom	psáňám [166]
Accusative	poľe	psáňí	poľa	psáňí
Locative	poľi	psáňú	poľoch	psáňách [167]
Instrumental	poľem	psáňím	poľami	psáňami [168]

In the plural endings for masculine and neuter nouns there are significant differences from LC in the instrumental, dative and prepositional. In the instrumental plural for hard stems, LC has the ending *–y*, but Valachian uses *–ama*. Thus LC *chlapy* = Valachian *chłapama*.[169] In the dative plural the ending *–om* tends to predominate for masculine and neuter nouns: LC *chlapům* versus Valachian *chłapom*. For locative plurals the ending in Valachian is *–och*: LC *chlapech* versus Valachian *chłapoch*.

Figure 4

	Literary Czech	Valachian
Nominative	chlapi (guys)	chłapi
Genitive	chlapů	chłapú
Dative	chlapům	chłapom
Accusative	chlapy	chłapy[170]
Locative	chlapech	chłapoch
Instrumental	chlapy	chłapama

For adjectival declensions, Valachian forms do not look appreciably different for the masculine and the neuter singular.[171] The feminine singular set of endings, however, is another matter for these differ significantly from LC. In addition to the absence of *–ou* already discussed, in Valachian the feminine forms in the oblique cases are rather archaic and did not undergo truncation as in LC. The feminine locative/genitive/dative singular in LC is *–é* but is *–éj* in Valachian (cf. Slovak *-ej*). Thus, Valachian hard-stem feminine adjectives in the singular look like their LC counterparts only in the nominative case:

Figure 5

	Literary Czech	Valachian[172]
Nominative	dobrá	dobrá
Genitive	dobré	dobréj
Dative	dobré	dobréj
Accusative	dobrou	dobrú
Locative	dobré	dobréj
Instrumental	dobrou	dobrú

The Valachian verb system also displays significant differences from Literary Czech. In the older version of LC, infinitives ended in *–ti*. Like the current form of LC Valachian drops the final *–i*, but unlike LC it preserves the soft consonant. Thus, the older form *dáti* > *dát* (to give) in LC but *dáti* > *dat'* in Valachian.[173] In addition, as we see in the previous example, the infinitive forms tend to have short vowels.[174]

The absence of *přehláska* also causes divergence in the conjugational endings. This is most evident in those third-person plural forms which end in *-ají* in LC: *mají* (they have), *znají* (they know)*, volají* (they call). In Valachian these forms are *majú*, *znajú, volajú*. The absence of the dipthong *–ou* also has a signficant effect. Those verbs which have the third-person plural ending in *–ou* in LC have *–ú* in Valachian: LC *jsou* (they are)*, vezou* (they take) = Valachian *sú, vezú*. As is the case with the declensional patterns, the net result is a smaller set of endings in Valachian and thus a simpler system. In the type of verbs ending in *-ějí*/*-í* in LC, the endings are significantly different in Valachian. In some cases the ending can be the longer form *–íja* (*umíja*, *hořija*, *prosíja*), in other cases the shorter *–á* (*hořá*, *prosá*, *bójá sa*), with the latter tending to soften the stem-final consonant (*sp'á*).[175] In LC verbs with the third person plural ending *–ají* will have the second person singular imperivate ending *–ej*: *dej* (from *dát*). In Valachian, the imperative endings for these forms retains the *a*, giving the ending *–aj*: *daj*. In the masculine past tense forms ending in a consonant plus *–ł,* the final *ł* is simply dropped: *nés, véd*.[176]

Finally, with regard to personal pronouns in Valachian here too the absence of *přehláska* causes signficant differences in appearance from that in LC, both in the long forms and in the short forms. Likewise, the preservation of the soft labials and the lack of the diphthong *ou* also add to the difference. This is most evident in declined forms of the first- and second-person singular pronouns *já* (I) and *ty* (you) as well as the reflexive pronoun. For example, with regard to

the short forms for the latter two: whereas LC has *se* and *tě* for the accusative/ genitive, Valachian has *sa* and *ťa* (cf. Slovak *sa*, *ťa*). Figure 6 reveals the sharp differencs in appearance:

Figure 6

Despite these differences, however, the system of the personal pro-

Valachian[177]					
Nominative	Genitive	Dative	Accusitive	Locative	Instrumental
já	mňa (ňa)	mně (mi)	mňa (ňa)	mně	mnú
ty	teb'a (ťa)	tobě (ti)	teb'a (ťa)	tobě	tebú
-----	seb'a (sa)	sobě (si)[179]	seb'a (sa)	sobě	sebú

Literary Czech					
Nominative	Genitive	Dative	Accusitive	Locative	Instrumental
já	mne (mě)	mně (mi)	mne (mě)	mně	mnou
ty	tebe (tě)	tobě (ti)	tebe (tě)	tobě	tebou
-----	sebe (se)	sobě (si)	sebe (se)	sobě	sebou

nouns is quite similar in both LC and Valachian: both make use of long and short forms, the short forms function as enclitics, and so on.[180]

Lexicon

Many of the differences in the Valachian lexicon versus LC are shared in common with the rest of Moravia, the primary example being the ubiquitous Moravian *tož* (thus, then; yes).[181] In addition, anyone perusing the *Czech Language Atlas* will immediately notice that the lexicon in the eastern half or third of Moravia often differed from the rest of Czech depending on the item under consideration. With regard to people/family members, for example, the terms used in the eastern part of Moravia sometimes differed substantially from the rest of Czech. For the term for "grandmother" most Czech regions either used the LC *babička* or the related forms *bábinka*, *baběnka*. But most of the eastern half of Moravia used a term derived from a different root: *stařenka*.[182] Likewise, for the term for "grandfather" most Czech regions used forms similar to LC *dědeček*: *děda, dědoušek, dědek*. The eastern part of Moravia, however, used the forms *staříček* or *stařeček*.[183] At one time the Valachian dialect also had a very distinctive lexicon, the terminology associated with *salašnictví*, that distinguished it from the rest of Czech.[184] Although, as we have seen above, this lexicon did indeed contain some words of Romanian origin or mediation, it must be remembered that much of the

pastoral terminology derived from Slavic sources.[185] With the virtual disappearance of this economic form, however, much of the terminology disappeared. Likewise, the urbanization and industrialization of the twentieth century along with the introduction of Literary Czech into the local school system has led to a considerable loss of the traditional lexicon.[186] Despite this fact, however, some traditional regionalisms have demonstrated remarkable resiliency. Regionalisms associated with, although not necessarily limited to Valašsko include *ogar* for *chlapec* (boy), *roba* for *žena* (woman), and so on. Many of these regionalisms do share much in common with Slovak. For example, the word *ľebo* (because, for) appears in the Valachian lexicon (cf. Slovak *lebo*) but one searches in vain in most Czech dictionaries for it. For those in need of a handbook of Valachian lexicon, two recent publications provide a convenient resource.[187]

Syntax

Although much research by Czech dialectologists was done in the areas of phonology and morphology, relatively little work has been done in the area of syntax which has often drawn commentary.[188] Be that as it may, the dialects of eastern Moravia have drawn some attention in this regard, especially from Jan Chloupek and Věra Michálková, due to their conservative nature.[189] With regard to East Moravian as a whole, Chloupek devoted much attention to the divergences from LC with regard to conjunctions. For example, he noted that the East Moravian dialects used the conjunction *co* more than LC and that they tended to avoid compound conjunctions.[190] In her studies Michálková noted that in comparison with LC the East Moravian dialects tended to make more use of nominal sentences, to make more use of sentences with infinitives, to make more use of transgressives (*přechodníky*), etc.[191] While these works tend to treat the East Moravian group as a whole and not the individual dialects, they do confirm the picture derived from phonological and morphological study: the dialects of eastern Moravia, including Valachian, are quite archaic vis-à-vis Literary Czech and preserve features extant nowhere else in the Czech lands.[192] With regard to Valachian the only specific treatment available comes in the work of Vašek, who covers 44 syntactical items in the dialect.[193] Many of these items include alternate usages of words. For example, in LC *než* means "than" but in Valachian it can be used as the conjunction "but."[194] Of more significance is the fact that in Valachian a neuter past tense form of the verb is often used whatever the gender of the grammatical subject: *było žydľik petroľínu*, *nebývało kupovaný chleba*.[195] Quite in constrast to Literary Czech, in Valachian the unstressed short forms (*sy*, *sa*) of the reflexive pronoun can occur at the end of a sentence, while the short forms can occur first when stressed.[196] Likewise, the genitive of negation, which has almost completely disappeared from Literary Czech is a common feature found in Valachian, even with concrete items.[197] In terms of pronouns one significant departure in Valachian is the use of *žádný* is used instead of *nikdo* (no one, nobody).[198] In short, studies of syntax confirm the picture of Valachian as the most peripheral, most archaic Czech dialect.

Conclusion

While the negative reaction to the controversy over the origin of the Valachs has produced an understandable reluctance to treat Valachian as a separate dialect under that name, this attitude is rather misguided. The term Valachian is a commonly-used, well-known term and the linguistic borders of the

dialect more or less match up with the boundaries of what is traditionally considered to be Valašsko. In particular, if we apply the terms Valašsko and Valachian just to the eastern part of the northern East Moravian dialect group that is the most archaic, not all of the northern area (i.e., excluding transitional areas like Hranicko), then a valid argument can easily made for a separate Valachian dialect. The paradox in this, however, is that as the terms Valašsko and Valachian have become more positive in the past century due to a growing sense of regional pride, the historical set of conditions that gave rise to them have long ceased to exist. Likewise, while a fairly good picture of the Valachian dialect in its heyday can be derived from various sources, the dialect itself has been under severe pressure and no longer exists in its "pure" form. In particular, in the realm of phonology some of the more striking features have been lost among the younger generation. The distinction between the hard and soft *l* has been lost,[199] while the LC pattern of stress on the first syllable has come to predominate,[200] and so on. In addition, the rise of the East Moravian interdialect has also erased some features of traditional Valachian speech. Be that as it may, however, any traveler to Valašsko will encounter a regional variety of Czech that still differs significantly from both Literary and so-called Colloquial Czech and may require some time for readjustment.

NOTES

1. For example, see Eva Eckert, "Language Change: The Testimony of Czech Tombstone Inscriptions in Praha, Texas," in *Varieties of Czech. Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics*, ed. Eva Eckert (Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1993), 189-215; Eva Eckert, "From Moravia to Texas: Immigrant Acculturation at the Cemetery, " *Markers: Annual Journal of the Association for Gravestone Studies* 19 (2002), 174-211; Eva Eckert, "Gravestones and the Linguistics Ethnography of Czech-Moravians in Texas," *Markers: Annual Journal of the Association for Gravestone Studies* 18 (2001), 146-187; Lida Dutkova-Cope, "Texas Czech Ethnic Identity: So How Czech Are You, Really?" *The Slavic and East European Journal* 47 (2003), 648-676; Kevin Hannan, "Reflections on Assimilation and Language Death in Czech-Moravian Texas," *Kosmas: Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 16 (2003), 110-132; Eva Eckert and Kevin Hannan, "Vernacular Writing and Sociolinguistic Change in the Texas Czech Community," *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 17 (2009), 87-161. I would like to thank Dr. Eckert for sending me a prepublication version of the latter article.

2. The other source is Lachian. Some 80% of all Czech immigration to Texas came either from the Valachian or Lachian regions of the Czech lands. Dutkova-Cope, "Texas Czech Ethnic Identity: So How Czech Are You, Really?" 649. See also Eckert and Hannan, "Vernacular Writing and Sociolinguistic Change in the Texas Czech Community," 88-89, 91; Robert Janak, *Geographic Origin of Czech Texas* (Hallettsville, TX: Old Homestead Pub. Co., 1985), 1.

3. In this regard the late Kevin Hannan performed a valuable service by translating Jaroslav Štika's book, *Etnografický region Moravské Valašsko, jeho vznik a vývoj* (Ostrava, 1973), into English: Jaroslav Štika, *The Ethnographic Region of Moravian Wallachia: Its Origin and Development* (Richardson, TX: Leo Baca, 2003).

4. This is not particularly surprising given the situation of Slavic linguistics as a whole in the English-language world. In summing up a half-century of linguistics scholarship in a major American journal, Gilbert Rappaport noted that few articles on dialectology had appeared. Gilbert C. Rappaport, "Slavic and East European Linguistics in *SEEJ*: A Half-Century of Scholarship," *Slavic and East European Journal* 50 (2006), 114.

5. Very brief descriptions of some aspects of the dialect can be found in Dutkova-Cope, "Texas Czech Ethnic Identity: So How Czech Are You, Really?" 648-676 and Eckert and Hannan, "Vernacular Writing and Sociolinguistic Change in the Texas Czech Community," 93-99.

6. As Richard Jeřábek has noted, Moravian Valašsko has been the object of many false assumptions. See Richard Jeřábek, "Ethnische und ethnographische Gruppen und Regionen in den böhmischen Ländern (17.-20. Jahrhundert)," *Ethnologia slavica* 19 (1987), 150.

7. František Dostál, "K původu a vývoji pozdně feudální diferenciace venkovského lidu na Moravě do pol. 17. stol. Počátky Hanáků a Valachů," in *Strážnice 1946-1965* (Brno, 1966), 229-33.

8. For some discussion in English, see Jaroslav Štika, *The Ethnographic Region of Moravian Wallachia*, 67-105. One should note that Štika uses the term "ethnographic region" to designate Valašsko. See also, Jaroslav Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko: o původu Valachů, valašské kolonizaci, vzniku a historii moravského Valašska a také o karpatských salaších* (Rožnov pod Radhoštěm: Valašské muzeum v přírodě, 2007), 178; J. Válek, "Hranice moravského Valašska," *Naše Valašsko* 1 (1929-30), 4-9. Even the application of one particular set of criteria is no guarantee of agreement on borders. Czech linguists, for example, have come up with differing borders for the dialects of eastern Moravia depending upon which isogloss is used. For further discussion see Antonín Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě* (Prague, 1967), 13. See also Jaromír Bělič and Václav Křístek, *Moravskoslovenská nářečí* (Olomouc, 1954), 6. With regard to economic forms (i.e., the Valachian method of animal husbandry) things likewise are not so clear. As Dostál has noted, the Valachian colonization went much further than the typical boundaries of Valašsko but in rather weak numbers. As a result drawing a border based on this criterion is problematic. František Dostál, "K otázce územního rozsahu valašské kolonisace na Moravě v 2. polovině 17. století," *Naše Valašsko* 11 (1948), 61.

9. Although it was once customary in the Czech lands to refer to the Moravian Valachs as a separate "tribe," Czech scholars have dispensed with the myth that the Valachs were one of the original Slavic tribes that settled the Czech lands. Dostál, "K původu a vývoji pozdně feudální diferenciace venkovského lidu na Moravě do pol. 17. stol. Počátky Hanáků a Valachů," 239-40; L. Hosák, "K nejstarším dokladům názvu regionů a jejich obyvatelstva na Moravě a jejich proměnám," in *Strážnice 1946-1965* (Brno, 1966), 195, 201; Jeřábek, "Ethnische und ethnographische Gruppen und Regionen in den böhmischen Ländern (17.-20. Jahrhundert)," 150. See also N. N. Gratsianskaia, *Etnograficheskie gruppy Moravii: K istorii etnicheskogo razvitiia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975), 10, 37, 41. The formation of a distinct Valachian dialect and identity is clearly a much later development. While the name Valašsko is clearly of later origin, there is some dispute among Czech scholars as to when it came into use and from what source. Several scholars in the Czech lands ar-

gued that the term was of foreign, literary origin. On this one point. Macůrek and Krandžalov agreed despite their otherwise heated polemics (see below). Dimitr Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody* (Prague, 1963), 212-14; Josef Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století* (Ostrava, 1959), 333. Likewise Dostál argued the term Valašsko did not appear in use before 1620 and most likely came from abroad. Dostál, "K původu a vývoji pozdně feudální diferenciace venkovského lidu na Moravě do pol. 17. stol. Počátky Hanáků a Valachů," 239. Jaroslav Štika has conclusively demonstrated, however, that the use of the term was long in use by the common people of the Czech lands. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 151-74. To be exact, however, the common people originally used the term *Valachy* (compare with *Čechy* the Czech term for Bohemia), not *Valašsko*. *Valašsko* was not actually used until the 19th century. See Karla Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před Třicetiletou válkou: Podle gruntovních knih a olomouckých půhonů" (Ph. D dissertation, Masaryk University, Brno, 1953), 20; Josef Polišenský, "O úloze lidových hnutí na východní Moravě v období pozdní feudalismu," *Český lid* 39 (1952), 13. While Štika is correct that these terms were used by the common people, not just bureaucrats, the inhabitants of the region did not use either the term Valach or Valašsko to refer to themselves. For a long time, the term Valach was a negative term applied to others within the region or used by outsiders to designate the inhabitants as a whole. The change in attitude towards the term came about with the Ethnographic Expostion in Prague in 1895 which prominently featured a Valachian section that caused quite a stir. M. Václavek, "O původu a jméně Valachů," *Sborník musejní společnosti ve Valašském Meziříčí* 2 (1898), 15; Hosák, "K nejstarším dokladům názvu regionů a jejich obyvatelstva na Moravě a jejich proměnám," 199-201. This was followed by other exhibits during the First Republic (especially the Valachian Year of 1925) and little by little the term became a source of pride among the inhabitants of the region. For a brief discussion of these festivals see Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 189-90. During the period of the First Republic publications began to appear that made use of the term Valašsko (*Naše Valašsko*). Today the inhabitants of the region have fully accepted the term. It is used for food products (*valašské mléko* "Valachian milk", *valašské klobasy* "Valachian sausage"), there is a Valachian National Theater (*Valašské národní divadlo*), there is a Valachian Open-air Museum (*Valašské muzeum v přírodě*), and in the 1990's the commercial venture Valachian Kingdom (*Valašské království*) was launched.

10. In some cases even the same scholar was known to shift his opinion. For example, František Bartoš did not include Zlín within Valašsko when he published the first volume of his *Dialektologie moravská* but did include it when he published the second volume based upon the criterion of folk costume (*kroj*). See František Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, Vol. 1 (Brno, 1886); František Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, Vol. 2 (Brno, 1895), i-ii.

11. One of the first Czech scholars to devote extensive attention to this problem was Josef Válek, whose first attempt extended over several years: "Poznámky k mapě moravského Valašska," *Časopis moravského muzea zemského* 7 (1907), 51-85, 220-33; 8 (1908), 81-118, 257-93; 9 (1909), 109-30, 194-211; 10 (1910), 133-46, 289-304; 11 (1911), 123-35, 282-88. He was later to return to this issue in a much more concise work:Válek, "Hranice moravského Valašska," 4-9. For Válek the Frenštát region was definitely a part of Valaš-

sko. Válek notes that in terms of dialect this region is Lachian but he insists that it is a part of Valašsko nevertheless. Válek, "Hranice," 6. The issue of Frenštát is rather complicated because the region was long considered a part of Valašsko by all, including the residents of the region themselves. However, due to dialectological criteria Bartoš included Frenštát within the Lachian area and over time his views came to have an enormous influence. Today, Frenštát is no longer considered a part of Valašsko by most, including the residents of the region. For further discussion of borders see Jaroslav Štika, "Názvy Lach, Valach, Gorol a název regionu," in *Těšínsko. 5. díl, Těšínská lidová kultura a polská národnostní menšina*, ed. Jaroslav Štika (Český Těšín; Rožnov pod Radhoštěm; Senov u Ostravy: Valašské muzeum v přírodě; Tilia, 2003), 67-76, 92-94. In his most recent book (2007), Jaroslav Štika gives a good summary of the various attempts to define the borders of Valašsko. In particular, this book has a very good set of acompanying maps which display several of the proposed boundaries and allow for easy comparison. In his various works Štika would question the value of the attempt by the linguist Antonín Vašek to draw a border based on a particular isogloss, arguing that the residents of Valašsko did not view this feature (i.e., the preservation of soft labials) as the key marker differentiating them from surrounding groups. Štika, *The Ethnographic Region of Moravian Wallachia*, 76. Vašek's book also contains a map of Valašsko which compares his proposed boundaries with those of Bartoš and Válek. Although they are rather difficult to obtain outside the Czech Republic, Rudolf Škubal has produced a set of materials on Valašsko for university students which nicely summarize the issues surrounding the region. See Rudolf Škubal, *Hranice Valašska: Vymezení etnografického regionu: Metodické pokyny*, 3rd ed. (Brno, 1995); Rudolf Škubal, *Valašsko: Etnografická studie: Metodické pokyny* (Brno, 2000); Rudolf Škubal, *Vývoj osídlení Valašska. Příspěvek k etnografickému regionu: Metodické pokyny* (Brno, 1990). Škubal argues that by combining three sets of criteria (folk costume, dialect, economic-administrative) a border can be produced for the region and he proceeds to list the villages and towns within it. Škubal, *Hranice Valašska: Vymezení etnografického regionu*, 20.

12. Zdeněk Láznička, "Vývoj osídlení Valašska," *Naše Valašsko* 13 (1950), 102-109; Dostál, "K původu a vývoji pozdně feudální diferenciace venkovského lidu na Moravě do pol. 17. stol. Počátky Hanáků a Valachů," 229 -30.

13. Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před třicetiletou válkou," 26.

14.Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 99-100. Only with the introduction of the Valachian type of sheep-raising did these areas begin to provide any large-scale economic utility. Once these lands grew in value, however, the local nobility began to pay much more attention to their property in the region and numerous boundary disputes resulted. See Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před třicetiletou válkou," 94, for more discussion.

15. For further discussion see Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 116-17.

16. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 115-17. See also Jaroslav Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," *Slovenský národopis* 9 (1961), 543; Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 80-81.

17. Until the introduction of the Valachian method, the eastern areas were often used for little else other than bee-keeping, woodcutting, etc. See Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před třicetiletou válkou," 26; Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 100.

18. While the terms transhumance and *salašnictví* are sometimes treated as synonymous, there is some question whether the term transhumance is accurate when applied to the practice of the Valachs throughout the western Carpathians. Transhumance involves the transfer of animals between summer pastures in the mountains and winter pastures in the lowlands and often involved great distances. However, as Štika notes, long distance transfers were unknown in the western Carpathians as was nomadic pastoralism. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 24-25. Fronek defines *salašnictví* as "Alpine dairy farming." Josef Fronek, *Velký česko-anglický slovník* (Prague: Leda, 2000), 1000.

19. In his works Krandžalov repeatedly disputed the notion that sheepraising was introduced to the Czech lands for the first time by the Valachs and whether anything new in terms of technique or breed was introduced into the Czech lands. See, for example, Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*, 152, 155-56, 185, 198. On the first point he was quite correct: sheepraising was quite well known in the Czech lands prior to the Valachian colonization. But the evidence does indicate that the Valachs brought in a new type of sheepraising and a new breed of sheep. For further discussion see Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 113-14; Jaroslav Štika, "O názvu a pojmu Valašsko a Valach na Moravě mezi třicetiletou válkou a polovinou 19. století," in *Strážnice 1946-1965* (Brno, 1966), 260-261.

20. For further discussion see Václav Chaloupecký, *Valaši na Slovensku* (Prague: Slovanský ústav, 1947), 8-11; Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 514-15.

21. Dostál, "K původu a vývoji pozdně feudální diferenciace venkovského lidu na Moravě do pol. 17. stol. Počátky Hanáků a Valachů," 230, 238-39. Polišenský argues that while the population of the region began to differ in terms of economic form, it in no way differed linguistically. Josef Polišenský, "Nové ukoly vlastivědné práce na Valašsku," *Valašsko* 1 (1952), 13. Majerová likewise argues that while life in the mountains definitely made the Moravian Valachs wilder and tougher, there is little evidence that they were foreign. What evidence there is shows only an occasional name of foreign origin. Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před třicetiletou válkou," 98-99.

22. Or in some cases this was due to the conscious policy of the local authorities to eliminate it. For example, in the Frenštát region the authorities adopted policies against *salašnictví* in the late 18th century and it eventually died out by the mid-19th century. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 187.

23. Although the Czech terms are sometimes translated as *Wallach* and *Wallachia* throughout this article I use the forms *Valach* and *Valašsko* to avoid confusion with the Romanian region of Wallachia. While the term is often taken to be a synonym for "Romanian" such was not at all the case. The term *Vlach*/*Valach* has had a number of meanings over the centuries depending upon geographical location. It has ranged in meaning from designating an Orthodox Serb to designating a gelding. For further discussion see Jaroslav Štika, "Význam slova ‚Valach' v západních Karpatech," *Slovenský národopis* 10 (1962), 396-437; Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 21-22. Within the specific area of the Czech and Slovak Carpathians the term was often used in the sense of

"shepherd." Kavuljak argues that at least in Slovakia the term always signified the occupation "shepherd," not ethnicity. Andrej Kavuljak, "Valasi na Slovensku," in *Sborník na počesť Jozefa Škultétyho* (Turčiansky Sv. Martin, 1933), 336; Andrej Kavuljak, "Valasi na Slovensku: na okraj publikácie V. Chaloupeckého o valachoch," *Sborník Muzeálnej slovenskej spoločnosti* 38-42 (1944-48), 306-07, 318. See also, Václav Davídek, *Osídlení Těšínska Valachy* (Prague: Nákl. Slezského kulturního ústavu, 1940), 58-59; Dostál, "K původu a vývoji pozdně feudální diferenciace venkovského lidu na Moravě do pol. 17. stol. Počátky Hanáků a Valachů," 236; Ivanov, V. V. and V. N. Toporov, "K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii etnonima 'valakhi'," in *Etnichicheskaia istoriia vostochnykh romantsev* (Moscow, 1979), 74; V. D. Koroliuk, "Termin 'Voloshskaia zemlia' v rannesrednevekovykh pis'mennykh istochnikakh," in *Etnicheskaia istoriia vostochnykh romantsev* (Moscow, 1979), 7; V. D. Koroliuk, "'Voloshskaia zemlia' i formirovanie vostochnoromanskoi (voloshskoi) obshchnosti," in *Sotsial'no-ekonomicheskaia i politicheskaia istoriia Iugo-Vostochnoi Evropy (do serediny XIX v.)* (Kishinev, 1980), 33; František Pastrnek, "O původě moravských Valachů," *Časopis Matice moravské* 31 (1907), 115; Polišenský, "O úloze lidových hnutí na východní Moravě v období pozdní feudalismu," 12. Štika goes into detail on the development of the term in eastern Moravia and how it eventually came to designate both the population of the area and was transformed into a geographical designation. See Štika, "O názvu a pojmu Valašsko a Valach na Moravě mezi třicetiletou válkou a polovinou 19. století," 259-269; Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 147-49. For some time in the Czech lands the term was also used to refer to Italians/Italy. For further discussion see Koroliuk, "Termin 'Voloshskaia zemlia' v rannesrednevekovykh pis'mennykh istochnikakh," 9-10; Koroliuk, "'Voloshskaia zemlia' i formirovanie vostochnoromanskoi (voloshskoi) obshchnosti," 35-36. The equation of the term Valach with Romanian was the source of much of Krandžalov's displeasure with the work of many scholars. Krandžalov insisted that the Romanians never used the term *Vlach/Vlakh* to refer to themselves. Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*, 6, 16, 50-51, 95; Dimitr Krandžalov, "O původu některých domněle rumunských jmen u nás (Visalaja, portáš, Dolina Urgatina, Bukeryšky, Cindoléna, Čerták, Pestalak aj.)," *Slezský sborník* 59 (1961), 122; Dimitr Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," *Studia slavica Akademiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 10 (1964), 299. On this point, Štika was in agreement with Krandžalov. Štika, "Význam slova ‚Valach' v zapadních Karpatech," 400. Earlier in his career, Macůrek argued that the term *Vlach/Vlakh* was the true national name of the Romanian people. Josef Macůrek, review of *Osídlení Těšínska Valachy* by V. Davídek, *Časopis Matice moravské* 63-64 (1939-40), 434; Davídek, Václav and Josef Macůrek, "Diskuse," *Časopis Matice moravské* 65 (1943), 254-55. He was more than happy to point out that early in his career Krandžalov had also accepted the notion that the Romanians called themselves *Vlachs/Vlakhs*. Josef Macůrek, "Diskuse o Valaších na Moravě a valašské kolonizaci v Karpatech," *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty Brněnské univerzity 11, C: Řada historická* 9 (1962), 173. For Krandžalov, see Dumitru Crânjală, *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k moravskému Valašsku* (Prague: Orbis, 1938), 415.

24. With regard to the ultimate origin of the term, Slavic *Vlach/Vlakh* is often seen as a borrowing from Germanic. While accepting that this is a rea-

sonable explanation Ivanov and Toporov propose that the Slavic, Germanic and Celtic terms ultimately derive from a common Indo-European source. See Ivanov, V. V. and V. N. Toporov, "K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii etnonima 'valakhi'," 61-85. With regard to the form *Valach*, there has been much discussion on the origin of this variant. Chaloupecký, *Valaši na Slovensku*, 16-17; Kavuljak, "Valasi na Slovensku," 337; Kavuljak, "Valasi na Slovensku: na okraj publikácie V. Chaloupeckého o valachoch," 310; Dimitr Krandžalov, "O Valašich na Moravě a valašské kolonizaci v Karpatech," *Československý časopis historický*, no. 2 (1962), 204; Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*, 73; Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," 299; Štika, "Význam slova ‚Valach' v západních Karpatech," 396-437.

25. According to Štika, arguing that Romanians had settled Valašsko was primarily the activity of Romanian scholars, not those in the Czech and Slovak lands. Instead, Czech and Slovak scholars limited themselves to arguing that Romanian pastoralists had influenced the culture of eastern Moravia. Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 533. Štika perhaps overstates the case, for there were Czech scholars who argued for a Romanian component in the settlement of the area.

26. Miklosich even suggested the possibility that the Valachs could be the descendants of a purely Romanian population. See Franz Miklosich, "Über die Wanderungen der Rumunen in den dalmatinischen Alpen und den Karpaten," *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-Historische Classe* 30 (1880), 6-7. Most early commentators, as Miklosich acknowledged, considered the Valachs to be Slavic in origin. The first speculation that they might be of Romanian descent comes from the year 1755 by an anonymous writer in the Těšín region. Václav Davídek, review of *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k Moravskému Valašsku* by Crânjală Dumitru, *Časopis pro dějiny venkova* 26 (1939), 203. Also preceding Miklosich were the Jireček brothers. See J. Jireček and H. Jireček, *Einstehen christlicher Reiche im Gebiete des heutigen österreichischen Kaiserstaates vom J.500 bis 1000* (Vienna, 1865), 223-25. Vašek credits the Romanian scholar D. P. Marţianu with providing the impulse for Miklosich's study. See A. Vashek, "Lingvisticheskaia karptalogiia," *Voprosy iazykoznaniia* (1976), 22. See also Crânjală, *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k moravskému Valašsku,* p. 47. One should also note that no less than František Palacký, speculated on the origin of the Valachs. In his *Dějiny národu českého v Čechách i v Moravě* Palacký argued that they were the Slavicized descendants of the Celtic Boj who once inhabited the Czech lands. Cited in Štika, who provides a good, concise summary of these and other early works. See Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 9-12.

27. František Bartoš, "Moravské Valašsko, kraj i lid," *Osvěta* 10 (1880), 371, 461; Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 59.

28. Václavek, for example, disputes some of Miklosich's arguments. See Václavek, "O původu a jméně Valachů," 10. See also F. Černý, "Moravští Valaši," *Časopis matice moravské* 33 (1909), 355-365; V. Houdek, "Jsou-li moravští Valaši původu rumunského," *Časopis vlasteneckého muzejního spolku Olomuckého* 3 (1886), 39-40; Jos. Lad. Píč, *Zur rumänisch-ungarischen Streitfrage* (Leipzig, 1886), 83-95. Some scholars would alter their position over time. Pastrnek, for example, while disputing some of Miklosich's indivi-

dual arguments, basically accepted the thesis that the Moravian Valachs were of Romanian origin. With time, however, he came to reject this view. See František Pastrnek, "Slovenský jazyk," *Slovenské pohľady* (1893), 695-98, 766 -67; Pastrnek, "O původě moravských Valachů," 127-28.

29. Philological evidence was one of the mainstays of the Romanian theory. However, much of the philological evidence produced in the early part of the debate was very much to be taken with a grain of salt. As Krandžalov repeatedly argued in his works, many of the scholars had little or no knowledge of the Romanian language which detracted from their ability to make sound judgments. See Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*, 15-16. Štika concedes that one of the early Czech scholars working on the topic, Válek, had a weak philological education. See Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 13. Regarding Válek see also Černý, "Moravští Valaši," 359, who stated "Válek accompanies his reasonings with such diverse philological explanations, which only prove, however, that this work is far beyond his capabilities." More than once scholars would embarrass themselves with rather strained arguments. For example, Chaloupecký argued that based on the evidence of names *Kubán* and *Kubančík* some elements of the Valachian colonization betrayed a Caucasian origin. Chaloupecký, *Valaši na Slovensku*, 86. As Kavuljak noted, however, a far more likely explanation of these names is that they are forms of the baptismal name Jakub. See Kavuljak, "Valasi na Slovensku: na okraj publikácie V. Chaloupeckého o valachoch," 317. As some scholars began to question the assumptions of their predecessors and began to cite philological evidence of their own that ran counter to the Romanian theory, defenders of the theory began to downplay the importance of this evidence. Macůrek, for example, in his review of Davídek's study questioned whether names were a reliable indicator of a person's nationality. See Macůrek, review of *Osídlení Těšínska Valachy* by V. Davídek, 434. When the evidence of names favored his argument, however, Macůrek was more than happy to rely on it, a contradiction that Krandžalov was more than happy to emphasize. See, for example, Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," 323. See also Krandžalov, "O Valašich na Moravě a valašské kolonizaci v Karpatech," 203.

30. See Crânjală, *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k moravskému Valašsku*, 60, for further discussion.

31. Krandžalov surveys many of these items in his 1938 study. See also Krandžalov, "O původu některých domněle rumunských jmen u nás (Visalaja, portáš, Dolina Urgatina, Bukeryšky, Cindoléna, Čerták, Pestalak aj.)," 118-27.

32. V. Machek, "Drobnosti ze slovenštiny," *Listy filologické* 66 (1939), 164.

33. A Romanian by birth, Krandžalov's original name was Dumitru Crânjală and he published his 1938 study under that name. After leaving Czechoslovakia he obtained Bulgarian citizenship and changed his named to Krandžalov. He returned to post-war Czechoslovakia under this name, under which all his subsequent works on this topic were published. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 15. As a result, in the text of this article the latter name will be used. Štika argues that Krandžalov's uncompromising position was an understandable reaction to the nationalism in his native country which led scholars there to pro-

pose some rather ridiculous theories regarding the origin of the Valachs. Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 532.

34. Among Krandžalov's most serious opponents/critics were: Dostál, Macůrek, Štika and Vašek. For the first see: František Dostál, "K historicko-kritické metodě D. Krandžalova," *Časopis Matice Moravské* 83 (1964), 332-335. Initially, Macůrek was receptive to Krandžalov's views, giving his book a rather positive review. Josef Macůrek, review of *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech, se zvláštním zřetelem k moravskému Valašsku* by Dumitru Crânjală, *Časopis Matice moravské* 63-64 (1940), 203-205. In later years, however, he and Krandžalov would engage in a rather bitter polemic. For example, at one point Macůrek stated that Krandžalov obviously did not read his book carefully and questioned the latter's knowledge of Czech. Macůrek, "Diskuse o Valaších na Moravě a valašské kolonizaci v Karpatech," 171. In their own time, Štika and Vašek would also criticize various aspects of Krandžalov's work. See, for example, Antonín Vašek, "Sur la méthodologie des recherches carpatologiques linguistiques: A propos de l'ouvrage *Valaši na Moravě* de D. Krandžalov," *Romanoslavica* 14 (1967), 13-38, as well as Štika cited above. For his part, Krandžalov did not mince words in attacking either of these two. See, for example, his harsh words regarding Vašek's book, whose title he labeled "bombastic" and the book itself as "pompous." Dimitr Krandžalov, "Současný stav studií o rumunských vlivech na Slovensku a na Moravě," *Časopis Vlastivědné společnosti muzejní v Olomouci* (1970), 35-36. In many cases, it is hard to distinguish the motivation for these challenges. That is, whether scholars were truly motivated by scholarly disagreement or were they simply irritated with Krandžalov's extremely combative, often insulting, polemical stance. Krandžalov seemed to possess the remarkable ability to alienate even those who were in basic agreement with his position. See, for example, Kavuljak's response to his book. Andrej Kavuljak, review of *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k moravskému Valašsku* by Dumitru Crânjală, *Sborník Muzeálnej slovenskej spoločnosti* 34-35 (1940-41), 158-161. More than one reviewer remarked on Krandžalov's tone in his works and his haughty attitude toward other scholars. For example, see: A. Gregor, review of *Valaši na Moravě*, by Dmitr Krandžalov, *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 17 (1965), 113-117; A. Gregor, *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 18 (1966), 172; A. Gregor, *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 18 (1966), 164. Indeed, Peroutka even characterized Krandžalov's 1963 book as a historical-philological *Proti všem* (Against Everyone), that is, the title of Alois Jirásek's trilogy about the Hussite Wars. Bohumil Peroutka, review of *Valaši na Moravě* by Dimitr Krandžalov, *Valašsko* 9 (1965), 105.

35. Crânjală, *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k moravskému Valašsku*, 467-69. The words in question are: *laja*, *kurnota*, *murgaňa*, *šuta*, *vakeša*, *vetula*, *cap*, *plekať*, *rumigať*, *redykať*, *cárek*, *strunga*, *gropa*/*grapa*, *gaura*, *koliba*, *komarnik*, *podišar*, *demikat*, *merinda*, *brynza*, *kulastra*, *glaga*, *urda*, *čutora*, *halbija* and *fujara*.

36. In addition to the original study published in 1938, Krandžalov also produced a follow-up study in 1963: Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*. For those who do not wish to read Krandžalov's lengthy studies, he summarizes his position in several articles, which he published in various languages: Krandžalov, "O původu některých domněle rumunských jmen u nás (Visalaja, portáš, Dolina Urgatina, Bukeryšky, Cindolé-

na, Čerták, Pestalak aj.)," 118-127; Dimitr Krandzhalov, "O sovremennom sostoianii izucheniia rumynskikh vliianii v Karpatach," *Ethnographica* 3-4 (1962), 254-273; Krandžalov, "O Valašich na Moravě a valašské kolonizaci v Karpatech," 200-209; Dimitr Krandžalov, review of *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.—18. století* by Josef Macůrek, *Československá etnografie* 10 (1962), 398-404; Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," 291-342; Krandžalov, "Současný stav studií o rumunských vlivech na Slovensku a na Moravě," 19-38; Dimitr Krandžalov, "L'etat actuel des études sur les influences roumaines en Slovaquie et en Moravie," *Les Études balkaniques tchécoslovaques* 2 (1967), 39-68; Dimitr Krandžalov, "Rumänische Einflüsse in der slawischen Hirtenterminologie und Toponomastik in den Karpaten," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 10 (1965), 355-366; Dymitr Krandžalov, "Znaczenie i charakter wpływów rumuńskich w Karpatach Zachodnich ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem Wołoszczyzny Morawskiej," in *Wędrówki pasterskie i nazewnictwo ludowe Tatr polskich i Podhala*, ed. Włodzimierz Antoniewicz, Vol. 5: *Pasterstwo Tatr polskich i Podhala* (Wrocław-Warsaw-Cracow, 1963), 165-232.

37. Davídek also gave Krandžalov's book a positive review, calling his research "revolutionary." Davídek, review of *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k Moravskému Valašsku* by Crânjală Dumitru, 201-203.

38. Davídek, *Osídlení Těšínska Valachy*, 45-46.

39. Ibid., 80.

40. See for example, Bohuslav Havránek, "Nářečí v regionalistické literatuře moravské," *Slovo a slovesnost* 7 (1941), 220-222; Macůrek, review of *Osídlení Těšínska Valachy* by V. Davídek, 431-435.

41. Others that whole-heartedly accepted Krandžalov's thesis include Baláš, who argued that the small number of Romanian words in the Valachian dialect was actually evidence against the Romanian origin of the inhabitants. Emanuel Baláš, "Původ moravských Valachů," *Dolina Urgatina* 3 (1949), 54.

42. Many of the issues are rather tangential to the discussion here: the nature of the *valašské právo,* the place of origin of *salašnictví*, how far ethnic Romanians penetrated west of the Uh River, the origin of the Romanian people, etc. For the most extended philological critique see František Kopečný, "Ještě k rumunskému přínosu do valašského slovníku," *Slezský sborník* (1966), 250-259. Kopečný argued that about 30 more words could be added to Krandžalov's list that were either of Romanian origin or mediation.

43. Despite his criticisms of Krandžalov's work, Štika did more or less accept the thesis that words of Romanian origin form a very small part of the Valachian lexicon. Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 536-37.

44. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 38. As scholars performed additional research, it turned out that some place names previously assumed to be of Romanian origin were not. See, for example, Andělín Hurt, "Vznik názvů některých hor a tratí na Karlovicku," *Dolina Urgatina* 3 (1949), 81.

45. The most in-depth study of the Valachian dialect was by Vašek who could discern absolutely no influence of Romanian on the structure of the dialect. Indeed, he delimits the 29 features of the Valachian dialect that distinguish it from other varieties of Czech and in each case concluded that no Romanian influence could be determined. The only area in which any Romanian

influence could be determined was in the lexicon of the pastoral terminology. He did argue, however, that the Valachian colonization, which he sees primarily as Slovak in nature, played a role in strengthening the conservative tendencies of the dialect. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 119-21. In contrast, in an earlier work Vašek downplayed the possible influence of Valachian colonization on the Valachian dialect. For example, he noted that Valachian lacked the feature of *přehláska* (see below) but that this phenomenon clearly antedated the colonization. At most, the colonization might have strengthened the conservative linguistic tendencies of the area, but it in no way was of primary importance. Antonín Vašek, "Významný krok vpřed v řešení valašské otázky," *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university. A. Řada jazykovědná* 11, no. 10 (1962), 189.The linguist Skulina came to similar conclusions regarding the influence of the Valachian colonization, whatever its actual origin, on the grammatical structure of the local dialects: Josef Skulina, "Archaický základ severního moravskoslovenského pomezí a proníkání inovací ze sousedních nářečních oblastí," in *Rodné zemi* (Brno, 1958), 414; Josef Skulina, "O valašském nářečí," *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 15 (1960), 205; Josef Skulina, "Jsou Gallašovy poznámky o valašském nářečí správné?" *Sborník Matice moravské* 79 (1960), 210. He also rejected the idea that the Valachian culture of Valašsko and Těšínsko was of Romanian origin. See Josef Skulina, "Stratifikace salašnických termínů v oblasti Moravskoslezských Beskyd," *Slezský sborník* (1971), 303; Josef Skulina, "Zur Problematik der walachischen Worter auf dem Gebiet der mahrischschlesischen Beskiden," *Les études balkaniques tchécoslovaques* 4 (1972), 83.

46. At the end of his critique of Krandžalov's work, Kopečný interjects the fact that there are cases when an ethnicity leaves behind relatively few linguistic traces and cites the example of the paucity of Celtic words in French and Bulgar words in Bulgarian. Kopečný, "Ještě k rumunskému přínosu do valašského slovníku," 259. The cases he cites, however, are not really applicable to the situation in Valašsko. There is abundant historical evidence that the Celts lived in modern-day France and the Bulgars in Bulgaria, whereas there is almost none that ethnic Romanians lived in eastern Moravia.

47. Polišenský, " O úloze lidových hnutí na východní Moravě v období pozdní feudalismu," 10; Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před třicetiletou válkou: podle gruntovních knih a olomouckých půhonů," 11.

48. Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*. In contrast to Krandžalov (Krandžalov, review of *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.—18. století* by Josef Macůrek, 398-404), Vašek provided a very positive review of Macůrek's book: Vašek, "Významný krok vpřed v řešení valašské otázky," 181-190. However, Vašek himself noted that Macůrek's linguistic interpretations were faulty. For example, he states that many of the names that Macůrek cites as foreign are clearly native Czech. See p. 186. Vašek, p. 189, also notes that in several places Macůrek states that there was a Romanian element among the colonists, but he fails to introduce the necessary evidence. In several places Krandžalov stressed Macůrek's faulty interpretation of names and his inconsistencies. See for example, Krandžalov, review of *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.—18. století* by Josef Macůrek, 400; Krandžalov, "O Valašich na Moravě a valašské kolonizaci v Karpatech, " 203, 208; Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," 323;

Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*, 165-69, 199-201.

49. The source material revealed that there were actually several different types of colonization and Czech scholars began to differentiate between the Valachian colonization and the *pasekařská* colonization. F. Nesvadba, "K pasekářské kolonizaci a valašské otázce na panství hukvaldském v 16.-17. století," *Časopis Matice moravské* 69 (1950), 253-54. In terms of chronology many scholars relied upon appearances of the surname *Valach* to date the beginnings of the Valachian colonization. However, as Macůrek pointed out, the surname Valach or Valášek does not prove anything by itself. The surname can be found in many places in the Czech lands, even western Bohemia. These occurrences have nothing to do with the Valachian colonization and their origins have other explanations. Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 40. See also Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před třicetiletou válkou," 48-49, who notes that none of those people identified as Valachs in the first half of the 16th century seem to have had anything to do with Valachian herding and also the curious circumstance that Valach never appears as a surname within Valašsko itself.

50. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 112-13; Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 327-29.

51. Majerová-Janišová, "Valaši na východní Moravě před třicetiletou válkou," 99; Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 114, 149; Nesvadba, "K pasekářské kolonizaci a valašské otázce na panství hukvaldském v 16.-17. století," 252-54; Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 62, 107, 203; Štika, "O názvu a pojmu Valašsko a Valach na Moravě mezi třicetiletou válkou a polovinou 19. století," 261; Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 528.

52. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 116; Josef Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí* (Prague: Nakladatelstvi ČSAV, 1964), 198; Nesvadba, "K pasekářské kolonizaci a valašské otázce na panství hukvaldském v 16.-17. století," 253-54; Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 80-81, 106-07, 136, 142-43, 241-57.

53. Nesvadba, "K pasekářské kolonizaci a valašské otázce na panství hukvaldském v 16.-17. století," 252-53; Černý, "Moravští Valaši," 363-64. Macůrek was rather perplexed by the low number of Valachs revealed by the sources. As a result he speculated on the existence of an unregistered population. Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 19, 95, 97, 143, 199-200. Krandžalov heavily criticized this aspect of his work. Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," 312; Krandžalov, review of *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.—18. století* by Josef Macůrek, 402. Štika also struggled with these low numbers and argued that some Valachs must not have been included in the lists. Štika, "Význam slova ‚Valach' v zapadních Karpatech," 419.

54. Some non-Czechs, however, were still inclined to accept it. For example, Gratsianskaia argued that one could not rule out a possible Eastern Romance influence. Gratsianskaia stresses that the use of the term "Romanian" is technically incorrect when referring to events of the 14th-17th centuries. Rather, the term "Eastern Romance" is more proper. Gratsianskaia, *Etnograficheskie gruppy Moravii: K istorii etnicheskogo razvitiia*, 80, 86. See also, Gratsianskaia and Koroliuk who still held out the possibility that there might

have been a Slavicized Eastern Romance element among the Valachian colonists. N. N. Gratsianskaia and V. D. Koroliuk, "Problemy etnogeneza moravskikh valakhov v sovremennoi chekhoslovatskoi istoriografii," in *Voprosy etnogeneza i etnicheskoi istorii slavian i vostochnykh romantsev* (Moscow, 1976), 255.

55. Although his own research demonstrated that the Romanian theory had little basis in the archival sources, Macůrek nevertheless held out the possibility that "remnants of the original Valachian, that is Romanian ethnic core had not disappeared" when it arrived in the western Carpathians. He would repeat this same basic statement in his conclusion. Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 104, 327.

56. Macůrek, "Diskuse o Valaších na Moravě a valašské kolonizaci v Karpatech," 171. To be sure, in his monograph Macůrek stated on more than one occasion that the domestic element played the primary role in settling Valašsko. Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 80, 329. However, in his monograph he does use the terms "wave" and "stream" which give the impression of large numbers of foreign colonists. It was this terminology that Krandžalov heavily criticized. Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*, 161; Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," 321.

57. Vashek, "Lingvisticheskaia karptalogiia," 22. See also Vašek, "Významný krok vpřed v řešení valašské otázky," 189-90.

58. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 191. Štika had long before stated that he agreed with Krandžalov on certain issues (i.e., the fact that a Romanian component in the Valachian lexicon did not necessarily entail the migration of Romanians to Moravia), but resisted Krandžalov's argument regarding the origin of the name for the region of Valašsko as well as his interpretation of the institution of *salašnictví*. While agreeing that Romanians did not migrate to Moravia, Štika insists that *salašnictví* originated in Romania (Transylvania). Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 536-37.

59. The significant exception was Krandžalov who repeatedly denied that the Valachian method originated in Romania or that there was anything specifically Romanian about it. See in particular his 1963 study.

60. While Macůrek was forced to dispense with the idea of any large-scale settlement of ethnic Romanians in Moravia, he emphasized the presence of a sizable foreign element on Czech soil. Macůrek, *Valaši v západních Karpatech v 15.-18. století*, 327-29.

61. Vašek placed much emphasis on the ties between Valašsko and western Slovakia. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 121. Other scholars who saw the Valachs as Slovaks include: Dostál, "K původu a vývoji pozdně feudální diferenciace venkovského lidu na Moravě do pol. 17. stol. Počátky Hanáků a Valachů," 230; Pastrnek, "O původě moravských Valachů," 113-129. Válek, while stressing the Romanian component of the Valachian lexicon and local place names, viewed the settlement of Valaško as primarily a Slovak matter. See J. Válek, "Poznámky k mapě moravského Valašska," *Časopis moravského muzea zemského* 7 (1907), 263; 10 (1910), 133; 11 (1911), 288. It should also be noted that there has been some dispute regarding the Valachs of Slovakia and their ethnic origin. Many scholars working on this topic likewise reject the notion that the Valachs of Slovakia were of Romanian origin, arguing that any Romanian element played only a

small role. See for example, Ján Beňko, "Doosídľovanie južných (slovenských) karpatských svahov valachmi a ich etnicita," in *Początki sąsiedztwa: Pogranicze etniczne polsko-rusko-slowackie w średniowieczu: Materialy z konferencji, Rzeszów 9-11 V 1995* (Rzeszów, 1996), 279-289; Kavuljak, "Valasi na Slovensku, " 343, 373; Kavuljak, review of *Rumunské vlivy v Karpatech se zvláštním zřetelem k moravskému Valašsku* by Dumitru Crânjală, 160-61; Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 70; Štika, "Význam slova ‚Valach' v zapadních Karpatech," 418. In his study of the Valachs in Slovakia, Chaloupecký argues for a scheme of progressive assimilation as the Valachs moved up the Carpathians. Originally, they were Romanians from Transylvania who were Slavicized once they reached East Slavic (Rusyn) territory, these Rusynized Valachs were in turn Slovakified as they moved further along the Carpathians, and so on. Chaloupecký, *Valaši na Slovensku*, 20. Štika calls this scheme simplistic. Štika, *Valaši a Valašsko*, 57. Kavuljak, in particular, found Chaloupecký's work problematic. See Kavuljak, "Valasi na Slovensku: na okraj publikácie V. Chaloupeckého o valachoch," 306-319.

62. As Hannan states: "Some dialects of eastern Moravia are actually as close to Slovak as they are to Czech." Kevin Hannan, "The Language Question in Nineteenth Century Moravia," *Czechoslovak and Central European Journal* 11 (1992), 119. Kučera sums up the problem well: "Neither is there any obvious bundle of isoglosses in the East which would clearly divide Czech from Slovak, two languages which – even in their codified literary form – are very similar. . . Most dialectologists draw the boundary approximately between the Czech and Slovak dialects on Moravian territory, on a line running approximately between 15 to 30 miles westward from the Moravian Slovak administrative boundary, except for the North Eastern corner of Moravia where the administrative and dialectical boundaries more or less coincide." Henry Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech* (The Hague: Mouton, 1961), 12.

63. See for example, Lamprecht who argued that an extra-linguistic factor (i.e., the border) was the best way to differentiate the two. Arnošt Lamprecht, "Přechodové dialekty a jejich význam pro poznání vzájemných vztahů slovanských jazyků," in *Československé přednášky pro VI. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů*, eds. Bohuslav Havránek and Miroslav Drozda (Prague, 1968), 146-47. In terms of linguistic features, the isogloss *ř/r* is one of the most important dividers used along with the morphological feature of the 1st person singular of certain verb endings: *beru* vs. *berem*. See, for example, Bohuslav Havránek, "Nářečí česká," in *Československá vlastivěda: III. Jazyk*, ed. Václav Dědina (Prague: Sfinx, 1934), 88; Brněnsky dialektologický kolektiv, "K diferenciaci moravskoslovenských nářečí a k jejich vztahu k českému národnímu jazyku," *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university. A. Řada jazykovědná* 3 (1954), 25. See also Bělič and Křístek, *Moravskoslovenská nářečí*, 8; Jaromír Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," in *Adolfu Kellnerovi: Sborník jazykovědných studií* (Opava, 1954), 81, 84-85. See also Havránek, "Nářečí česká," 88-89. Havránek, p. 94, considered the Moravian Slovak dialects to be closer to Slovak than to Lachian. Vašek, however, argues for a close tie between Valachian and Lachian and argues that it was only the Carpathian colonization that led to a separation between the two. Antonín Vašek, "Nářečí na Rožnovsku a Valašskomeziříčsku," (Ph. dissertation, Masaryk University, Brno, 1952), 40.

64. See Bělič for a summary of Czech attitudes up to the pre-WWII period. Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 81-85; Jaromír Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině* (Prague: SPN, 1955), 69-76.

65. Trávníček in his study of Moravian dialects simply used the term Slovak to describe this group. František Trávníček, *Moravská nářečí* (Prague, 1926).

66. For example, in his various works the Czech linguist Jaromír Bělič often referred to Havránek's work as "excellent.' See Jaromír Bělič, "Naléhavé úkoly české dialektologie," *Slovo a slovesnost* 29 (1968), 287; Jaromír Bělič, "Názvy základních nářečních skupin českého jazyka," *Slovo a slovesnost* 34 (1973), 134. He did note, however, that while Havránek's study was the best thing available to date, this was a serious flaw with it. Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 69. See also Jaromír Bělič, "Stav a úkoly české dialektologie," in *Československé přednašky pro IV. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů v Moskvě* (Prague, 1958), 201-02.

67. Václav Vážný, "Nářečí slovenská," in *Československá vlastivěda: III. Jazyk*, ed. Václav Dědina (Prague: Sfinx, 1934), 219-310.

68. See Bělič for further discussion. Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 85-86; Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 70.

69. For example, see Brněnsky dialektologický kolektiv, "K diferenciaci moravskoslovenských nářečí a k jejich vztahu k českému národnímu jazyku," 18-31. The members of the Brno collective were: Jan Chloupek, Stanislav Králík, Arnošt Lamprecht, Josef Skulina, Dušan Šlosar, Antonín Vašek. See also, Jan Chloupek, "Diferenciace východomoravských nářečí," *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 14 (1959), 80; Adolf Kellner, *Úvod do dialektologie* (Prague, 1954), 21; Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 88-91; Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 72-75; Antonín Vašek, "Nářečí Rožnovsko-Meziříčské," (Ph. D. dissertation, Masaryk University, Brno, 1960), 648.; Dušan Šlosar, "Dnešní rozdělení nářečí na východní Moravě," in *Studie ze slovanské jazykovědy*, ed. Václav Machek (Prague, 1958), 389-90. Bělič argued that Vašek's 1967 study conclusively proved that whatever close association the Valašsko region had with Slovakia, the dialect was unquestionably a part of the Czech national language. Ia. Belich, "Sostoianie i zadachi cheshskoi dialektologii," *Voprosy iazykoznaniia* 17, no. 4 (1968), 11. It should be noted that Vašek himself, however, drew a more mixed conclusion in that he argued for a considerable amount of Slovak influence as a result of the Carpathian colonization. See Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 120-21. However, Bělič is essentially correct, for Vašek's conclusion is not supported by the evidence presented in the main text of his study.

70. Considerable work was done in Moravia in the post-war era. In part this was driven by the desire to create the *Czech Language Atlas* but also by the recognition that the traditional dialects were in danger of dying out due to urbanization and industrialization. For discussions of the early years of the project see Belich, "Sostoianie i zadachi cheshskoi dialektologii," 7-9; Kellner, *Úvod do dialektologie*, 53-55. The *Czech Language Atlas* took quite a long time to appear. See Jan Chloupek, "Česká dialektologie splácí svůj dluh," *Naše řeč* 77 (1994), 96-99, for a discussion. Due to their more archaic nature the Moravian dialects for a long time tended to attract more attention than those of Bohemia. See Bělič, "Stav a úkoly české dialektologie," 198; Bělič, "Naléhavé úkoly české dialektologie," 4; Dušan Šlosar, review of *Studie o*

východomoravské nářeční větě by Věra Michálková, *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 24 (1974), 245.

71. This region experienced an influx of migrants from Slovakia in the 17th century which left an imprint on the local dialect. See Brněnsky dialektologický kolektiv, "K diferenciaci moravskoslovenských nářečí a k jejich vztahu k českému národnímu jazyku," 29. Šlosar emphasized that any similarities between east Moravian and Slovak were not due to colonization in most cases. Šlosar, "Dnešní rozdělení nářečí na východní Moravě," 389.

72. Brněnsky dialektologický kolektiv, "K diferenciaci moravskoslovenských nářečí a k jejich vztahu k českému národnímu jazyku," 25. Havránek had argued this same basic point in his 1934 study. Noting the difficulty of drawing a line, he proposed that the two criteria to be used were the 1) presence or absence of *ř* and 2) the use of the ending *–u* versus *–em* in the first person singular of certain verb forms. Havránek, "Nářečí česká," 88. See also Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 91.

73. For further discussion of the transitional nature of the dialects of eastern Moravia and western Slovakia see: Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 89; Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 66-69, 73-74; Jaromír Bělič, "Hranice mezi příbuznými jazyky a pomezní nářeční izoglosy," in *Československé přednášky pro V. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů v Sofii* (Prague, 1963), 135-142; Bělič and Křístek, *Moravskoslovenská nářečí*, 4, 8, 11.

74. Based on material found in the work of Galaš one might be able to argue for a stronger Slovak linguistic influence in Valašsko. However, doubt has repeatedly been raised regarding the reliability of his material. Skulina, "Jsou Gallašovy poznámky o valašském nářečí správné?" 206-210; Polišenský, "Nové ukoly vlastivědné práce na Valašsku," 73; Josef Skulina, "Jazykový vývoj na severním pomezí moravskoslovenské oblasti," in *Studie ze slovanské jazykovědy*, ed. Václav Machek (Prague, 1958), 413; Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 518. For Galaš's work see Karel Kadlec, "Jos. Heřm. Gallaše ztracený spis o Valaších v kraji Přerovském," *Český lid* 15 (1906), 161-178, 209-25, 257-77.

75. See for example, Josef Skulina, "Nářeční diferenciace severního úseku moravskoslovenské oblasti se zřením k valašské kolonizaci (Příspěvek k pomezní problematice česko-slovenské)," *Jazykovědný časopis* 15 (1964), 70-71; Šlosar, "Dnešní rozdělení nářečí na východní Moravě," 387-390; Vašek, "Nářečí rožnovsko-meziříčské," 648; Chloupek, "Diferenciace východomoravských nářečí," 80. Chloupek argues that in certain respects that Moravian Slovak is more archaic than Slovak proper and cites the preservation of soft labials as evidence. Jan Chloupek, *Aspekty dialektu* (Brno: Universita J.E. Purkyně, 1971), 27.

76. Bělič was clearly the leader in this regard, consistently arguing that the term Moravian Slovak was outmoded. Although he co-authored a work in 1954 in which he still used the term Moravian Slovak, in the same year he proposed the term "East Moravian." Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 88. See also Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 73; Bělič, "Názvy základních nářečních skupin českého jazyka," 135. In the latter work, he argues that the term Moravian Slovak gives the ignorant the idea that this dialect group belongs to the Slovak national language. Other Czech dialectologists tended to agree with him, but noted the difficulties that a change in names would entail. See for example, Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 12. Eventually

the term East Moravian did catch on but old habits died hard. As late as 1977 the term Moravian Slovak was still in use. See František Cuřín et al, *Vývoj českého jazyka a dialektologie: Učebnice pro pedagogické fakulty* (Prague, 1977).

77. Kazmíř, writing for a Czech audience makes essentially the same point. He also notes that much of the work that is available is too detailed for the average person. Silvestr Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí* (Vsetín: Malina, 2001), 7.

78. Skulina, "O valašském nářečí," 204-05. Likewise, Bělič and Křístek argued that Valachian is the same as the dialect of Slovácko (the southern part of eastern Moravia) in all its main features and thus there was no reason to separate it. Bělič and Křístek, *Moravskoslovenská nářečí*, 3. Michálková referred to "so-called Valachian" in her works. Věra Michálková, "Městská mluva ve Vsetíně," *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 30 (1978), 285, 287; Věra Michálková, "Východomoravské věty typu 'było vdołky'," *Sborník prací Filosofické fakulty Brněnské university* 10. *A: Řada jazykovědná* 9 (1961), 105. See also, Jan Chloupek, "Tvary třetí osoby mn. č. přit. času ve východomoravských nářečích," *Naše řeč* 46 (1963), 66.

79. Šembera was the first to notice this dialect but did not use the term Valachian. Alois Vojtěch Šembera, *Základové dialektologie československé* (Vienna, 1864). Bartoš was the first to use the term, even using the term *valaština*, which could be translated as "Valachian language" (compare with *čeština*=Czech language, *ruština*=Russian language, etc.). Bartoš, "Moravské Valašsko, kraj i lid," 459. See Skulina, *O valašském nářečí*, 203, for further discussion. Trávníček was also quite comfortable with the notion of a separate Valachian entity. See František Trávníček, "Poznámky o valašské mluvě," *Naše Valašsko* 1 (1929-30), 56-59.

80. Jaromír Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 2nd ed. (Prague: Univerzita Karlova, 1988), 45. See also Jaromír Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie* (Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1972), 271.

81. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 271-74; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 45-47; Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*.

82. By focusing on this isogloss, Chloupek was able to create a central zone that incorporated territory from both Valašsko and Slovácko. Taking the verb *prosit*, he divided eastern Moravia into three zones based on the third-person plural ending used: a northern zone with *prosá*, a central zone with *prosíja* and the variant *prosíjá*, and a southern zone with *prosijú*, *prosá*, and *prosí*. Chloupek, "Tvary třetí osoby mn. č. přit. času ve východomoravských nářečích," 67. See also his earlier article. Chloupek, "Diferenciace východomoravských nářečí," 81.

83. Chloupek is careful to document the villages in which he found each feature he discusses so it is possible but rather time-consuming.

84.See, for example, Chloupek, "Diferenciace východomoravských nářečí," 84. He later retreated somewhat from his previous stance by naming the Valašsko region and noting that even within East Moravian it was the most archaic region of all, thus indicating that there is good reason to treat it as a separate dialect. Chloupek, *Aspekty dialektu*, 111-12. Skulina states that within Czech, Valachian is the most archaic, most peripheral of the dialects. Skulina, "Jsou Gallašovy poznámky o valašském nářečí správné?" 208.

85. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 9, 13, 119.

86. Vašek identifies himself as a native of Valašsko in the first part of his *diplomová práce*. Vašek, "Nářečí na Rožnovsku a Valašskomeziříčsku," 2. In this same work, p. 12, he argues that Valachian has enough features that distinguish it from surrounding dialects.

87. See Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 72-73, for a concise summary. When listing the features Vašek did not argue that each one was found consistently throughout Valašsko. Vašek, as many other Czech linguists, had to contend with the fact that there was a significant amount of variation and few sharp linguistic borders. But be that as it may, he identified 12 features that are found throughout Valašsko and another 17 features that are found on the greater part of its territory that separate Valachian from its neighbors. In an earlier work Vašek lamented that there was no truly exhaustive study of the Valachian dialect. Vašek, "Významný krok vpřed v řešení valašské otázky," 187.

88. As we have alread noted, Bělič cited Vašek's book as a work that conclusively demonstrated that Valachian is a part of Czech. However, in his later works on Czech dialectology he continued to ignore Valachian as a separate dialect and would only grudgingly use the term in parenthesis, if at all. While Vašek's book was positively received by most Czech scholars, Krandžalov's reception was not at all positive, referring to its title as bombastic and making several criticisms. See Krandžalov, "Současný stav studií o rumunských vlivech na Slovensku a na Moravě," 35-36. The ethnographer Štika also questioned the value of his study because the general population of the region was not particularly cognizant of the key lingustic feature (i.e., the soft labials) Vašek described as separating it from surrounding areas. See Štika, *The Ethnographic Region of Moravian Wallachia: Its Origin and Development*, 75-76.

89. Sometimes the Awakeners are criticized for this decision. This is rather anachronistic thinking however, for, as Bělič notes, there was no Colloquial Czech or Common Czech at that time. Rather there was just a bunch of different peasant dialects. Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 42. Neishchimenko and Shirokova argue that none of these regional dialects were capable of functioning as the national medium and the only solution was to return to the literary language of the earlier era as the basis for modern Literary Czech. Neishchimenko, G. P. and A. G. Shirokova, "Vozrozhdenie cheshskogo iazyka kak neobkhodimyi komponent formirovaniia cheshskoi natsii," in *Slavianskie kul'tury v epokhu formirovaniia i razvitiia slavianskikh natsii XVIII-XIX vv.*, ed. D. F. Markov (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), 129-30.

90. See for example: Eva Eckert, "Introduction," In *Varieties of Czech*, ed. Eva Eckert (Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1993), 20.; Marie Krčmová, "Termín obecná čeština a různost jeho chápání," in *Čeština: Univerzália a specifika*, ed. P. Karlík and Z. Hladká (Brno, 2000), 2:63-77; Charles E. Townsend, *A Description of Spoken Prague Czech* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1990), 10-12; Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech*, 15-19; František Čermák, "Spoken Czech," in *Varieties of Czech. Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics*, ed. Eva Eckert (Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1993), 27-41.

91. Jaromír Bělič, "Poznámky k mizení nářečí," *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 1 (1946), 196, and Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech*, 15, make this same point.

92. As Hammer notes, literary Czech does not at all seem stilted to Moravians. Louise Hammer, "The Function of Code Switching in Prague Colloquial Czech," in *Varieties of Czech. Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics*, ed. Eva Eckert (Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1993), 73. See also George Cummins, "Common Colloquial Czech and Brno City Speech," in *Varieties of Czech. Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics*, ed. Eva Eckert (Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1993), 153-54.

93. As it was some Moravians were not happy with the situation and wanted to establish a separate Moravian literary language but their arguments did not prevail. For further discussion see Hannan, "The Language Question in Nineteenth Century Moravia," 116-125.

94. For a brief treatment in English of these four zones see David Short, "Czech," in *The Slavonic Languages*, eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett (New York: Routledge, 2002), 527-31.

95. Again the leader in this regard was Jaromír Bělič who not only wanted to dispense with the term Moravian Slovak, but also the terms Lachian and Hanak. Bělič gives a discussion of his reasons for rejecting the older labels in his 1973 article. Bělič, "Názvy základních nářečních skupin českého jazyka," 134-137.

96. Provided in Bělič and Křístek, *Moravskoslovenská nářečí*, 4. For additional examples, see also Kellner, *Úvod do dialektologie*, 23. Somewhat longer examples can be found in Cuřín et al, *Vývoj českého jazyka a dialektologie: Učebnice pro pedagogické fakulty*, 172-73. Havránek provides a similar set of examples, but also includes an Old Czech variant. Havránek, "Nářečí česká," 104.

97. In his early work Vašek argued that at one point that Lachian and the dialect of the Rožnov and Valašské Meziříčí areas, i.e., Valachian, formed a unified whole which was shattered by the Valachian colonization. Vašek, "Nářečí na Rožnovsku a Valašskomeziříčsku, " 40. However, in a later work, he downplayed the significance of the Valachian colonization on the Valachian dialect. Vašek, "Významný krok vpřed v řešení valašské otázky," 189.

98. The majority of the differences among the Czech dialects arose in the period between the 14th and 16th centuries. For an extended discussion see Arnošt Lamprecht, "Vznik a historický vývoj českých nářečí," in *České nářeční texty*, ed. Arnošt Lamprecht and Věra Michálková (Prague: Státni pedagogické nakladatelství, 1976), 11-16.

99. Bělič very much stresses that the political border is also a border in terms of consciousness. Inhabitants west of the border think of themselves as Czech. Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 87-88.

100. As Czech linguists have routinely pointed out, there are few firm linguistic boundaries in Moravia and western Slovakia. While there are numerous isoglosses, they rarely coincide with one another. The entire area can be seen as a transitional zone between Czech and Slovak with numerous transitional zones between the various internal dialects. For further discussion see Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 65-68; Bělič and Křístek, *Moravskoslovenská nářečí*, 8, 11. Bartoš noted the difficulty in separating the dialects from one another and argued that folk costume (*kroj*) should be the deciding factor in differentiating them. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 59; Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, i; Bartoš, "Moravské Valašsko, kraj i lid," 459.

101. Skulina's monograph gives excellent detail although he covers territory usually considered outside the traditional confines of Valašsko. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*. The most detailed study in the region comes from Svěrák whose monograph covers only two villages. See F. Svěrák, *Karlovické nářečí* (Prague, 1957).The reader should note, however, that Svěrák's study came under intense criticism from Vašek who found it deficient in several ways. See Antonín Vašek, "Nová práce o valašském nářečí," *Slovo a slovesnost* 20 (1959), 66-71.

102. As Kazmíř notes, the original Valachian is almost entirely gone. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 7, 494-96.

103. Bělič, "Poznámky k mizení nářečí," 195-96; Věra Michálková, "K vlivu spisovné češtiny na lidové nářečí," *Vlastivědný věstník moravský* 15 (1960), 209; Marie Krčmová, "Tradiční nářečí v současnosti," *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty Brněnské univerzity.* Vol 37. *A: Řada jazykovědná* 36 (1988), 86. See also Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 207 -09.

104. Bělič, "Poznámky k mizení nářečí," 195. As Bělič noted, within Moravia "Common Hanak", "Common Lachian" and "Common Moravian Slovak" began to arise. Briefly stated, an interdialect is a form in which leveling has taken place between several closely related dialects. Those features that are most distinct for each individual dialect are erased in favor of forms more common to the group as a whole. For further discussion of the interdialects see Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 89-101; Jan Chloupek, "Vznik interdialektu a jeho poměru k národnímu jazyku," *Slavia* 22 (1953), 214; Jan Chloupek, "K otázce interdialektů," in *Adolfu Kellnerovi: Sborník jazykovědných studií* (Opava, 1955), 145-153.

105. Jan Chloupek, "Perspektivy dialektu ve vývoji národního jazyka," in *Současná vesnice* (Brno, 1978), 64-65; Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 96; Chloupek, *Aspekty dialektu*, 108; Krčmová, "Tradiční nářečí v současnosti," 92; Lamprecht, "Vznik a historický vývoj českých nářečí," 15-16.

106. Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 93.

107. Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech*, 12. Kučera noted that use of LC in the schools and mass media was weakening dialectical structures. This process did not occur easily, however, for students at school viewed the use of Literary Czech by another student as affectation. See Bělič, "Poznámky k mizení nářečí," 200. Where LC was most easily triumphant was in abstract terminology or neologisms. In these cases, the LC forms were adopted; no attempt was made to localize the terms. See Bělič, "Postavení moravské slovenštiny," 91; Chloupek, "K otázce interdialektů," 152.

108. Kazmíř views Valachian as having held its own until circa 1950. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 496.

109. Czech rock bands are notorious for their use of non-literary Czech and a fair amount of non-standard language finds its way on to the broadcasts of TV Nova.

110. Some linguists have downplayed the important of Colloquial Czech in eastern Moravia. See, for example, Cuřín et al, *Vývoj českého jazyka a dialektologie: Učebnice pro pedagogické fakulty*, 136; Cummins, "Common Colloquial Czech and Brno City Speech," 170. Although her research deals with the region south of Valašsko, Krčmová's statement that "our research

indicates that Common Czech does not enjoy prestige in the areas observed. Respondents do not seem to pay much attention to it, and perceive it as a variety of a different region" is of relevance. See Krčmová, "The Position of Dialect in the Language of East Moravian Villages," in *Varieties of Czech. Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics*, ed. Eva Eckert (Amsterdam-Atlanta: Rodopi, 1993), 148-49. In the nineteenth century in Moravia, Common Czech was viewed rather negatively in contrast to Literary Czech due to class distinctions. For further discussion, see Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 93-94. With regard to eastern Moravia, Chloupek noted in the 1950's that the local residents were more resistant to Colloquial Czech than Literary Czech in part because the former was perceived as "aristocratic" (*panský*). Chloupek, "K otázce interdialektů," 148.

111. Although not often expressed in venues visible to non-Czechs, many Moravians have a fair amount of antagonism towards the residents of the capital. For some Moravians with whom this author has spoken, the word hatred would not be too strong a term. Cummins notes that the residents of Brno have a resentful attitude towards those of Prague. Cummins, "Common Colloquial Czech and Brno City Speech," 156, 171.

112. Cuřín, et al, argue that there are four levels of language at work: 1) Literary Czech, 2) Colloquial Czech (*hovorová čeština*), 3) Common Czech (*obecná čeština*) and 4) dialects (*nářečí*). However, they argue that in eastern Moravia colloquial Czech and the dialects interact without the mediation of Common Czech. Cuřín et al, *Vývoj českého jazyka a dialektologie*, 136.

113. On Czechoslovak TV and radio, Czech and Slovak routinely alternated with one another.

114. Lamprecht, "Vznik a historický vývoj českých nářečí," 16.

115. See, for example, the introduction written in Valachian to Josef Fabián, *Slovník nespisovného jazyka valaského* (Valašské Meziříčí, 2001). See also: Helena Mičkalová, *Co sa Karlovjanom stalo aj nestalo* (Velké Karlovice, n.d.); Helena Mičkalová, *Co si pamatajú Karlovjané* (Velké Karlovice-Vsetín: Helena Mičkalová-Masarykova veřejná knihovna, 2001); Helena Mičkalová, *O čem si vyprávjajú Karlovjané* ([Velké Karlovice], 1997).

116. The Valachian *y* is not pronounced exactly the same as the Russian *ы*. According to Vašek, the Valachian *y* is palatal whereas the Russian *ы* is mediopalatal. Antonín Vašek, "Charakteristika nářečí na Rožnovsku a východní Valašskomeziříčsku," in *Studie ze slovanské jazykovědy*, ed. Václav Machek (Prague, 1958), 391. See also Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 24.

117. See, for example, Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 26; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 45.

118. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 271.Compare with the pronunciation of Russian *u* after *ш, ж, ц*. The complete inventory is: *ž, š, c, č, ř, z, s*. Kazmíř draws a small distinction in the pronunciation between the *i* after these letters and the regular *y*. See Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 496.

119. Cuřín et al, *Vývoj českého jazyka a dialektologie*, 44-56.

120. Townsend provides a good discussion in English of this phenomenon. See Charles E. Townsend, *Czech through Russian* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1981), 33-37. Czechs use different terms to label the various vowel changes. The term *přehláska* refers specifically to the shift of back vowels to front vowels and covers the changes *a* > *ě*, *u* > *i*, *aj* > *ej*. The vowel shift *ie, é* > *í* is

referred to as *užení* (contraction) while the change from *ó* > *uo* > *ů*, and *ú* > *au* > *ou* is termed *změna* (change). These terms are taken from Kellner, *Úvod do dialektologie* and Cuřín et al, *Vývoj českého jazyka a dialektologie.*

121. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 264; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 41. Carlton describes the situation for *a* following a soft consonant in LC. Terence R. Carlton, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1991), 234.

122. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 263; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 40. Carlton describes the situation of *u/ú* for LC. Carlton, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*, 234.

123. Carlton, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*, 234.

124. The change *ú* > *ó* > *ou* took place in the 14th and 15th centuries in most Czech dialects. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 493; Cuřín et al, *Vývoj českého jazyka a dialektologie*, 53, 63.

125. The editors of Kellner's *Introduction to Dialectology* argued that from a purely synchronic point of view Moravian Slovak could be placed in the Slovak group of dialects. They cited these vowel shifts however, as evidence that the dialects of eastern Moravia were developing in accord with Czech, not Slovak. Kellner, *Úvod do dialektologie*, 21.

126. In both cases the vowel is the same but the convention in LC is to write all words with the sound *ú* derived from *ó* with the symbol *ů*. In works on dialectology, the convention is to write *ú.*

127. Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 40. Carlton describes this situation for LC in similar terms, but notes that after *l* long *ě* went to *é* not *í*. Thus *mléko* not *mlíko*. Carlton, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*, 235. For the last form, *hřích*, the Valachian pronunciation is *hřých* in accord with the rule outlined above. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 51.

128. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 264; Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 74.

129. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 75-76.

130. Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech*, 30, 85. The inventory is: *p, b, t, d, ť, ď, k, g, f, v, s, z, ch, h, c, č, m, n, ň, l, r, ř, j*.

131. The complete inventory for the "archaic kernel" (i.e., Valašsko) provided by Skulina in his monograph is: *p, b, m, f, v, p', b', m', f', v', t, d, n, c, č, s, z, š, ž, ł, ľ, r, ř, ť, ď, ň, j, k, g, ch, h* although he adds the consonants *ʒ* and *ʒ́* in parentheses. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 28. In the same year in an article he simply lists the latter two consonants for an inventory of 33. Skulina, "Nářeční diferenciace severního úseku moravskoslovenské oblasti se zřením k valašské kolonizaci (Příspěvek k pomezní problematice česko-slovenské)," 69.

132. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 14-15.

133. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 68. The Czech *ť*, *ď*, and *ň* differ from the Russian *mь*, *дь*, and *нь*. For further discussion see Townsend, *Czech through Russian*, 18-19.

134. Skulina gives a description of the pronunciation of the *ł*, which is close to, but not exactly the same as the Russian hard *l*. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 29. Vašek gives a detailed description of

both the soft *l* and the hard *l* in Valachian. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 21-22. Skulina refers to the *l* of LC as both "middle" (*střední*) and "not hard" (*netvrdé*). Vašek, however, uses the term *netvrdé* to refer to the softer *l* as opposed to the LC middle one. Both scholars consistently used the symbol *l'* when representing the soft *l*.

135. The use of the symbol (*ł*) for the hard *l* can be rather confusing for it is the same as the Polish *ł* which represents the sound *w* in English. Further adding to the confusion is the fact that the *w* sound can occur in certain Czech dialects, especially in southeastern Moravia. See Marie Krčmová, "The Position of Dialect in the Language of East Moravian Villages," 145. However, Czech dialectologists have routinely noted that this sound rarely occurs in Valašsko. See Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 29; Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 22.

136. In his dictionary, Kazmíř uses only the hard symbol (*ł*) but not the soft one (*l'*). The standard *l* is used although he clearly indicates that it represents a soft sound. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 492, 496.

137. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 22. For the latter verb, Kazmíř provides the definition "to strike on the head." Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 153.

138. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 400. The *l* lengthens in diminutive forms. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 60.

139. Both the *r* and *ř* can be vocalic. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 60.

140. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 492. As the dialectologists have noted, in a few areas, the old syllabic *ł*, both short and long, was preserved in the southern area of Valachian, but in most areas it was fully syllabicized. Thus in a few areas *dłh* but usually *dluh*. For further discussion, see Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 272; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 40.

141. Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech*, 33-34.

142. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 39.

143. Carlton, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages*, 233.

144. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 262; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 40. Kazmíř treats this phoneme as less widespread. For example, with regard to the former example, he renders it simply as *cuzí*.

145. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 40.

146. Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech*, 35.

147. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 493.

148. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 66. He named specifically the Karlovsko and Rožnovsko areas. Kašík, following Bartoš by a couple of decades, noted that penultimate stress was a regular feature in the region. He also noted that in a word with more than three syllables that a secondary stess often appeared on the first syllable. He argued that this this was a long-standing tendency and not necessarily due to the influence of Literary Czech. Antonín Kašík, *Popis a rozbor nářečí středobečevského* (Prague, 1908), 36-37. Decades later, Skulina would confirm Kašík's observations, noting that multisyllabic words have penultimate stress and words with over three syllables have a secondary stress on the first syllable. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 79.

149. Vašek noted that the entire northern area of Valašsko had penultimate stress and that the feature went much further south than previously thought. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 43. Belič argued that penultimate stress was the norm although the younger generation was beginning to succumb to Literary Czech in this regard. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 272. See also Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 497.

150. For a brief discussion see Bělič, *Sedm kapitol o češtině*, 76.

151. Skulina, *Jazykový vývoj na severním pomezí moravskoslovenské oblasti*, 413; Svěrák, *Karlovické nářečí*, 153.

152. Trávníček, "Poznámky o valašské mluvě," 56-58. He also questioned whether the Lachian/Silesian dialects could have had much influence on Valachian in terms of stress. Vašek cites penultimate stress as a key feature that ties Valachian and Lachian together. Vašek, "Charakteristika nářečí na Rožnovsku a východní Valašskomeziříčsku," 395.

153. Havránek, "Nářečí česká," 115-16. Havránek cites evidence from the Bohemian dialects that indicate the penultimate stress might indeed be the original.

154. Romportl cited evidence from archaic south Bohemian dialects. Milan Romportl, "K otázce ustálení západoslovanského přízvuku," in *Studie a práce linguistické*, Vol. I (Prague, 1954), 73-80. Havránek, relying on Romportl's article, would later restate his position on the matter. Bohuslav Havránek, "K historické dialektologii," *Slovo a slovesnost* 16 (1955), 155.

155. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 265; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 42. This particular feature is shared by most East Moravian dialects. The latter two examples also violate one of the underlying rules of LC phonology regarding imperatives, in which the ending *–me* is not truly a suffix but an enclitic particle. For further discussion, see Kučera, *The Phonology of Czech*, 70-71.

156. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 60-61. Skulina also notes, pp. 64-66, that simplification of consonant clusters is a feature of Valachian speech. However, he also notes that this phenomenon occurs in surrounding regions, raising the question as to whether this is a truly dialectical feature. Compare with Towsend's discussion of simplification and whether this should be considered a "colloquial" feature. Townsend, *A Description of Spoken Prague Czech*, 44-45.

157. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 264; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 41.

158. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 264; Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 41; Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 345.

159. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 265. Despite the strong similarities, however, the correspondence of Valachian with Slovak is not perfect. In first example, where Valachian has *ídlo*, Slovak has *jedlo.* Also note that forms with the initial *j* often function as variants for those without.

160. The genitive and dative/locative forms for example still have considerable differences. Likewise, as in Literary Czech there is another type of feminine soft-stem noun ending in a consonant that has its own declensional pattern (*žížeň*). However, for feminine nouns ending in a vowel, there is only one ending in the nominative, accusative and instrumental singular which is much simpler than the system of Literary Czech.

161. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 498-99; Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 69.

162. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 498; Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 71.

163. Bartoš cites this ending as *–i*: *koni*. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 71.

164. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 68; Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 499-500. Based on the practice in Literary Czech neither Bartoš nor Kazmíř writes the symbol *ň* before the *í* in the forms for Valachian *psáňí*. Likewise, neither uses the symbol for the soft l (*ĺ*). I do so here for the sake of consistency.

165. Bartoš cites *–á* as the ending for the nominative and accusative plural. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 68.

166. Kazmíř cites *–om* as an alternate ending. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 500.

167. Kazmíř cites *–och* as an alternate ending. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 500.

168. Kazmíř cites *–ama* as an alternate ending for soft neuters nouns in the instrumental plural. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 499-500.

169. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 498. Belič while arguing that *–ama* is characteristic for the East Moravian dialect as a whole, states that the ending *–ami/am'i* tends to predominate in Valachian. Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 42, 46. In contrast to both of these authors, Bartoš cited the masculine plural instrumental for as *–y/i*: *chłapy*. He does note, however, that both *–ami* and *–ama* are heard in the region. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 66-68.

170. Belič notes that in some areas the masculine animate accusative plural takes the genitive plural ending. Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 46.

171. In the plural the forms for Valachian differ significantly for all genders only in the instrumental: LC *dobrými* versus Valachian *dobrýma*. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 500. Bartoš, however, gives the ending for Valachian as *–ými* although he does note *–ýma* as a variant. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 76. As with the noun ending *–ama*, *-ýma* goes back to the old dual declension in Slavic.

172. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 500; Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 76.

173. Bělič, *Nástin české dialektologie*, 271. Bartoš did not see this phenomenon as widespread. He noted several areas had endings just in *–t* or a mixture of *–t* and *-ť*.Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 76.

174. Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 41.

175. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 76-77.

176. Bělič, *Přehled nářečí českého jazyka*, 46. Bartoš argued that there were actually three patterns in existence. One coincides with Belič's observation. But he also argued that in some areas the final *ł* never dropped, while in other areas there was an alternation between dropping the *ł* or inserting an *é*: *néséł*. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 62, 77.

177. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 72-73; Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 501. The forms in parentheses are the short forms of the pronouns. In his dictionary Kazmíř notes the presence of the soft labials with

the symbol *j*: *tebja* instead of *teb'a*. Kazmíř also tends to provide forms that are more in line with LC: thus *sebe* instead of *seb'a* for the genitive singular of the reflexive pronoun. Bartoš lists these forms as alternates.

178. Bartoš also lists the form *m'a*.

179. In accordance with the rule given above, it is pronounced *sy*.

180. Other differences include the forms for the feminine third-person singular forms for the accusative and the instrumental (LC *ji* and *jí* vs. Valachian *ju* and *ňú*). Kazmíř provides alternates for the instrumental endings for all plural pronouns (LC *námi*, *vámi* and *jimi* vs. Valachian *nama*, *vama*, and *nima*). For the third-person plural pronoun, Bartoš cites the forms *nimi*, *něma*. Bartoš, *Dialektologie moravská*, 75.

181. For a list of Moravian lexicon see František Bartoš, *Dialektický slovník moravský* (Prague, 1906). The *Czech Language Atlas* can also be quite useful. For example, with regard to the term for "village" (LC *vesnice*), there is a fairly neat division between Bohemia and Moravia. Most of Moravia was recorded not as using *vesnice* but rather *dědina*. Jan Balhar and Pavel Jančák, *Česky jazykový atlas*. Vol. 1 (Prague: Academia, 2004), 350-51.

182. Jan Balhar and Pavel Jančák, *Česky jazykový atlas*. Vol. 1, 78-79.

183. Jan Balhar and Pavel Jančák, *Česky jazykový atlas*. Vol. 1, 76-77. One might also note the use of *cerka* instead of LC *děvče* (girl), p. 69.

184. See, for example, the list cited above provided by Krandžalov. See also Jaromír Bělič, "Lexikální rozdíly na území českého jazyka z hlediska vztahů k jiným jazykům slovanským," *Slavia* 42 (1973), 2-3; Bělič and Kříštek, *Moravskoslovenská nářečí*, 13; Svěrák, *Karlovické nářečí*, 154; Bartoš, "Moravské Valašsko, kraj i lid," 461.

185. See for example, Krandžalov, "K dnešnímu stavu studia rumunských vlivů v Karpatech," 340; Krandžalov, *Valaši na Moravě: Materiály, problémy, metody*, 198; Krandzhalov, "O sovremennom sostoianii izucheniia rumynskikh vliianii v Karpatach," 264, 269; Skulina, "Zur Problematik der walachischen Worter auf dem Gebiet der mahrischschlesischen Beskiden," 82-83; Skulina, "Stratifikace salašnických termínů v oblasti Moravskoslezských Beskyd," 303; Štika, "Bádání o karpatském salašnictví a valašské kolonizaci na Moravě," 532. See also Anton Habovštiak, "O výskume pastierskej terminológie," *Slovenský národopis* 9 (1961), 653-661. For a discussion of the Slavic pastoral terminology as a whole, see G. P. Klepikova, *Slavianskaia pastusheskaia terminologiia (ee genezis i rasprostranenie v iazykakh Karpatskogo areala)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1974).

186. Chloupek, *Aspekty dialektu*, 107.

187. Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*; Fabián, *Slovník nespisovného jazyka valaského.* Both publications provide a list of proverbs and sayings of the region. Fabián also provides a brief section on the folklore of the region.

188. See, for example, Jan Chloupek, "Some Notes on Dialectical Syntax," *Sborník prací Filosofické fakulty Brněnské university.* Vol 7. *A: Řada jazykovědná* 6 (1958), 37; Jan Chloupek, "Pořádek slov v nářečí, zvlaště východomoravském," *Slovo a slovesnost* 19 (1958), 261; Bělič, "Naléhavé úkoly české dialektologie," 287-88. Belič argued that while Czech dialectology had accomplished much since 1945, more work was need in the areas of syntax, word formation and lexicon.

189. See in particular Chloupek, *Aspekty dialektu* and Věra Michálková, *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě* (Prague, 1971).

190. Jan Chloupek, "Časové a podmínkové reálné věty ve východomoravských dialektech," *Sborník prací Filosofické fakulty Brněnské university.* Vol. 10 *A: Řada jazykovědná* 9 (1961), 95-103; Jan Chloupek, "Východomoravské věty se spojkovým CO," *Slovo a slovesnost* 20 (1959), 261 -271.

191. Michálková, *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě*, 25, 31, 72-73.

192. Šlosar in his review of Michálková's book makes precisely this point. Šlosar, review of *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě* by Věra Michálková, 246. Michálková herself comes to this conclusion at the end of her monograph. Michálková, *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě*, 169-70.

193. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 32. It should be stressed that this does not mean that some of these features cannot be found in neighboring dialects. Although his study focuses on all of the northern East Moravian group, Skulina's monograph also provides a valuable discussion of some syntactical features. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 135-82. See also Svěrák, *Karlovické nářečí*, 82-108.

194. Other items listed by Vašek include the use of compound prepositions (*s-po-nad*), the use of plural modifiers and verbs with a singular subject to express respect, the repetition of prepositions, and so on. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 32-37.

195. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 136; Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 34; Michálková, "Východomoravské věty typu 'bylo vdołky'," 105-111; Michálková, *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě*, 148; Chloupek, *Aspekty dialektu*, 99. This feature is not specific just to Valachian but occurs in all of East Moravian.

196. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 165. See also Michálková, *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě*, 157. In LC these forms are enclitics and generally occur as the second element in a sentence or clause unless another enclitic with higher priority pushes them out.

197. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 169; Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 37; Michálková, *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě*, 115.

198. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 179; Michálková, *Studie o východomoravské nářeční větě*, 91.

199. See Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 492. Skulina noted this process was underway in the 1960's. Skulina, *Severní pomezí moravskoslovenských nářečí*, 30. Vašek noted that the influence of LC was leading to some distortions because the *l* in LC was closer to the soft Valachian *l* rather than the hard one. Under the influence of LC members of the younger generation began to pronounce words that traditionally had a hard *l* with a soft one: *žľutý* instead of *žłutý*. Vašek, *Jazykové vlivy karpatské salašnické kolonizace na Moravě*, 22.

200. Here the years of exposure to Literary Czech have had their effect. Many residents of Valašsko now use the stress patterns of Literary Czech. But a hybrid form has also developed in which the primary stress is on the first syllable with a secondary stress on the penultimate syllable. Belič noticed this process taking place among the younger generation when writing in

the 1970's. Bělič, "K české dialektologické terminologii," 272. See also Kazmíř, *Slovník valašského nářečí*, 497.

Czech (Bohemian) Women in U.S. History:
Independent Spirit and Their Nonconforming Role
by Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr.

When the subject of Czech women casually comes up during a conversation or a social gathering, most Americans usually come up with such names as the tennis player Martina Navrátilová,[1] a model and socialite Ivana Trump, ex-wife of mogul Donald Trump,[2] or the past U.S. Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.[3] With that, their knowledge of specific names ends, although they may also be familiar with some of the beautiful Czech supermodels who are pursuing their careers in the U.S. To be sure, American men like to marry them, not just because they are good looking, but also on account of their incomparable cooking, industrious nature and for being kind, understanding and good mothers.

The purpose of this article is to look beyond the superficiality and examine how American women of Czech extraction have played a significant role in U.S. history, from Colonial times to date. Many such women made major contributions to public life, as well as to various professions. In fact, their number is so large that this study is divided into several parts, beginning with women pioneers, women activists and reformers and with nonconforming women in public life who generally exercised an independent spirit:[4]

I. Pioneers and Pathfinders
    A. Moravians
    B. Patriots and Loyalists
    C. Charitable Souls
II. Early Professionals
    Teachers
    Social Workers
    Librarians
    Journalists
III. Women as Organizers
    Religious Organizations
    Secular Organizations
IV. Activists and Reformers
V. Women in Public Office
    A. Politicians
    B. First Woman Public Servant
    C. Executive Branch
    D. Legislative Branch
    E. Judicial Branch

Pioneers and Pathfinders

Moravians

Women who came to America in the first part of the 18th century, as members of the renewed *Unitas fratrum*, known as the Moravian Church, played a variety of roles at every level of Moravian society. In many ways, these women were ahead of the suffragist goals by more than one hundred years

Besides working alongside their husbands as equal partners, they were

storekeepers, financial managers, missionaries and stewardesses who took care of the temporal affairs of a congregation or choir. They were members of the Church councils around the world, and in these governing bodies they participated actively in discussions and decision-making. They were also active spiritual leaders. They served as acolytes, they were ordained as deaconesses, eldresses and even presbyters. As deaconesses and eldresses, they led worship and preached in services for their own choirs. Some of them even ordained deaconesses and female presbyters, a function normally reserved for bishops. While no one knows the actual numbers, probably between 100 to 150 women held administrative and spiritual offices in the Moravian settlements and central Church. Such representation in public offices were unthinkable by usual standards.[5]

There is a consensus that of all the Moravian women, Anna Caritas Nitschmann (1715-1760), a native of Suchdol, Moravia, was most influential. She was a daughter of the famed "Father" David Nitschmann[6] and his wife Anna, nee Schneider. When her father and brother Melchior were confined in prison because of their religious activities, she longed to share their imprisonment. They later managed to escape. When Anna's mother and her younger brother John were also threatened with arrest, the latter three fled, in 1725, to Herrnhut (Ochranov, in Czech). The family moved to nearby Berthelsdorf, where Anna became errand girl for a young Countess Zinzendorf.

When she was fifteen years old, in 1730, the lottery designated Anna as the Eldress of all the women of Herrnhut. In May 1730, she organized the Choir of Unmarried Women. That year she also became governess of Countess Benigna Zinzendorf. She was unable to accept the marriage offers of John Nitschmann and Leonard Dober, because of her Church responsibilities.

In 1736 she joined the "pilgrim" group and the banished Count Zinzendorf in his work. She travelled to desolate castle in Wetteravia, where she taught children of the poverty-stricken residents. When they were ordered out by the owner, she went to Holland and in 1837 to England. The next year she had charge of the Countess Anna Theresa Zinzendorf.

She resigned her office as Eldress in 1740 so that she could accompany her father to Pennsylvania, where she remained until 1743. Here she conducted services among Quakers and Indians. One day, while engaged in spiritual work among the Indians, she met Count Zinzendorf and his daughter Benigna. She joined them and then all three continued working among the Indians. In 1743 she was back in Germany with the "pilgrim" group in Herrnahaag, Herrnhut, Ebersdorf and Silesia, and he was also in prison with this group in Riga, 1743-44. In 1746 she was named Mother of the entire Moravian Church.

During 1744-50 she was in Herrnhut, Gnadeck, Marienborn, Herrnhaag, England and again in Herrnhut, "everywhere tireless in the work for the Lord and for souls." In 1751 she accompanied Count Zinzendorf to Switzerland, France and England, being in charge of work among women.

In June 1757, Count Zinzendorf married her as his second wife, his first wife having died in 1756. They then spent five months in Switzerland and the rest of their lives in the Dutch and German congregations. Zinzendorf died on May 9, 1760 and she followed him twelve days later. In the Moravian Church she was known as "selige Jüngerin" (the blessed woman Disciple). She wrote many hymns, but only a few were translated to English.[7]

The second place among the women in the Moravian Church hierar-

chy would most certainly have to go to Anna Johanna Seidel (nee Piesch) (1726-1788), a native of Berthelsdorf, of Moravian parents. Her father George Piesch was born in Kunín. In 1739, at the age of fourteen, she was leader of the Children's Choir. In 1741 she became acolyte and in 1743 Eldress of Children and Associate Eldress of Older Girls in Herrnhut. At the Herschberg Synod in 1743 she was elected as General Associate Eldress. In the same year she was active in Herrnhag as leader of her choir and later in London in the organization of a Sisters' Choir. In 1747 she was the General Eldress of all the Single Sisters' Choirs, in which capacity she traveled extensively across Europe and America with Count Zinzendorf and her aunt Anna Nitschmann. In 1751 she became head of a girls' school in Grosshennersdorf. She was close to Count Zinzendorf and his wife and was engaged to their son, who prematurely died in May 1752. Later Count Henry XXXI Reuss also sought her in marriage.

In 1752 she was again in London and in the same year went to America with a group of Single Sisters. In 1753 she was back in London and in 1754 was in Herrnhut and Silesia. Later she went to London for the fourth time and then went to Zeist and Heerendyk in Holland, Berthelsdorf and Herrnhut. In 1757 she was in Switzerland, in 1759 made her fifth visit to England and in 1760 was in Herrnhut to care for Countess Zinzendorf. On October 10, 1760, at the age of thirty-five, she married Bishop Nathaniel Seidel. She was reluctant to do that at first but recognized the administrative necessity of such a move, due to the death of Count Zinzendorf and Anna Nitschmann. After all, they were then the best known members in the Church in Europe and in America, They came to Bethlehem in 1761 and in 1769 they both attended the Synod in Europe. In 1770 she returned to Bethlehem, where her husband died in May 1782. In 1784, she became leader of the Widows' Choir in Nazareth, where she died April 11, 1788.[8]

Catherine Riedel, nee Pudmenský (1713-1791), was a native of Životice, Moravia. Her life was less conspicuous than that of Anna Nitschmann or Anna Johanna Seidel; nevertheless, it is illustrative of the fact that most Moravian women, like her, besides their role as mothers and household managers, also had outside jobs or responsibilities, unlike most women in the 18th century.

Catherine's father was a Catholic and her mother Evangelical. The mother, with her children, fled to Herrnhut in 1725. Catherine was present at the First Holy Communion in Berthelsdorf on August 12, 1727, which led to the re-establishment of the *Unitas fratrum* as the Moravian Church. She married as her first husband Frederick Riedel, a native of Žilina, Moravia, with whom she had two children, both of whom died in Herrnhut. Riedel was one of the first groups of missionaries who went to Savannah, Georgia where he died in 1735. His wife followed him to Savannah in 1736 but learned there that her husband had died the previous year.

She then married Peter Rosa, also a Bohemian, who came to Savannah with Frederick Riedel. They were selected by lot for missionary work among the Creek Indians, not too far from Savannah. They moved into a primitive hut, called "Irene," which the Moravians constructed for their lodging and as a schoolhouse. The Indians, and particularly their famed chief Tomochichi, heartily welcomed them. The Moravians, even in the midst of their building operations, began to teach the Indians the English alphabet, at the same time putting forth every effort to learn the Indian tongue, in which the Roses were

rapidly becoming proficient.

According to the plan, in the morning and in the evening, the Rosas were to read the English Bible, accompanied by silent prayer; morning, midday and hour in the evening was to be given to the study of the Indian language; and Rosa and his wife were to have an hour for their private devotions. Mrs. Rosa was to teach the Indian girls to read, and the boys, who had already begun to read, were to be taught to write. In their remaining time they were to clear and plant some land, that they might not be too long dependent on the Congregation at Savannah, and on the friendly and generous Indians. The children readily learned, not only to read but some to write; they memorized many passages of Scripture, and learned hymns. The older Indians looked on with wonder and approval, which stimulated the missionaries to new zeal in mastering the language and in taking every opportunity to make the "Great Word" known to them. Despite the good beginning, at the end the conditions worsened, particularly when rumors began to be spread of the imminent Spanish war, as a result of which the Rosas had to be brought back to Savannah. Peter and Catherine Rosa eventually left Georgia and moved to Germantown, Pennsylvania. They had three daughters together, including Anna, about whom more will be said later.

Peter Rosa died in March 1740. His widow went to Bethlehem in time to be one of the eighty people who organized the Bethlehem Congregation on June 25, 1742. In November of that year she married, as her third husband, John Michael Huber, a blacksmith from Tyrol, who came to Bethlehem with the “First Sea Congregation in 1742. In October 1747 Huber was sent on an official visit to St. Thomas. The ship on which he sailed never was heard from again.

The three-times-widow was one of the three occupants of the Widows’ House in Bethlehem. She was ordained a deaconess by Zinzendorf at Bethlehem. Catherine served as head of the Widows’ Choir, as midwife and in various other capacities, both in Bethlehem and Nazareth. She retained her physical and mental vigor until in her ninety-fifth year, when she suffered a stroke and died on June 29, 1798.

She was the first Moravian Sister to enter mission service among the Indians, with her second husband Peter Rosa, among the Creek Indians near Savannah, Georgia. She was one of eight survivors of the charter members of Bethlehem at the Jubilee in 1792 at Bethlehem and the only one attending the services.[9]

Catherine’s and Peter Rosa’s daughter Anna (Rosa) Boehler (1740-1809) was born in Germantown, Pennsylvania. After various schools, Anna joined the single Sisters’ Choir at the age of eighteen and became a teacher herself for the Older Girls. At the age of thirty-one, she married the Rev. Frederick Unger from Ligen, Germany, and moved with her husband to Philadelphia, then Lancaster and Heidelberg, Pennsylvania. He died in April 1779 and she was widowed with two young children and one on the way. She returned to Bethlehem and five years later married Francis Boehler, the brother of the famous preacher Peter Boehler who ran the school at Old Man’s Creek in New Jersey. He died in Lititz in 1806 and she died there in 1809. A portrait of her by Valentine Haidt hangs in the Moravian Archives in Bethlehem.

Her memoir[10] provided a long detailed account of how a woman’s life in the 18th century was shaped by the political and denominational issues of

that time. She also described in depth the Children's House (Kinder-Anstalt). Although the children were taught there, the Anstalt's primary purpose was not that of education but rather freeing both parents of young children for full-time church service and the development of the children's spirituality and fellowship.

As indicated above, most important decisions in the early Moravian Church, including the election of their leaders, building of houses, the choosing of missionaries, and, above all, the selection of spouses in marriages, were done by lot. Moravians made use of the lot in an effort to determine the will of the Lord in any situation in which their right course of action was not clear. They were convinced that they could in this way rely on Christ's guidance because of their acknowledgment of Him as the Chief Elder of their Church. After a prayer, the solutions for the problem posed were written on slips of paper and then one was randomly drawn from a box. The one chosen was God's decision. The idea that even authority could be granted in such a random manner underlined the equality of the congregation members, and that their ultimate subservience lay only to God.[11]

Not all Church members accepted the system without questioning or even opposing it, as is seen in the example of Juliana Jaeschke (1724-1766). She was a native of Žilina, Moravia, who immigrated to Savannah in February 1736. As described in Adela Fries' monograph:[12] "It was a serious mistake to send Juliana Jaeschke to Savannah with the second company. A seamstress was badly needed, and had she been so minded she might have been very useful, but in a list giving very briefly the standing of each one in the 'Society,' it is curtly stated that she was 'ill-mannered, and obstructing everything.' Soon after her arrival it was suggested that she marry Peter Rosa, but the lot forbade and he found a much better helpmeet in the widow of Friedrich Riedel. George Waschke, a carpenter from Kunín, Moravia, thought he would like to marry Juliana, but she refused, even though Bishop Nitschmann, and Mr. and Mrs. Toeltschig pleaded with her. Her preference was for George Haberland, and the result was an uncomfortable state of affairs, which disturbed the leaders of the 'Society' not a little, for living as they did as one large family it meant constant friction on all sides. They did not know whether to force Juliana to submit to their authority, (as a member of the 'Society' she had pledged herself to obedience to the duly elected officers), or whether they should wait and hope for a better frame of mind. At last they referred it to the lot, which read 'Juliana shall not marry any one yet.' This settled the question for the time being. On the 10th of June, the matrimonial troubles of George Waschke and Juliana were resolved by their marriage.[13] They lived happy lives together.

The Patriots and the Loyalists

During the War for Independence, most American women supported the cause of the American Revolution and some were quite active in it. This is also true about the women of Bohemian extraction, such as the descendants of the first immigrants from Bohemia, Augustine Herman (1621-1686)[14] and Frederick Philipse (1626-1702),[15] who came to New Amsterdam in the middle of the 17th century.

Nevertheless, some of these women were also supporters of the Loyalists, as was the case of Mary Philipse and her sister Susannah. Mary Philipse (1730-1782, b. Philipse Manor House, on Hudson River, New York. She was

the daughter of Frederick Philipse, Jr., speaker of the New York Colonial Assembly and one of the early great landholders on the Hudson River. Mary Philipse was carefully educated and enjoyed all of the advantages that society offered. She was described as having great personal beauty, with dark eyes and hair, strong-willed yet of a kindly disposition. She received notoriety as George Washington's first love, then a Virginia Colonel, 24 years of age, who had just won his first laurels on the field of battle. On his way to Boston to meet General Shirley, Washington stopped at the house of Colonel Beverley Robinson in New York. There he met Miss Mary who was visiting her brother-in-law during the winter months. George was apparently touched by her charm and beauty. He left reluctantly, continuing on to Boston. On his return he was again the willing guest of Colonel Robinson. He remained there, in Mary's company, as long as duty would allow. Speculation is that he offered her his hand but was refused. Shortly thereafter, he heard that Colonel Roger Morris, his companion-in-arms and confidante on the bloody field of Monongahela, won Mary's hand. The couple was married in 1758. They built a mansion on the outskirts of New York where they lived happily, until the Revolution. Then, after Colonel Morris affirmed his allegiance to England and the King, their house was confiscated and, ironically, became Washington's headquarters in the autumn of 1776. Mary, her sister and the wife of Rev. Charles Inglis were the only women accused of treason during the Revolution. Mary went with her husband to England where he died in 1794. Mary lived for another 31 years. She died at the age of 96 and was buried by her husband's side near Saviourgate Church in York, UK.[16]

Mary Philipse's sister, Susannah (1727-1822), was the wife of Beverley Robinson of New York. There is some ground for the belief that "she actually exercised over her husband's mind some portion of the influence said to have been possessed by her sister; for it appears that he was at first disinclined to take any active part in the contest between the Colonies and Great Britain."[17] He was so much opposed to the measures of the ministry, that he would not use imported merchandise; but he was at length prevailed on by his friends to enter the Royal service. As before-mentioned, he and Washington were intimate friends before they were separated by difference of political opinion. The "Robinson house," which had been confiscated with the lands, was occupied by Benedict Arnold as his head-quarters, and by Washington at the time of Arnold's treason.

When Colonel Robinson gave up the quiet enjoyment of country life, his wife took her share of the outlawry that awaited him, she, as well as her sister, being included in the act of confiscation. After their removal to England, they lived in retirement. She died near Bath, at the age of ninety-four, in 1822. Her descendants in New Brunswick preserve, among other relics of the olden time, a silver tea-urn, of rich and massive workmanship, said to be the first of such articles used in America.[18]

Of quite a "different dough" than the above two women was a Maryland patriot and a folk heroine Kitty Knight (1775-1855), a descendant of the Bohemian immigrant Augustine Herman, although she shared with them the same nonconforming nature and independent spirit. She was an early American heroine who is credited with saving part of Georgetown, Kent County, Maryland, during the War of 1812. She was one of the most beautiful and accomplished women of her day. She was tall and graceful, with hair dressed

high on her head in colonial style. She attended a ball in Philadelphia during a session of the Continental Congress, and George Washington was one of her dance partners. The British invaded the Eastern Shore of Maryland during the War of 1812. Their goal was to burn down houses and communities close to the shore to protect their soldiers as they moved about the Chesapeake area. While the men marched to fight, older men, women and children were left to protect the area. They were no match for trained British troops and many fled fearing for their safety. After British forces landed, they burned Fredericktown and the lower part of Georgetown. Georgetown was a historic Port of Entry, Ferry Landing, and a base of continental supplies from 1775 to 1783. As the British advanced up the Sassafras River in May 1813, they burned the town, reducing it to ash except for a church and two brick houses at the top of the Hill. As the British approached the hill where the two brick houses were located, they were met by Miss Kitty Knight. She stood her ground and pleaded with Admiral George Cockburn not to burn the houses. The British had already set on fire one of these houses that was occupied by a sick and destitute old lady. Miss Kitty pleaded for the old lady and her home and managed to convince the Admiral not to burn the houses. Miss Kitty is reported to have declared: "I shall not leave. If you burn this house, you burn me with it." It is said she stamped the flames out twice. Kitty did own neither of the houses. She was doing her duty to protect the community. She did however purchase one of the houses later. The local newspaper of November 22, 1855 in an article referring to Miss Kitty Knight's recent death, wrote: “By her heroism at the burning of Georgetown … she saved several families from being made homeless and friendless by the fire and sword…" Her appeal so moved the commodore that he ordered the troops to their barges and left unburned a church and several houses standing there as monuments to her memory for this noble and hazardous act. "A maiden fair, with courage bold, with spirit pure and high, displayed her flag of truce, and all for poor humanity."[19]

Charitable Souls

Quite different from the above was Rebecca Gratz (1781-1869), a native of Philadelphia Pennsylvania, whose father, Michael Gratz, who immigrated to America, was born in Silesia, at the time when the country was still a part of the Kingdom of Bohemia. She was an educator, philanthropist, and promoter of religious, educational, and charitable institutions.

She was born into a wealthy and highly esteemed Jewish family that supported the American Revolution. As a young lady, she was one of the most beautiful and gracious women of her time. There were few marriageable Jewish men of her class. She rejected a marriage proposal from a lawyer she loved because he was not Jewish, and remained single all of her life.

The environment in which she grew up did not deter her from devoting her life to needy and charitable causes. Gratz was not content with the high society life of dances and teas. Her first philanthropic project began when she was 20 years old. In 1801, with other Jewish and non-Jewish women, she founded the first non-sectarian charitable organization in Philadelphia, the Female Association for the Relief of Women and Children in Reduced Circumstances. She was the first secretary of this organization for many years. In 1815, she helped establish the Philadelphia Orphan Asylum, and served as secretary for its first forty years. As executive secretary of each organization that

she helped found, she functioned as the chief administrator, maintaining all records and correspondence and submitting annual reports to the managing boards each year.

Noticing increased involvement of Christian women in church life and in aiding the poor, she became convinced that Philadelphia's Jewish women and children needed their own charitable institutions. In 1819, she founded the country's first non-synagogue associated Jewish charity, the Female Hebrew Benevolent Society, which provided food and shelter, and later an employment bureau, for poor Jewish woman and children. Similarly, in response to the plight of an increasing number of Jewish immigrants in the 1850's Gratz founded a Jewish orphanage in Philadelphia, the Jewish Foster Home, serving as its vice-president when she was over 70 years old.

She also applied Sunday school format of Christian Churches to Jewish education. In 1838 she established the first Jewish Sunday school system, the Hebrew Sunday School, and was its president and supervisor for 26 years. The school was co-educational and offered Jewish women their first public role in teaching religion and designing the curriculum in a Jewish school. Gratz advised women in many other cities on establishing similar Jewish Sunday schools.

Many Americans called Rebecca Gratz "the foremost American Jewess of her day." Her fame was widespread as many people believed that she was the prototype for Sir Walter Scotts' Rebecca, a Jew, in his novel, *Ivanhoe*. She was clearly the earliest Jewish American woman activist, who can be compared in modern times, for her work, devotion, and dedication to the needy, to a Mother Teresa of the Catholic faith. As the founder of one of the Philadelphia's earliest women's philanthropic organizations,[20] Gratz helped define a new identity for American women.

Early Professionals

In the 19th and the early 20th centuries, the most common employment of women was in the area of teaching, librarianship, social work and less so in journalism. This was also true about American women of Czech extraction.

Frankly, in the early days, it was not dignified for women to work outside their home. In the 19th century upper class and middle class women were not expected to earn their own living. Women rarely had careers and most professions refused entry to women. In the middle of the 19th century it was virtually impossible for women to become doctors, engineers, architects, accountants or bankers.

Teachers

Among the earliest significant Czech-American teachers was Louise Mannheimer (1845-1921), nee Herschman, from Prague.[21] She was educated at St. Teine School, privately, and at Normal School, Prague, and the University of Cincinnati. She came to the U.S. with her parents in 1866 and later she married Rabbi Sigmund Mannheimer and moved with him, as he was employed by various congregations. During these moves, she served as religious school teacher. Eventually they settled in Cincinnati. Besides teaching, she also immersed herself in the world of arts and literature. She sometimes taught music and arranged music programs and composed "The Maiden's Song." She had written poems for English and German periodicals, including her prize-

winning "The Harvest" and penned several children's stories. She spoke at the 1893 Chicago World Congresses of History and Religion. She founded the Cincinnati's Boys' Industrial School and was active in the National Council of Jewish Women and the Mother's Congress. She was also inventor of a patented window ventilator. Her daughter Jennie[22] was also a teacher and recognized dramatist.[23]

One of the most effective teachers was Julia Richman (1855-1912), a native of New York City, of Bohemian ancestry, her parents having immigrated to America from Prague. At age 17, she graduated from the newly organized Female Normal College (later renamed Hunter College) and began her 40-year career in the New York City public school system as a teacher. Richman was very active in the Council of Jewish Women and worked with them all her life to improve the Sabbath school system. When she was twenty-nine, she became the principal of the Girls' Department of Public School 77 and held it for nineteen years. She was the first Jewess and the first Normal College graduate to acquire such a position.

Julia Richman was deeply interested in Jewish religious affairs. She had come from a long line of rabbis in Prague that dated back to the fifteenth century. She was the director of the Hebrew Free School Association, first president of the Young Women's Hebrew Association (1896-98) and a member of the Jewish Chautauqua Society's education council.

In 1903, she was selected as the first woman district superintendent of schools in the City of New York. Her innovations, leadership and curriculum brought an entirely new dimension to public school education at the beginning of the twentieth century. She developed language programs for foreign-born students. She also advocated for the establishment of school playgrounds, nutritious lunch programs, and health examinations for students. Her position in the New York public school system and her interest in the plight of immigrant children forged the way for improvement of living conditions for many new Americans. She wrote books on curriculum and she started school optical programs, special schools for delinquents, chronic absentees and above average pupils. In 1906, she converted her house into a social center for the teachers of her district. Richman was actively involved in the community by fighting prostitution around 1910. She also was very active in aiding children and established many types of clubs for them to join.[24]

Anna Heyberger (1874-1952), a native of Bohemia, was an educator of different sort. She studied at the Universities of Vienna and Prague; was awarded diploma in Modern Languages at the Carl-Ferdinand University in Prague and Music Teachers' diploma in Vienna. She was director of the School of Modern Languages at Tábor, Bohemia before coming to the U.S., where she became Professor of French and German at Beaver College, Pennsylvania (1905-1906). She joined the faculty at Westminster College in 1906, as Professor of German and French. In 1912 she came to Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa to teach the French, Italian and Bohemian (Czech) languages. As a teacher, Dr. Heyberger stimulated the interests of her students in the language, history and culture of the Czech people. She also acted as a faculty advisor and sponsor of the Komenský Club.[25] During and following World War I, the Club sponsored many benefit concerts and other fund raising projects in support of a health camp for sick Czech war orphans at Černovice near Tábor. Dr. Heyberger personally helped to establish the health camp while she was in Czecho-

slovakia in 1919. She worked closely with her friend, Dr. Alice Masaryk,[26] who was the first President of the Czechoslovak Red Cross. This organization was responsible for the administration of the camp, which was originally known as The Coe Camp. Dr. Heyberger visited the camp annually and the Komenský Club continued to support it. During her final year at Coe in 1939, Dr. Heyberger promoted a fund raising drive for a new building at the camp and a total of $12,772 was raised. The money, however, could not be sent because of the German occupation of Czechoslovakia on March 15, 1939. After the war, in February 1948, the Communists seized control of the Czechoslovak government, and the project had to be abandoned.[27]

Šárka B. Hrbková (1878-1948), a native of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, of Czech immigrant parents, shared the Czech orientation as Anna Heyberger. She had a B. A. degree from the State University of Iowa (1909) and M.A. from the University of Nebraska (1914). From 1895 to 1906 she taught in the public schools in Cedar Rapids, where she organized the first night school for foreigners and for two years taught it gratis. From 1908 to 1919 she was a member of the faculty of the University of Nebraska, heading the Department of Slavonic Languages and Literature. In 1910 she received the title of Adjunct Professor, in 1914 Assistant Professor, with a position on the University Senate and in 1918 was made full professor. From 1908 to 1917 she was editor in chief of the *Komenský Magazine*, Lincoln. Between 1918 and 1919 she was State Chairman of the Women's Committee, Council of National Defense (Nebraska Division). Appointed by Dr. Anna Howard Shaw and later elected by a mass vote of the women of Nebraska. For her patriotic and tireless service she received no pay. In 1919 she was Chairman of the Speaker's Division of Women's State Liberty Loan Committee and in that year left the state for New York City, where she managed the Czechoslovak Bureau, Foreign Language Information Service. Miss Hrbková has written: *Bridging the Atlantic* (a discussion of the Americanization problem) (1918;), *The Slavs of Central Europe* (published by the Society for Advancement of Slavonic Study) (1919), *Czechoslovak Stories* (translation of thirteen stories by Czech writers and a brief history of Czechoslovak literature) (1919), "The Bohemians of Nebraska"(volume 19 of *Nebraska State Historical Publications*), "The library and the foreign-born citizen" (published in *Public Libraries*, March, 1910); "Bunk in Americanization" (published in *the Forum*, Nos. 4 and 5, Vol. 63); "Americans of Czechoslovak descent" (published in *The Survey*, June 11, 1921); "The Czechoslovaks in America" (in *Our World*, December, 1923). She also translated stories and plays of Czech authors into English and wrote numerous reviews and articles published in *The Survey* and papers in Cleveland, Ohio; Omaha and Lincoln, Nebraska; and Cedar Rapids, Iowa.[28]

Another teacher of note was Carrie T. Pollitzer (1881-1974), born in Charleston, South Carolina. Her grandparents immigrated to America from Mikulov in Moravia. Her chief endeavors were the organization of kindergartens. Upon returning to Charleston from New York City, where she had gone for training, she became assistant principal and a member of the faculty of the South Carolina Kindergarten School. Later as director of the kindergarten, she taught the children and was among the first to go into the homes to give suggestions and advice for the improvements of family living. Under her initiative, the kindergarten groups had the first medical examination and by pediatricians. She also introduced the first lunch program. When the Free Kindergarten As-

sociation needed funds to maintain two free kindergartens, Carrie conceived and organized a Community Children Festival at Colonial Lake, having secured the cooperation of the city government and many community organizations. The event, providing fun and recreation for children, proved to be such a success that it was held annually for over 30 years. Carrie Pollitzer is best known, however, for being instrumental in opening the College of Charleston to women students. It took persistent effort and the aid of the Charleston Federation of Women's Clubs, to accomplish this. In fact, the Federation had to raise funds to pay for a woman matron and needed facilities. Carrie headed the successful drive. In 1981, women were first admitted to the College. Over fruitful years of a long life, Carrie Pollitzer was involved with the Community Chest, the American Red Cross, the Natural History Society of the Charleston Museum and efforts on behalf of the mentally retarded. She was a member of the Congregation Beth Elohim, teaching in its Sunday school, and participating in the activities of the Council of Jewish Women.[29]

Her younger sister, Mabel L. Pollitzer (1885-1879) of Charleston was also a teacher. After graduating from Memminger, an all-girls school in Charleston, Pollitzer went to Columbia University, where she majored in science and education. After graduating in 1906, she returned to South Carolina to become a biology teacher at Memminger, where she immediately organized a department of natural sciences and designed a laboratory and had it built to her plans. She involved students in conservation efforts and was instrumental in having state legislation passed to prevent destruction of wild flowers along state highways. She also established a "No Cheat Club," which was the forerunner of a school Student Council. In the 1920s, she introduced sex education in her biology classes. Later she developed a pioneer course for seniors, Child Development and Family Relations, which attracted statewide attention. On the community scene, she was responsible for starting a city-wide Plant Exchange Day and the Charleston Co. Junior Wildlife Federation. As chairperson of the Civic Club's Betterment Committee, she was instrumental in projects that led to the planting of trees and bushes to beautify streets, public parks and gardens. She served as secretary on the board of trustees of the Charleston Museum for over thirty-five years. Her greatest satisfaction came with the passing of a state act that enabled Charleston Co. to establish its first free library in 1930. A few years later, she was the prime mover in securing the library's first building on Rutledge Ave. She was a member of the library's board of trustees over thirty–five years. She was also involved in many different community and professional organizations, including the Charleston Symphony Orchestra, and served in many different capacities, including the state chairperson of the National Women's Party, first president of the South Carolina Biology Teachers Association and president of the Central Council of Charleston Teachers.[30]

Librarians

One of the earliest librarians of Bohemian extraction was Jennie Maas Flexner (1882-1944), a native of Louisville, Kentucky. Her grandfather, who started as a peddler, was born in Všeruby, Bohemia. She was an innovator in the use of public libraries for adult education, especially for minorities, immigrants, and refugees during the unsettled years of the Depression and World War II. She got training as a librarian at Western Reserve University, although she never finished the school. In 1911 she was named head of the circulation

department of the Free Public Library in Louisville and also served as instructor and later supervisor of a training course for librarians. She developed the concept of a library service that could help guide a patron's reading according to individual needs. She was instrumental in establishing a branch library for blacks, the first in the south. 1926, she took a leave of absence to serve on the curriculum staff of the American Library Association. Flexner worked on developing criteria and materials for the professional education of librarians. As a result of her involvement, she wrote *Circulation Work in Public Libraries* (1927), which was a standard text in library schools. In 1928 she joined the staff of the New York Public Library to inaugurate readers' advisory service which would help adults carry forward their post-school education through a program of systematic reading. She prepared systematic advice on the selection of books to hospitals, schools, welfare organizations, trade unions and government agencies. Her final effort was *Making Books Work: A Guide to the Use of Libraries* (1943), written not for fellow librarians, but for common readers.[31]

Esther Jeřábek (1897-1979) of Silver Lake, Minnesota, was an effective teacher and librarian. She was the daughter of Czech immigrants John and Julia (Břeň) Jeřábek. She graduated in 1918 magna cum laude from Macalester College, St. Paul, and received an M.A. degree from the University of Minnesota in 1924. She taught school (1918-1923) in Goodhue and Sibley counties and in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, and later (1925-1928) in Rawlins, Wyoming. In 1929 she joined the library technical services staff of the Minnesota Historical Society, where she served as cataloger until her retirement in 1963. Jeřábek authored many books and articles on Czechs in Minnesota and the United States, and on library procedures. Her major publications were *Check List of Minnesota Public Documents*, 1941-1950 (1952) and *Czechs and Slovaks in North America: A Bibliography* (1972).

Fern Long (1907-1987), was born in Cleveland, Ohio, of Czech ancestry. She was trained at Charles University and Western University. She held an important position of superintendent, of the adult education department at the Cleveland Public Library and since 1970 was director of the Library.

Jewel Drickamer (nee Weidenthal) (1917-2005) was a native of Cleveland, Ohio, of Bohemian ancestry. She was one of the pioneers in the development of Rhode Island's state library network and statewide library development in general. She served at the Department of State Library Services as Deputy Director from 1964-1975 and then as Director from 1975 until she retired in 1980. Before coming to Rhode Island, Drickamer worked in a variety of library settings including the Cleveland Public Library, the Hartford Public Library, the National Association of Broadcasters library in Washington, DC, and in various branches of the New York Public Library.[32]

Social Workers

Among the first notable American social workers of Czech ancestry was Theresa Grotta (1841-1922), a native of Krásný les , Bohemia. She immigrated to America, went to school in New York City, and, after marrying Heineman Grotta, they lived in Wisconsin for a number of years, before settling permanently in Newark, New Jersey. It is there that she achieved an enviable reputation as a selfless worker for Jewish community and as a wonderful human being in general. As a member of Hulda Lodge, she worked tirelessly

on behalf of needy families, earning the gratitude of people throughout the city. She was also a member of the Newark chapter of the National Council of Jewish Women. In addition to her communal activities, she raised eleven children. As she neared her eightieth birthday her friends pondered what they might give her as a present. What could be more fitting, they decided, than to honor this fine woman with the ultimate gift – a home for the indigent named after her. The Theresa Grotta Aid for Convalescents was the result. When the property was later sold, the profits became the basis of the Grotta Foundation for Senior Care, which gives out grants. [33]

Another Bohemian-born woman social worker of note was Rose Newberger (1855-1917), nee Levy. She lived in Detroit Michigan until 1886, when Chicago became her home. As one of the earliest workers for the Deborah, and, later, as president of the Jewish Altenheim Society for eight years, she was one of the outstanding figures in the field of welfare work. She was instrumental in making the Home for the Jews a reality. She also helped bring into existence the Chicago Home for Jewish Orphans, and her name is on the charter of that institution as one of its builders. In the formation of the Home for Jewish Friendless she likewise shared prominently, after which followed her activities for the Chicago Hebrew Institute, which earned her the affectionate sobriquet "A Mother of the Institute."

An extraordinary social worker of Bohemian ancestry was also Helen Goldmark Adler (1859-1948), a native of Brooklyn, New York. She was the eldest daughter of Regina (Wehle) and Joseph Goldmark, both of whom had immigrated to the United States in 1849. Her mother came from Prague with her affluent Jewish family, and settled in Madison, Indiana. Helen attended the Brooklyn Heights Seminary and passed Harvard's entrance exam, although at that time women could not attend Harvard. She was an extremely intelligent and articulate writer. After her marriage to Felix Adler, she involved herself in the Ethical Culture Movement and her husband's work. She wrote articles for *The Standard*, the organ of the Ethical Culture Society, and was prominent in the Women's Conference of the Society. Adler helped her husband establish the first model tenements at Cherry Street as well as the first free kindergarten in America, called the Working Man's School, and later the Ethical Culture School at Fieldston. She took an active part in the visiting nurses' service for the poor at the DeMilt Dispensary, the oldest clinic in the city, which her husband had initiated in 1877. She helped cut the infant death rate by having milk bottled safely at the Laboratory Department for Modified Milk for Tenement Babies.[34]

Frances Taussig (1883-1981), born in Chicago, Illinois, of Bohemian ancestry, was a leading Jewish social worker. She was an executive director of the Jewish Family Service of New York for 30 years before her retirement in 1949.Taussig, became director of the United Hebrew Society in 1918 after graduating from the University of Chicago. She then became associated with the Jewish Family Service, now known as the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services, where she was considered a pioneer in the development of professional social work. Taussig was a past president of the American Association of Social Work, the National Conference of Jewish Welfare and the Social Work Vocational Bureau. She was a charter member of the National Association of Social Workers and, after her retirement, then living in Manhattan, served as director on the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services and

as a director of the National Council of Jewish Women. She died at the age of 98.[35]

Eleanor H. Adler (b. 1884), a native of New York City, a daughter of Helen G. Adler, was also a significant social worker. She was trained at Columbia University School for Social Workers. Founder of Employment Bureau for Cripples (l9l3-l4); a co-founder of Austen Riggs Foundation (l9l7), founder and director, Bureau of part-time workers (l922-44), founder, Committee of health tests for household workers; investigating work for crippled authors (l9l8). She was the author of *Employment for Cripples* (l9l3).

Caroline Flexner (l892-l958), a native of Louisville, Kentucky, of Bohemian ancestry, was an aide to New York Governor and Senator Herbert. H. Lehman. She held important positions in the Joint Distribution Committee and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. During World War II she worked on the headquarter staff of UNRRA, where she was in charge of the Central Location Index which helped unite refugees with their families.

Jean Brandeis Tachau (1894-1979), a native of Louisville, Kentucky, of Bohemian ancestry, was a niece of the U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis. She was a social worker for the Children's Protection Association in Louisville during the 1920s. In 1933,Tachau helped establish the Kentucky Birth Control League along with a clinic, the forerunner of Planned Parenthood in Louisville.

Hertha Kraus (l897-1968), born in Prague, Bohemia, is considered a real phenomenon in social work. She was educated at the University of Frankfurt, receiving her doctorate in 1919. She began her career as a social worker in Berlin and then successfully continued in it in Cologne. Her innovative ideas made her known beyond Germany. Her innovations in welfare and relief were based on a comprehensive community-oriented approach which took into account individual needs. When the Nazis took over the German government, being Jewish, she was dismissed and had no recourse but to immigrate to the U.S. Through her connections with Quakers, she immediately received a one-year contract with the Family Welfare Agency and research assignment with the Russell Sage Foundation. From 1934 to 1936, she was professor of social work at the Margaret Morrison College and at the Carnegie Institute of Technology. As an expert in public administration and social management, she had exactly what was needed at the start of the New Deal during President Roosevelt's administration. This was also reflected in her numerous advisory appointments. In 1936 she served as an advisor to the Social Security Board and was recognized as expert on public social welfare. In 1936, she was appointed to a professorship of social economy at Bryn Mawr, a famed Quaker woman's college in Philadelphia. She also taught at Columbia, University of Washington and Swarthmore College. After the war, she taught at the Teaching Center of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA). She was a good friend of the First Lady, Eleanor Roosevelt.[36]

Last but not least, a Canadian humanitarian, Lotte Hitschmann (1909-1990), a native of Prague, Bohemia, should be mentioned. After completing her PhD at the University of Prague she worked for several newspapers as well as the Yugoslavian government newspaper agency. When the Germans seized a part of Czechoslovakia in September 1938 Hitschmann relocated to Paris and Brussels and changed her last name to the Czech form "Hitschmanová," which

sounded less German than "Hitschmann." After the Germans invaded Belgium she escaped to Marseilles. In 1942, she was able to escape from Europe by sailing from Lisbon to New York on a refugee-packed twin-screw steamer designed to carry bananas rather than passengers. She then departed for Canada, which, unlike the United States, had granted her a visa. When she learned that her parents died in a holding camp en route to Auschwitz she decided to stay in Canada.

In July 1945, she helped to organize the Canadian branch of the Unitarian Service Committee and was made the Executive Director. Its initial objective was the relief of distressed people in France and Czechoslovakia. The program was later expanded to Italy, Greece, India, Nepal and Vietnam among other countries. In 1970 she wrote a book entitled *The USC Story: A Quarter Century of Loving Service* by the Unitarian Service Committee about her experiences working for USC Canada. She always knew what was needed to make a story and used this expertise to full advantage, earning her the nickname "The Atomic Mosquito" because of her continuing success in getting good media coverage. Throughout the years, Dr. Hitschmanová received many awards, including the Gold Medal from the Red Cross of France (1950) and the Medal of St. Paul from Greece (1952). In 1968 she was made an Officer of the Order of Canada and was promoted to Companion in 1979. In 1982 she retired from her position as Executive Director due to ill health.[37]

Journalists

The earliest known woman journalist of Bohemian extraction on record is Rosa Sonneschein (1847-1932), a native of Prostějov in Moravia. She was the daughter of Fannie (Sternfeld) and Hirsch Bär Fassel, a respected scholar and moderate Reform rabbi. Rose received an education at home and at the local high school that was remarkably thorough for a nineteenth-century girl. In 1864, she married Solomon Hirsch Sonneschein, a young radical Reform rabbi with a congregation in Warasdin, Croatia. In the next five years, the Sonnescheins moved to successive posts in Prague, New York City, and finally, in 1869, St. Louis, where they remained for about twenty years.

During the years Sonneschein spent as a rebbetzin (rabbi's wife) in St. Louis, she was a public figure in the city's Jewish community. She helped lead the "Ladies' Meetings" and organized the choral society at the two St. Louis congregations Solomon Sonneschein served. Her position as a rebbetzin also enabled her to move beyond the Jewish community, participating in literary circles and the city's cultural life. In 1879, she founded the Pioneers, a Jewish women's literary society. Encouraged by club experiences, Sonneschein began to publish stories in Jewish periodicals as early as the mid 1880s. Her standing in the community and her frequent European travels positioned Sonneschein well as a correspondent for the German-language press, and her reports on world expositions in Paris, St. Louis, and Chicago gained her prominence.

After her divorce, Sonneschein's journalistic skills proved essential, as she received no alimony. Through writing, she not only supported herself, but also gained some fame. At the May 1893 Press Congress, held as part of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, she spoke on "Newspaperwomen in Austria." During this speech Sonneschein articulated the need for a magazine specifically addressing American Jewish women. Sonneschein remained in Chicago after the exposition, and in April 1895 she

began editing the *American Jewess*. At first she also published and managed the business affairs of the magazine. Financial troubles led Sonneschein to sell the magazine in 1898, though she retained editorship. Despite the efforts of the new owners, the *American Jewess's* financial situation did not improve; its August 1899 issue was its last.

Throughout the run of the *American Jewess,* Sonneschein advocated the expansion of women's roles in the synagogue and the Jewish community. She also advocated Zionism in the *American Jewess's* pages. She viewed Zionism as a potential source of relief for oppressed Jews in Eastern Europe and a source of pride and a countermeasure to assimilation for Jews in America and Western Europe. By founding and editing the *American Jewess,* Rosa Sonneschein not only provided support and space for the emerging national network of Jewish clubwomen and created a forum in which to publicize her then unconventional views on Zionism, but also pioneered a professional role in journalism for American Jewish women.[38]

Another woman pioneer journalist was Rose Rosický (1875-1954), a native of Crete, Nebraska; she was a daughter of John Rosický, a noted pioneer Czech settler in Nebraska. In March, 1876, her parents moved to Omaha, where she lived. For a number of years she was her father's secretary, and after his death became associate editor of the *Osvěta Americká, Hospodář* and *Květy Americké*. She translated for the *Osvěta Americká* Helen Hunt Jackson's *Ramona* and Margaret Hill McCarter's *The Price of the Prairie,* besides many articles and stories. She edited five volumes of the almanac *Pioneer,* for which she prepared translations and also translated S. E. Forman's *History of the United States*. All the foregoing were translations from English into Czech. From Czech into English she translated her mother's *Bohemian-American Cook Book*; and stories by the following leading Czech writers: Karel V. Rais, Gabriela Preissová, Růžena Svobodová and Božena Víková-Kunětická. She compiled several handbooks for farmers and the home and became associate editor of the *Hospodář*. Her most important publication is *History of Czechs in Nebraska*, which she published in Czech (1928) and also in English (1929).[39]

Women as Organizers

Toward the end of the 19th century, apart from suffragists, women began organizing themselves in various religious, fraternal, benevolent, and patriotic organizations. In going through some of the earlier biographical compendia, one finds, in fact, more women listed as organizers of various clubs than in specific professions.

Religious Organizations

Putting aside the Moravian women, who were discussed earlier, one of the earliest woman religious organizers on record was most assuredly Henrietta Bruckman (nee Kahn) (1810-1888), founder of the Independent Order of True Sisters. She and her husband Philip, a physician, immigrated to America from Bohemia in 1842, settling in New York City. The Bruckmans joined the city's immigrant Bohemian Jewish elite, supporting charitable efforts on behalf of their less well-off fellow immigrants, and participating in the community's cultural life. Shortly after his arrival, Philip, together with a group of other middle-class immigrants, founded the Mendelsohnian Society. This Cultus Verein provided the impetus for the establishment of the B'nai B'rith, a secular

Jewish fraternal order, in 1843, and the basis of Temple Emanu-El, which was formed in 1845. Despite considerable interest, the B'nai B'rith refused to accept female members. Temple Emanu-El similarly rebuffed efforts to create a society for the women of the congregation. In 1846, Bruckman, mustering support from among her friends, proposed the creation of a female counterpart to the B'nai B'rith open exclusively to women. The Emanuel Lodge of the Independent Order of True Sisters was established a few weeks later as a philanthropic and educational organization and Henrietta Bruckman was installed as its first president. Thereafter the Order operated independently of the B'nai B'rith. At its founding, it was the only fraternal organization in America open exclusively to women.

The concept of a "True Sister" organization was truly revolutionary in an age when a woman's life was dominated by home, family and synagogue. Originally established as a secret society to spare the recipient of charity any humiliation, True Sisters adopted rituals, degrees, a constitution, by-laws and the official seal. The proper regalia for retiring presidents was drawn up and accepted. It is still in use today. The first chapter, Immanuel, named because of the religious significance (God be with us) and because it was the name of the Congregation, renamed under the guidance of the men who aided it until May 4, 1851, when the Grand Lodge was formed with Henrietta Bruckman as President. In 1851, a second chapter was formed in Philadelphia and in 1874 the first Mid-Western Chapter, Johanna #9 in Chicago, joined the Order. Today there are Chapters around the country.[40]

Thirty years later, another Bohemian Jewish woman came to prominence, Emma B. Mandl (1842-l928) from Plzeň, Bohemia. Mandl immigrated to the United States with her family at age fifteen. She spent 40 years working for philanthropic organizations in Chicago, organizations mainly geared toward helping the Eastern European Jewish immigrants. She was one of the founders of the Baron Hirsch Woman's Club (l889) and its president (1893-97). In l90l she helped organize the Chicago Home for Jewish Friendless and Working Girls and also became its president. In 1907 she was one of the founders of the Jewish Home Finding Society to help mothers, whose children were in orphan asylums, to establish homes of their own and to place children in private homes. In l908 she founded the Baron Hirsch Co-Workers, an organization of young women to assist in communal activities. She also helped establish the Chicago Winfield TB Sanatorium of which she was honorary president and in l9l5 the Home for Convalescent men and boys. [41]

Forty years later, Jean Wise May (188l-d.), a native of Cincinnati, of Bohemian ancestry, made name for herself as a religious organization leader. She was a daughter of the famed Rabbi Isaac M. Wise who immigrated to America from Lomnička, Bohemia. She became honorary president of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods (s. 1960), honorary vice president of the New York Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations and honorary president of the Sisterhood Religious Schools Comm. She was also an honorary board member, of the New York section of the National Council of Jewish Women and honorary member of the Jewish Welfare Board honorary vice president of the National Federation of Temple Youth, New York Federation of Reformed Synagogues, etc.

The last Jewish woman organizer of Czech extraction of note was Sara Blum (nee Abeles) (1910-1986), born in Newark, New Jersey, of Bohe-

mian ancestry. She became active in the Conference of Christians and Jews of Essex County to better fight anti-Semitism. She also joined the Black Urban League to improve race relations. A staunch Zionist, Blum founded the South Orange-Maplewood chapter of Hadassah and committed herself to getting European Jewish children to Palestine. Moving on to become regional president of the Northern New Jersey Region of Hadassah, she was responsible for membership doubling in one year and raising $35,000 at the first donor luncheon. By the early 1940s, Blum was a leader in the United Jewish Appeal (UJA) of Essex County, one of the largest giving regions in the nation. She had also become a partner in Camp Nawita, a girls' camp on Paradox Lake in New York. In 1946, she ascended to the presidency of the Essex County UJA's Women's Division. It had 15,000 members, but Blum sought still more. Women's Division members responded magnificently to her call. Records indicate they contributed more than three times as much to UJA as they had the year before. Blum went on to become a national vice chairman of the UJA Women's Division, her faithful service interrupted only slightly when she left Nawita and purchased Navarac in 1952. She was elected chairman of the Women's Service Group of the Jewish Community Council of Essex County in 1956 and ultimately became vice president of the entire Council. A year later she was named to the National Council of the Joint Distribution Committee, and in 1957 co-chaired the program committee for the 26th General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations in New Orleans. In 1958, she was named "Woman of the Year" by the Betty Chodokowsky Memorial for Crippling Diseases.

Roman Catholics had also a number of significant women organizers, one of the earliest being Rosalie Josephine Nedvěd (nee Lukasová) (b. 1862). She was born in Chocenice, Bohemia. When eighteen years old she immigrated to the U.S. and settled in Chicago. . She became early associated with the Bohemian Roman Catholic Central Women's Union of the U.S. ("Česká Římsko-Katolická Ústřední Jednota Žen ve Spojených Státech"), where she held an important position as an accountant (1882-1917). Simultaneously, she a series of offices, starting as a secretary (1887-91), then treasurer (1891-93), and finally president (1882-1917).[42]

Another officer in the same organization was Marie Agnes Karásek (b. 1866) of Tábor, Bohemia. She came to America with her parents in 1885, also settling in Chicago. She became vice president of the Women's Bohemian Roman Catholic Central Union. In addition she was also president of the St. Ludmila Lodge and president of Parish Club.

Alžběta Souhrada (nee Peklovová) (b. 1872) was born in Domažlice, Bohemia. At the age of sixteen, she came to the U.S. and became a resident of Chicago. Twelve years later she joined the St. Elizabeth Club, No. 33 and became its Secretary in the same year. In 1905 she became President and in 1910 Accountant. In 1900 she became a member of the Women's Catholic Order of Foresters, No. 110, and in 1915 Treasurer of the Bohemian Roman Catholic Central Women's Union.[43]

Marie Král (b. 1891), a native of Chicago, Czech ancestry, was another officer in that organization. She attended the Chicago Business College (1909-11). She became editor of *Posel,* the official monthly organ of the Women's Bohemian Roman Catholic Central Union and vice president of the Benedict's Home for the Aged. She was one of the organizers and former president

of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Sacred Heart Academy and one of the founders of the Ladies Aid of St. Benedict's Home of the Aged. She was also a member of the board of directors of the Cicero Welfare Association, a member of the executive committee of the National Alliance of Bohemian Catholics and a member of the Council of Catholic Women.[44]

The Bohemian Roman Catholic Central Union of Women was a national fraternal benefit society with its national headquarters located in Cleveland. The Union's first two branches were St. Anne's in Cleveland and St. Ludmila's in New York. Both lodges had religious, charitable, and cultural purposes. In the early years, members of the benefit society agreed to pay $.25 each upon the death of a member. In 1881 the society had 629 members, and its death benefit was increased from $100 to $150. Improvements in financial management came about largely at the insistence of the State of Ohio, which in 1934 ordered the union to become 100% solvent. Soon thereafter the union merged with the Czech Catholic Cleveland Union of Men and the Czech Catholic Cleveland Union of Women. By 1939 the Bohemian Roman Catholic Central Union of Women had become known as the Czech Catholic Union. Marie L. Král, the society's long-time president, guided the union through this period of reorganization.

The Czech Catholic women in Texas had their own organization, known as "Česká Římsko-Katolická Jednota Žen Texaských" (KJZT), in English: Bohemian Catholic Union of Women of Texas. It was organized in 1894 from two smaller clubs in Yoakum and Halletsville. The Foundress, Anna Jakubík served as President (1897–1905), followed by Marie Yurek (1905–1930) and Josephine Habartová from 1930–1958.

Anna Jakubík (nee Miglová) (b. 1853) was born in Dubenec, near Netolice, who immigrated to America in 1871.[45] Marie Yurek (nee Mařalíková) (b. 1861), who was a native of Frenštát pod Radhoštěm in Moravia, came to America in 1880.[46] Josefina Habartová (b. 1886), a native of Ždánice, Moravia, arrived in America in 1894.[47]

Among Czech Women Protestant organizers the mention should be made of Albina Barton (nee Mikulenčáková) (1893-1979),[48] the wife of Rev. Joseph Barton, who immigrated to Texas from Moravia in 1903. She helped him in very important ways during his ministry which included serving as organist and music teacher in the various congregations. She was one of the founders and the first president of the Christian Sisters Union, with which she was associated from 1926-1950.[49]

Secular Organizations

A number of women of Czech extraction were active as organizers of various fraternal and benevolent organizations, not affiliated with any particular religion. The most important organizations were: "Jednota Českých Dam" (JČD) - Bohemian Ladies Union,[50] which was founded in Cleveland, Ohio in 1870, "Česká Sesterská Podporující Unie" (ČSPJ) - Czech Sisters Benefit Union,[51] also established in Cleveland in 1890 and "Ústřední Jednota Česko-Amerických Žen" (UJČAŽ) - Czech-American Women's Central Union, which had its headquarters in Chicago.

One of the earliest Czech-Americans in this area was Bohemia-born Caroline Rychlík (1846-1925) who settled in Cleveland, Ohio. She is generally considered the founder and the first President of "Jednota Českých

Dam" (Bohemian Ladies Union), which was founded in Cleveland in 1870. Because of her enthusiasm and effectiveness she was affectionately called "the mother of the Bohemian lodge."

Anna Štolfová (nee Papíková) (b. 1853), a native of Mšeno , near Mělník, Bohemia, was another early woman organizer. She lived in the U.S. since 1867, the year she emigrated to America with her parents from Bohemia. She was publically active since she was sixteen. She started as an amateur actress and later got involved in a number of women's organizations. She became President of the "Velkovýbor Jednoty Českých Dam" of the State of Illinois, apart from other offices she held in this organization. In addition, she was also active in the Czech Sisters' Benefit Union. In 1915 she became active in the women's movement to free the Czech nation from the Austrian rule. She represented the Central Council of the Bohemian Ladies Union, of which she was Secretary, in the National Bohemian Alliance, the organization for which she served beyond her 75th years of life. [52]

Anna F. Fučík (nee Kakuška) (b. 1854), a native of Chicago of Czech parentage, was a charter member of one of the first lodges of Bohemian Ladies Union (JČD). She was also a treasurer of Sarah Rebekah Lodge No. 98 of the Odd Fellow Order (1970), charter member of "Vlast" Rebekah Lodge No. 165, I.O.I.F. and was the first Czech woman who was awarded the "Decoration of Chivalry" in 1900. She was the first Czech woman representing her Lodge at the Illinois Grand Lodge for 23 years in succession, was for nine years instructor of Grand Lodge, 35 years as deputy of her lodge. She contributed substantial funds to orphanages at Lisle and in Chicago.[53]

Marie Frances Kuchyňka (nee Jirásek) (b. 1855) was born in Philadelphia of Czech parents. She came to Chicago with her parents when she was 4 years old. She founded the Czech-American Women's Central Union "Ústřední Jednota Česko-Amerických Žen," desirous to create such a body in which the ideals of the Czech and American nations would be molded into a harmonious whole, inspiring its women members towards a higher form of patriotism. It was created in 1907 and was composed of 17 lodges. During her life she was a member of twenty-one different organizations, including the Bohemian Ladies Union and the Czech Sisters' Benefit Union.[54]

Marie Terezie Hora (nee Nedvědová) (b. 1873), b. Světnov. Bohemia. She immigrated with her parents in 1886. She was secretary, Supreme Lodge of the Bohemian Ladies Union, president of the Grand Lodge of the Czech-American Women's Central Union and president of the Czech Sisters= Benefit Union).[55]

Antonie Mazáčová (b. 1873), a native of Rakovník, Bohemia, came to America in 1897 and settled in Chicago. She was very active in the liberation movement for an independent Czechoslovakia, as a member of the Bohemian National Alliance. She became President, of the Bohemian Ladies Union. Besides that, she was active in the ČSPJ, and Bohemian Old People's Home and Orphan Asylum ("Česká Útulna and Sirotčinec") and in the American Sokol Union for over thirty years. For her efforts on behalf of Czechoslovakia she received the Czechoslovak Revolutionary medal.[56]

Alžběta Marie Lisy-Strohmayer (nee Wintrová) (b. 1877) was born in Úsilov, Bohemia. She immigrated to America in 1890. She was an accountant, treasurer, secretary and president of the "Sesterská Podporujícíi Jednota," secretary and director of the Praha Sokol Women, director of the Sokol Women in

Town of Lake, secretary and president of Club Svoboda, treasurer, vice president and president of "Vlast" Rebekah Lodge, accountant of "Česká Vlast" No. 5 of the American Women's Central Union, treasurer, accountant, secretary and president of the Bohemian Ladies Union, which she joined in 1898. She was also a member of the editorial board of *Ženské Listy* and contributor to *Svornost.* She also became head of the Chicago Sokol.[57]

Marie Urbánková (b. 1882) was born in Skuteč, in eastern Bohemia.[58] She came to America in 1894, when she was twelve, and where she got married in 1903. Around that time, she joined the Czech Sisters' Benefit Union of which she became President. She also became a member of the executive council of the American Sokol Union ("Americká obec sokolská") and during the World War she actively worked in the Bohemian National Alliance. She was also a member of the Free Thought Union ("Svaz vobodomyslných").

Marie Johanna Filip (nee Punčochář) (b. 1890) was born in Chicago, Illinois of Czech immigrant parents. She studied at the Farragut and the John Spry Public Schools and at the Chicago Business College. She became financial Secretary of the Supreme Lodge of the Bohemian Ladies Union (JČD). Besides that she served as Recording Secretary of the Grand Lodge of the State of Illinois and Auditor, Recording Secretary, Financial Secretary and Past President of Chapter Tetin No. 105 of the same organization. She also served as President of the first convention of the Czech Sisters' Benefit Union (ČSPJ) and was Secretary and President of the finance committee, Lodge 37. For nine years she held the office of Treasurer of the Royal Neighbors of America. She represented JČD and ČSPJ in the Bohemian National Alliance, and was a member of the Czech American Women's Central Union and of the Rebekahs. During World War I she served as a Red Cross nurse.[59]

Activists and Reformers

Chronologically, Florence Bayard Hilles (1865-1954), a native of Wilmington, Delaware, who was descended from Augustine Herman, would head this category. As an early worker on behalf of the women's suffrage movement, she became known as a fighter and leader and for her abilities as a speaker. In l9l7, leading a group of suffrages, she picketed the White House and was jailed for her efforts. After the 19th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified in 1920, she worked for the adoption of an equal rights amendment. She was national chairwoman of the National Woman's Party (NWP) (1933-38) and later became honorary national chairman. The Feminist Library at the national headquarters at the NWP in Washington was named the Florence Bayard Hilles Library in her honor in 1943.

Josephine Humpal-Zeman (l870-I906), a native of Sušice, Bohemia, would come second. She was a newspaper writer and advocate of woman suffrage. An unfortunate marriage forced her to earn her own living. Through the generosity of Mary Ingersoll in Chicago, she was able to acquire a college education. While studying at Western Reserve University, she became chief editor of the college paper *College Folio* which she helped establish. Later she put herself at the head of the Czech woman suffrage movement and in 1894 she founded a weekly paper the *Ženské Listy* (Woman's Gazette). She was also active as lecturer, speaking to both English and Czech audiences. Some journalists referred to her ungallantly as "Mrs. General." In 1894 she was engaged in the social settlements Hull House where she acquired invaluable social work

experience. Subsequently she was appointed by the city of Chicago a Truant Officer in which position she remained for four years. It was largely through her efforts that the American Czechs participated successfully in the Ethnographic Exposition in Prague in 1895. In 1897 at the Congress of Slavic journalists she was elected executive secretary. In 1904 she accepted a position of executive secretary of the Woman's Club in Prague. She was the author of *Amerika v pravém světle* (America in its True Light), published in Prague in 1903.[60]

Josephine Clara Goldmark (1877-1950), born in Brooklyn, New York, of Bohemian ancestry, would come next. She was a reformer whose research contributed significantly to the enactment of labor legislature. A graduate of Bryn Mawr College, she held position of research director at the National Consumer League. She compiled social and economic data used in the legal briefs in support of protective legislation for women. Some of the briefs were used by Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis in landmark rulings of the Supreme Court of the U.S. The results of her research were published in such influential publications as *Child Labor Legislation Handbook* (1907) and *Fatigue and Efficiency* (1912).

After graduation from Bryn Mawr in 1898, she volunteered at the National Consumers' League and went on to serve as publications secretary (1903) and as chair of its committee on the legal defense of labor laws. She gathered the medical, economic, and social data that lawyer Louis Brandeis (husband of her sister Alice) used in Muller vs. Oregon (1908), in which the Supreme Court upheld a state law setting maximum working hours for women. That case was probably the first to document the cost of industrialization in terms of human suffering. Josephine's book, *Fatigue and Efficiency* (1912), presented evidence that led to shorter working hours. From 1912 to 1914 Josephine worked for the Factory Investigating Committee, appointed to investigate the Triangle Shirtwaist Company fire (1911). Her work as secretary to the Committee for the Study of Nursing Education resulted in the Winslow-Goldmark report, which advocated upgrading the standard of education for nurses and resulted in the foundation of schools of nursing at Yale, Vanderbilt, and Western Reserve universities. In the 1920s, she worked in the campaign to safeguard workers against radium poisoning. In 1930 she published *Pilgrims of '48*, in which she wrote of her parents' life and of her belief that the revolution of 1848 and its refugees had contributed to America's liberal heritage.[61]

Her sister, Pauline Dorothea Goldmark (1886-1962), was also a reformer. She was graduated from Bryn Mawr College in 1896 and began a career as a social investigator as assistant secretary of the New York Consumers' League, a position she held until 1904; she later served as executive secretary (1905-1909) and as chair of the legislative committee (1908-1911). In 1907 she initiated the first investigation (1907-1908) of the canneries in New York State, a project that resulted in the book, *Women and Children in the Canneries* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1908). By 1912 she was the assistant director of social research for the Russell Sage Foundation. She was a member of the industrial board of the New York State Labor Department (1913-1915), and during World War I served as executive secretary of the Committee on Women in Industry. As manager (1918-1920) of the Women's Service Section of the United States Railroad Administration, Goldmark toured the country, investigating the working conditions of women and children. From 1919 until

her retirement in 1939, she worked in the research department of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company as their expert on the employment and health problems of women. She was let go shortly before completing twenty years of service, and was thus denied her retirement benefits. She was also vice -chair of the New York City Child Labor Commission and a director of the National Consumers' League.[62]

The most accomplished suffragist among the women of Czech ancestry was Anita Pollitzer (1894-1975), a native of Charleston, South Carolina, whose grandparents came from Mikulov, Moravia. She devoted her public life to feminist politics and artistic patronage. Pollitzer's most prominent contribution to feminism came in 1945, when she became Alice Paul's hand-picked successor for the chairmanship of the National Woman's Party (NWP). Pollitzer also gained recognition for her close friendship with Georgia O'Keeffe, whose artistic career blossomed when Pollitzer showed Alfred Stieglitz a series of her paintings. A biography of O'Keeffe by Pollitzer, entitled *A Woman on Paper: Georgia O'Keeffe,* published after Pollitzer's death and against O'Keeffe's wishes, has added significantly to information on the artist's personal life. After graduating from Memminger High and Normal School, Pollitzer entered Teachers College at Columbia University, where she majored in art and education. Soon after her graduation in 1916, she became interested in the woman suffrage movement, met Alice Paul, and joined the NWP. As a party organizer traveling through the states for the NWP, she helped ratify the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Pollitzer demonstrated her commitment to women's suffrage in 1917 by being arrested as a Silent Sentinel picketing the Woodrow Wilson White House. In August 1920, Pollitzer used her considerable charm to convince legislator Harry T. Burn of Tennessee to cast the deciding vote for the amendment. In 1933, Pollitzer received a master's degree in international law from Columbia University. Soon after this achievement, she became vice-chair of the World Woman's Party with Alice Paul. Pollitzer married Elie Charlie Edson, a free-lance press agent, in 1928. The couple settled in New York City. Neither earned a substantial salary, causing them to depend upon securities bestowed on her from her relatives and an inheritance from his mother. She remained active both in the arts and in feminist politics throughout most of her life.[63]

Another suffragist of note was Anna R. Kovanda (nee Klíma) (b. 1873), a native of Steinauer, Nebraska, of Czech immigrant parents. Her education was received in high school with two additional years of academic work at the Pawnee City Academy, and had special training in dramatics. She lived in Nebraska all her life and had always been interested in church and club affairs. For four years she was state vice-president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, prior to the enactment of woman suffrage and in 1915 was elected president. However, she resigned that honor and again became vice-president. During that time she kept headquarters at the Lincoln Epworth Assembly and also at Pawnee City. She was instrumental in securing passage of the suffragist amendment in Nebraska. In February 1920, for her loyal and energetic service she was awarded, by Carrie Chapman Catt, a certificate of honor entitling her to the Honor Roll of the brave army of men and women who have rendered distinguished service to the cause of woman suffrage in America. 1n 1926 she was a delegate to GFWC (General Federation of the Women's Clubs) in Atlantic City and in 1933 in Detroit.

For nine years she was assistant postmistress at Table Rock. She also served as secretary of the Pawnee County Historical Society. Kovanda had also been active among her own people, having taught the Czech school and directed many dramatic performances in Czech and participating in lodge life. She raised funds for ZČBJ lodge rooms at Table Rock, holding the position of president. She was a member and past matron of the Order of Eastern Star (OES) and was active in the Methodist Church, serving as a special teacher for 30 years. During the World War I Mrs. Kovanda was president of the local Red Cross, and took part in every drive for funds.[64]

Jean Brandeis Tachau (1894-1978), a native of Louisville, Kentucky, of Bohemian ancestry, was a social activist. She was a niece of the Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis. She attended Bryn Mawr College for a year and then spent two years in Cambridge studying violin. With the U.S. entry into World War I in 1917, she joined the war effort through volunteer work with the Red Cross Home Service. She was then hired by the Children's Protective Association of Louisville as a clerk-typist. However she soon began to be assigned cases. After she got married to Charles Tachau, she left her employment but continued her volunteer work. As chair of the Council of Social Agencies, she worked to get an ordinance passed to require inspection and licensing of all children's boarding homes in Louisville. In 1932, she became president of the Children's Agency. From the early 1930s to World War II, she served on the advisory committee of the board of the Louisville and Jefferson Co. Children's Home. Tachau's involvement in child welfare led her to become an advocate of birth control. In 1933, she and a group of volunteers organized the Kentucky Birth Control League. In 1946, Tachau, as chair of the Child Welfare Division of the Health and Welfare Council in Louisville worked on establishing new standards for the juvenile court. She was then appointed by the governor to a legislative advisory committee to study the State's child welfare laws and propose changes. In 1952, the General Assembly passed several important child welfare laws, based on the committee's recommendations. When the Kentucky Citizens for Child Welfare was established, she became its president. The establishment of the new Kentucky Department of Child Welfare in 1960 was the result of their work.[65]

Elizabeth Brandeis Raushenbush (1896-1984), a native of Boston, Massachusetts, of Czech ancestry, was a daughter of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis. She was a labor economist and social researcher educated at Radcliffe College and the University of Wisconsin. She was associated with the University of Wisconsin, where she advanced from instructor of economics to full professor. Together with her husband Paul she did research that led to the signing of the nation's first unemployment compensation law in 1932. This led them to be known in Wisconsin as Mr. and Mrs. Unemployment Compensation. Later she developed interest in the plight of the migrant worker and served as chair person from 1960 to 1967 on the Governor's Committee on Migratory Labor. She fought for improved conditions for migratory workers and their families and succeeded in bringing them under the protection of the workmen's compensation act. She also was instrumental in establishing summer schools for the migrant workers' children. An account of her involvement in the unemployment compensation movement in Wisconsin can be found in the book *Our U.C. Story* (1930-1967), which she wrote with her husband.[66]

Another activist, Franziska Porges Hosken (1920-2006), was born in

Vienna, of Bohemian ancestry, her father being a noted physician from Prague. She had a versatile career, including being a journalist, photographer, painter, author, urban planner, furniture and jewelry designer, entrepreneur, social activist, and world traveler whose interests ranged widely, from global health issues to the creative arts.

In the activist community, she was perhaps best known for having founded the Women's International Network, which began publishing a quarterly journal on women's health issues in 1975, and for researching and writing a groundbreaking study of female genital mutilation, primarily as practiced in African and Muslim nations. She also designed and wrote "The Childbirth Picture Book," a teaching aid that has been translated into a dozen languages and distributed throughout the world. In artistic circles, Mrs. Hosken was celebrated as one of the first women to earn a degree from Harvard University's Graduate School of Design (where she studied under Walter Gropius), as a pioneering architectural photographer and archivist, as an authority on urban planning and interior design, and as a writer, teacher, and artist whose work was exhibited at MIT's Hayden Gallery and the Boston Visual Arts Union, among other venues.

Women in Public Life

Politicians

Apart from suffragists, discussed earlier, relatively few Czech-American women have been involved in politics. Albina Čermák (1904-1978), a native of Cleveland, Ohio, of Czech ancestry, was apparently one of the few women who became politically active in the early and mid 20th century. She was a lifelong Republican and the first woman to run for mayor of Cleveland. She dropped out of nursing school to become bookkeeper-secretary-buyer in the family Čermák Dry Goods Co. In 1933 she became a bookkeeper for the city public utilities department and within two years, was supervisor. Active as a Republican precinct committeewoman from 1925-53, Čermák served as vice-chairman and secretary of the Cuyahoga County Republican Central & Executive Committee and chairman of the Republican Women's Organization of Cuyahoga County from 1939-53. From 1946-53 she was a member of the Board of Elections and was a delegate to the Republican National Conventions in 1940, 1944, and 1952. In 1953, Čermák resigned from many offices to become U.S. collector of customs, stepping down to run against Anthony Celebrezze in 1961 as the first woman to run for mayor. She predicted that Celebrezze, if elected, would abandon Cleveland for a cabinet post. As expected, she lost, while Celebrezze became secretary of HEW in 1962. Čermák was rewarded for party loyalty with choice and historic appointments. She was the first woman appointed bailiff to the common pleas court in 1964. In 1965, State Auditor Roger Cloud selected her as an administrative specialist, while Governor James Rhodes named her vice-chairwoman of the Ohio Status of Women Committee in 1966. Single by choice, she was considered among Cleveland's top career women and was a sought-after speaker.[67]

Mildred Otenášek (19l4-) of Baltimore, Maryland, of Czech ancestry was an economist, educated at Johns Hopkins University, and politician. She was with Trinity College (1940-54), professor of economics at Mt. Saint Agnes College (1954-56), and later at professor of economics and political science at Notre Dame College. Her name had been synonymous with Women in Demo-

cratic politics in Maryland for over 30 years, ever since her selection in 1948 as vice-chairman of the Maryland Democratic Central Committee. For over 20 years, too, she had served as Democratic National Committeewoman for Maryland, a position she assumed in 1956. She had been a delegate to the five Democratic National Conventions (s. 1968) and a number of committees for these conventions. She was also president of the Central Democratic Club of Maryland (1955-57).[68]

First Woman Public Servant

As far as I could determine, the first woman public servant of Czech extraction was most likely Louise Block, born around 1800 in Virginia. Her father Jacob Block was a native of Švihov, Bohemia. She married Abraham Jonas (1801-1864), a merchant and lawyer, with whom she raised a family in Quincy, Illinois. They were close friends of upcoming lawyer and politician Abraham Lincoln. When Lincoln became President, he appointed Jonas postmaster of Quincy in 1861. When Jonas died in 1864, President Lincoln appointed the widowed Mrs. Jonas postmaster in succession to her late husband.[69]

Executive Branch

There have been two outstanding women of Czech extraction in the Executive Branch of the U.S. Government: Frances Knight and Madeleine Albright.

Frances Knight (1905-1999), a native of Newport, Rhode Island, was of British and Czech parents. She grew up in New York City and attended Hunter College and New York University. She moved to Washington when her husband, Wayne Parrish, a magazine publisher, was offered the editorship of a Washington-based aviation magazine. Mr. Parrish soon became a multimillionaire and the couple lived on Embassy Row in Washington. He later started his own publication, with his wife dealing with the bookkeeping and circulation. She then held a variety of Government positions and in 1955 she was picked for the position of Director of the U.S. Passport Office in the State Department. She ran the U.S. Passport Office for 22 years, under five different Presidents, with efficiency and conservative zeal, denying passports and entrance visas to those she regarded as enemies of the nation and surviving efforts to remove her and even mandatory retirement at 70. Frances Knight Parrish used her maiden name of Knight while working at the State Department rather than her married name. The conviction that guided Ms. Knight as she supervised the Passport Office was that the Government had a legal right and moral responsibility to protect American citizens from ideas and philosophies she found abhorrent, especially Communism. To people who represented such forces, she denied passports and visas. Sometimes, when she was not permitted to do so by her superiors in the State Department, she went over their heads and complained to Congress.[70]

Madeleine Korbelová Albright (1937-) was born in Prague, her father being a member of the Czechoslovak diplomatic core and later professor of international relations and then dean at the University of Denver. Albright became the first woman ever to hold the post of United States Secretary of State. She served from January 1997 to January 2001, in President Bill Clinton's second administration, after having been United States representative to the Unit-

ed Nations starting in 1991. She fled with her family when the Nazis occupied the country, then again when the Communists moved in after the war. She first attended school in Switzerland; her family was granted political asylum in the United States, and they settled in Denver in 1948, when she was 11. In 1957, while a student at Wellesley College, she became an American citizen. After graduating with a degree in political science in 1959, she married Joseph Medill Patterson Albright, the heir of a wealthy media empire, and they had three daughters. The marriage ended when Mr. Albright left her abruptly in 1982. By then, Madeleine Albright had a master's degree and a doctorate from Columbia and had occupied positions at top foreign policy research institutions.[71]

After the 1976 U.S. presidential election of Jimmy Carter, Albright's former professor Zbigniew Brzezinski was named National Security Advisor, and recruited Albright in 1978 to work in the West Wing as the National Security Council's congressional liaison. Following Carter's loss in 1980 to Ronald Reagan, Albright moved on to the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., where she was given a grant for a research project. In 1982, Albright joined the academic staff at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., specializing in Eastern European studies. She also directed the University's program on women in global politics. She also served as a major Democratic Party foreign policy advisor, and briefed Vice-Presidential candidate Geraldine Ferraro in 1984 and Presidential candidate Michael Dukakis in 1988. In 1992, Bill Clinton returned the White House to the Democratic Party, and Albright was employed to handle the transition to a new administration at the National Security Council. In January 1993, Clinton nominated her to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, her first diplomatic posting. In 1997 she was appointed the U.S. Secretary of State.

The most visible woman public figure of Czech ancestry is, however, the former First Lady Barbara Bush, nee Pierce, (1925-), the wife of the 41st President of the United States George H. W. Bush, who served as the First Lady of the United States from 1989 to 1993. She is the mother of the 43rd President George W. Bush and 43rd Governor of Florida Jeb Bush. Previously she had served as Second Lady of the United States from 1981 to 1989.[72]

She is a descendant from the known Moravian-Brethren family, the Demuths, from Karlov, Bohemia, some of whose members immigrated to America in 1736 and took part in building the new town of Bethlehem in Pennsylvania.[73] To be sure, Barbara Bush's strong personality personifies the "independent spirit and nonconforming nature" of Czech-American women.

As Pamela Kilian wrote in her monograph, as First Lady, Barbara Bush was universally beloved by the American people. Despite an upper-middle-class adulthood, she managed to convey a down-to-earth image. When she got to the White House, Barbara Bush became a symbol for the millions of women who put home and family first, whether or not they held jobs. She compared her to Abigail Adams. The only other First Lady to achieve this status in America was Abigail Adams almost two centuries earlier.[74]

In his analysis of President Bush, psychologist Oliver James quotes Bush's sons regarding the role of their mother, Barbara Bush, in their upbringing which throws more light on her character. "Barbara Bush was the main authority-figure in the home. Jeb describes it as having been, 'A kind of matriarchy... when we were growing up, Dad wasn't at home. Mom was the one to

hand out the goodies and the discipline.' A childhood friend recalls that' She was the one who instilled fear,' while Bush put it like this: 'Every mother has her own style. Mine was a little like an army drill sergeant's... my mother has always been a very outspoken person who vents very well - she'll just let rip if she's got something on her mind.' According to his uncle, the "letting rip" often included slaps and hits."[75]

Presidential scholar, Robert Watson, wrote: "She will be remembered for those wonderful quips, so straight-talking, so witty and so straightforward. In the age when politicians and their spouses are holding their fingers to the wind of public opinion, Barbara Bush was a breath of fresh air. She was straight-talking, she was herself, she was comfortable in her own skin." He thought that Barbara Bush will be ranked among the top ten on first-lady lists, primarily because she was so popular.[76]

Barbara Bush's cause as First Lady was literacy, as it was when she was Second Lady, calling it "the most important issue we have." She became involved with many literacy organizations, served on literacy committees and chaired many reading organizations. Eventually she helped develop the Barbara Bush Foundation for Family Literacy. During the early 1980s, statistics showed that 35 million adults could not read above the eight-grade level and that 23 million were not beyond a fourth-grade level. Mrs. Bush appeared on the Oprah Winfrey Show to discuss the situation. She also appeared regularly on Mrs. Bush's Story Time, a national radio program that stressed the importance of reading aloud to children. Through her influence, Virginia's former First Lady Jeannie Baliles was inspired to form the Virginia Literacy Foundation, which supported Virginia's grass roots adult literacy programs. Through her support and the publicity she generated as First Lady, grass roots adult literacy programs began to spring up around the country.

She was also active with the White House Historical Association and worked to revitalize the White House Preservation Fund, which she renamed the White House Endowment Trust. The trust raises funds for the ongoing refurbishment and restoration of the White House. She met her goal of raising $25 million towards the endowment.

Bush was known for her affection for her pet English Springer Spaniel Millie and wrote a child's book about Millie's new litter of puppies. Barbara Bush became the first U.S. First Lady to become a recipient of the Henry G. Freeman Jr. Pin Money Fund, receiving $36,000, most of which she gave to favorite charities.

Legislative Branch

In the Legislative Branch, Shelly Sekula-Gibbs (1952-), a native of Floresville, Texas, of Czech ancestry, served with distinction for a brief time. She is a physician by training and from November 2006 to January 2007 she was a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, representing Texas's 22nd Congressional district. She also served as a City Councilwoman in Houston, Texas for three terms. She won the Special Election to fill the 22nd Congressional seat on November 7, 2006 for the remaining weeks of the 109th United States Congress. On the same day, she also lost in the general election for that seat in the 110th United States Congress. Thereby she was in the interesting position of being a lame duck the moment she was elected. In the 2008 campaign for the Republican nomination in the 22nd Congressional District, she

finished first in the primary, but lost a runoff on April 8 to Pete Olson.

Sekula-Gibbs graduated from Our Lady of the Lake University in San Antonio, Texas with summa cum laude honors and a degree in chemistry. She later earned her Doctor of Medicine degree from the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston, Texas and went on to residencies at the University of Florida in family practice, and Baylor College of Medicine in Houston, specializing in dermatology. Presently, Sekula-Gibbs runs a private dermatology practice in the Clear Lake area of Houston. In addition to her practice, Sekula-Gibbs also teaches at Ben Taub Hospital and serves as a clinical assistant professor at Baylor College of Medicine, both in the Texas Medical Center.[77]

Judicial Branch

At least one of Moravian ancestry was a judge: Justine Wise Polier (1903-1987). She was born in Portland, Oregon, daughter of reform Rabbi Stephen Wise. She was a brilliant jurist and activist on issues related to child welfare and the law and one of the earliest and most vocal critics of religious and racial matching in adoption. Although her name is unlikely to be counted in the top ranks of civil rights and social justice advocates, Justine Wise Polier deserves to be remembered alongside figures such as Jane Addams and Eleanor Roosevelt. She worked tirelessly as a children's advocate, was the recipient of numerous national awards and honors, and spoke and wrote widely on legal and social issues for a broad audience.

She was educated in top schools: Bryn Mawr, Radcliffe, Barnard, and then Yale University Law School. She was appointed to the Domestic Relations Court in Manhattan by New York Mayor Fiorello La Guardia, the first judicial appointment in New York State to elevate a woman above the rank of magistrate. It was 1935 and Polier was just 32 years old. For 38 years she used her position on the Family Court bench to fight for the rights of the poor and disempowered. She strove to implement juvenile justice law as treatment, not punishment, making her court the center of a community network that encompassed psychiatric services, economic aid, teachers, placement agencies, and families. She did not resign her judgeship until 1973. After that, she directed the Juvenile Justice Division of the Children's Defense Fund. She also played a pivotal role in mobilizing support for the Wilder case, a landmark class action suit filed in 1973 that eventually transformed the sectarian rules of New York's large foster care system, which had been in place since the nineteenth century.[78]

Epilogue

This study clearly demonstrates that American women of Czech extractions have played a significant role in the U.S. history, starting soon after their arrival in America. To be sure, they excelled as individuals, rather than members of any particular ethnic grouping, which is not surprising, considering that women did not start organizing themselves until the end of 19th century. Beyond that, this is also a reflection of the individuality which is so characteristic of the Czech character.[79] In fact, independent spirit and nonconforming nature transcends their personality and actions, which this study reflects.

Most of the women discussed here were self-educated since at least until the midst of the 19th century women could not attend institutions of higher learning. They were simply not admitted. Frankly, some Ivy League Universi-

ties did not start admitting women until after the midst of the second half of the 20th century.

The exceptions to the above generalization were the Moravian schools. Moravian College, originally established in Germantown, Pennsylvania in 1742 and later moved to Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, began admitting women from the very start. In 1784, it admitted young girls from outside the religious community, offering them one of the most advanced curricula available in the period just following the Revolutionary War.

The College, which traces its roots to the Bethlehem Female Seminary, located in Germantown, is considered the first school for young women in the U.S. The seminary was created by Benigna, Countess von Zinzendorf,[80] the daughter of Count Nikolas Ludwig Zinzendorf, who was the benefactor of the fledgling Moravian communities in Nazareth and Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The Female Seminary was incorporated by the Pennsylvania State Legislature in 1863 and became the woman's college, the Moravian Seminary and College for Women in 1913.

Some thirty years later, in 1772, Little Girls' School (now Salem College), originally established as a primary school, later became an academy (high school) and finally a college. It is the oldest female educational establishment is still operating as a women's college, and the oldest female institution in the Southern United States.

As shown in this study, the Moravian women are really a class by themselves who enjoyed rights and privileges unheard of by other women.

From the later period, the role of Jewish women of Bohemian ancestry is particularly noteworthy, which, in part, may be explained by their upbringing and traditions their parents brought with them to America from Bohemia, where the emphasis on education was part of their life, They considered the importance of education not only for its own sake but also as a means to an end.

NOTES

1. Adrianne Blue, *Martina: The Lives and Times of Martina Navratilova* (Secaucus, New Jersey: Carol Publishing Corporation, 1995).

2. Ivana Trump, *Free to Love* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994).

3. Michael Dobbs, *Madeleine Albright: A Twentieth-Century Odyssey* (Holt Paperbacks, 2000); Madeleine Albright, *Madam Secretary: A Memoir* (New York: Miramax, 2005).

4. Women in professions, and those in the arts and letters, will be covered in subsequent studies.

5. Beverly Prior Smaby, *The Transformation of Moravian Bethlehem from Communal Mission to Family Economy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1989); Beverly Smaby, "Dismantling Female Leadership among Eighteenth-Century Moravians," in: *Pious Pursuits: German Moravians in the Atlantic World,* by Michele Gillespie and Robert Beachy (Berghahn Books, 2007), 159-175.

6. The future master builder of Bethlehem.

7. Grethe Goodman, *Anna Nitschmann, 1715-1760: Founder of the Women Single Sisters' Choir (Keepers)* (Oaks Print. Co., 1985); *A History of the Beginnings of Moravian Work in America, being a translation of Georg*

Neisser's manuscripts… (Bethlehem, Pennsylvania: Archives of the Moravian Church, 1955), 108-110.

8. Katherine M. Faull and Amira El Azhary Sonbol, *Moravian Women's Memoirs: Their Related Lives, 1750-1820* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1997), 121-128; *A History of the Beginnings of Moravian Work in America*, 171.

9. *A History of the Beginnings of Moravian Work in America*, 72-75; Adelaide L. Fries, *The Moravians in Georgia 1735-1740* (Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton, 1905), 152-155..

10. Katherine M. Faull and Amira El Azhary Sonbol, op. cit., 68-76.

11. Elizabeth Sommer, "Gambling with God: The Use of the Lot by the Moravian Brethren in the Eighteenth Century," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 59, no. 2 (April 1998), 267-286; Gillian Lindt Gollin, *Moravians in Two Worlds* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967).

12. Adelaide L. Fries, op. cit., 158-159.

13. Ibid., 174.

14. Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "Augustine Herman Bohemiensis," *Kosmas* 3, no. 1 (Summer 1984), 139-148.

15. Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "Český 'Vanderbilt' v Americe" (Czech Vanderbilt in America) in *Postavy naší Ameriky* (Pražská edice, 2000), 28-30.

16. Elizabeth F. Ellet, "Mary Philipse," in *The Women of the American Revolution* (New York: Baker and Scribner, 1849), 1:202-207; Elizabeth Fries Ellet, *Revolutionary Women in the War for American Independence*, edited and annotated by Lincoln Diamant (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1998); Edgerton Ryerson, *The Loyalists of America and their Times* 2:233-235.

17. Elizabeth Ellet, *Women of the American Revolution,* 1:206.

18. Ibid. Edgerton Ryerson, *The Loyalists of America and their Times*, 2:229-231.

19. Fred G. Usilton, *History of Kent County, Maryland, 1630-1916* (Chestertown: Perry Publications, 1980), 64.

20. Miriam Biskin, *Pattern for a Heroine: The Life Story of Rebecca Gratz* (New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1967); Dianne Ashton, *Rebecca Gratz: Women's Judaism in Antebellum America* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1997); Dwight F. Burlingame, ed., *Philanthropy in America: A Comprehensive Historical Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2006), 1:215-216.

21. Judy Barrett Litoff and Judith McDonnell, *European Immigrant Women in the United States: a Biographical Dictionary.*

22. Jennie Mannheimer (1872-1943), born in New York, New York, was also a teacher. She attended the Rochester Real-Schule, German American Institute of Rochester, New York for her early education. In 1884, her family moved to Cincinnati in order for her father, Sigmund Mannheimer, to take a professorial position at the Hebrew Union College. In Cincinnati, Mannheimer attended Hughes High School. She was one of first two women to receive B.A. in Hebrew Letters from the Hebrew Union College in 1892; she also earned Bachelor of Letters from the University of Cincinnati that year. Mannheimer established the Cincinnati School of Expression in 1894 to teach the art of every day speech and voice culture for speech. Mannheimer directed the school until 1912. Mannheimer also directed the Drama Department of the Cincinnati College of Music from 1900 through 1907.

Beginning in 1913, Mannheimer gave a series of modern drama readings at the Cincinnati Women's Club. The readings were a great success, and Mannheimer also gave them in New York City. She eventually moved to New York City, changing her professional name to Jane Manner, to continue a career as reader and teacher, and then director of Jane Manner Drama Studio. In New York, Mannheimer gave numerous recitals and readings and directed plays, performing at Carnegie Hall, Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, and the Waldorf Astoria, where she gave recitals for 7 consecutive years. She published books on drama and speech, including *The Silver Treasury, Prose and Verse for Every Mood* (1934).

23. Jennie Mannheimer [Jane Manner] Papers, Manuscript Collection no. 259, Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives, Cincinnati Campus, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

24. "School Folk Honor Miss Julia Richman; Education Commissioners Pay a Tribute to the Dead District Superintendent," *The New York Times* June 27, 1912; Selma C. Berrol, "Superintendent Julia Richman: A Social Progressive in the Public Schools," *The Elementary School Journal* 72, no. 8 (May 1972), 402-411; Selma Cantor Berrol, *Julia Richman, A Notable Woman* (Philadelphia: Balch Institute Press, 1993); *Jewish Women in America: An Historical Encyclopedia* edited by Paula E. Hyman and Deborah Dash Moore (New York: Routledge, 1997), 1148-1149.

25. The Komenský Clubs (named for Jan Amos Komenský, or Comenius, the pioneer Czech educator) were founded during the Christmas vacation 1903 by Prof. Bohumil Shimek (Šimek) of the State University of Iowa and F.J. Pípal, a student of the Nebraska University. Pípal later became a professor at Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, and then lived in Humboldt, Nebraska. Upon his return to school, after vacation, in January 1904, Mr. Pípal and a group of twelve students met and founded the Komensky Educational Clubs. According to the constitution, any club or society of an educational or cultural nature was entitled to membership upon taking the name Komensky Educational Club and the aim was to help all clubs enrolled in educational effort, which was to form a bond among Czech-Americans. Further, Czech language and songs were to be perpetuated, Czech history and literature studied, the social condition of our people here, mentally and morally, was to be improved, and Americans were to be informed of whatever meritorious endeavors were undertaken by Czechs.

26. She was a daughter of Czechoslovak President Thomas G. Masaryk.

27. Thomas Čapek, *The Čechs (Bohemians) in America* (Boston: Houghton & Mifflin, 1920), 244.

28. Rose Rosicky, *A History of Czechs (Bohemians) in Nebraska* (Omaha: Czech Historical Society of Nebraska, 1929), 401-402; Thomas Čapek, *The Čechs (Bohemians) in America.*, 208, 244, 245.

29. Solomon Breibart, Jack Bass and Robert N. Rosen, *Explorations in Charleston's Jewish History* (Charleston: The History Press. 2005), 1:90-91; Sidney R. Bland, *Preserving Charleston's Past, Shaping Its Future* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999).

30. Ibid.

31. Emily Miller Danton, *Pioneering Leaders in Librarianship* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1953); Sigrid A. Edge, "Flexner,

Jennie Maas," in *Notable American Women*, 4th ed. (The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1975); Obituary, *New York Times*, November 18, 1944; *Jewish Women in America*, 457-458.

32. Obituary, *Providence Journal*, February 20, 2005.

33. William B. Heimreich, *The Enduring Community: the Jews of Newark and Metro West* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2007), 208; "Mrs. Grotta Dies. Thousands Mourn," *Jewish Chronicle*, January 27, 1922.

34. *Woman's Who's Who of America, 1914-1915* (New York: The American Commonwealth Co., 1914), 29; Alden Whitman, ed., *American Reformers: An H.W. Wilson Biographical Dictionary* (Bronx: H.W. Wilson, 1985); *Jewish Women in America*, 15-16..

35. "Frances Taussig Dead at 98: Leading Jewish Social Worker," *New York Times*, October 24, 1981.

36. Beate Bussiek, "Herha Kraus: Quaker Spirit and Competence," in *History of Social Work in Europe (1900-1960*) edited by Sabine Hering and Berteke Waaldjik (Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 2003).

37. Grace Hyam, "Foreign-Aid Worker and Humanitarian Lotta Hitschmanova and the Unitarian Service Committee of Canada," in Sharon Anne Cook, Lorna R. McLean and Kate O'Rourke, *Framing Our Past: Canadian Women's History in the Twentieth Century* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001).

38. Jack Nusan Porter, "Rosa Sonneschein and The American Jewess: The First Independent English Language Jewish Women's Journal in the United States," *American Jewish History* 67 (September 1978), 57–63, and "Rosa Sonneschein and The American Jewess Revisited: New Historical Information on an Early American Zionist and Jewish Feminist," *American Jewish Archives Journal* 32 , no. 2 (1980), 125–131; "Widow of Rabbi Sonneschein Dies." *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, April 6, 1932; *Jewish Women in America*, 1289-1291.

39. Rose Rosicky, *History of Czechs (Bohemians) in Nebraska*, 409-410; Paul G. Johnson and Rosemary Machacek, eds., *Perspectives: Women in Nebraska History* (Lincoln: Paul G. Johnson, 1984).

40. H. Grinstein, *The Rise of the Jewish Community of New York* (1847)*; Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Gale, 2008).

41. "The Chicago Jewess*," Reform Advocate*, January 30, 1909, 725-729; *The Chicago Jewish Community Blue Boo*k (1918); Hyman L. Meites, ed., *History of the Jews of Chicago* (1924); Obituary, *Reform Advocate*, August 4, 1928; *The Sentinel's History of Chicago Jewry 1911–1986* (1986); Oswald Stein, *Leading Women in Social Service* (1914); *Woman's Who's Who of America: A Biographical Dictionary of Contemporary Women of the United States and Canada, 1914–1915*, edited by John William Leonard (1914, reprint, 1976); *Jewish Women in America*, 887-888.

42. Daniel D. Droba, Czech and Slovak Leaders in Metropolitan Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Slavonic Club, 1934, , 206.

43. Daniel D. Droba, op. cit., 208.

44. Ibid., 203.

45. Národní svaz českých katolíků v Texasu, *Naše Dějiny* (Granger: Našinec, 1939), 628-629.

46. Ibid., 630.

47. Ibid., 636.

48. "Guide to the Joseph and Albina Mikulencak Barton Papers, ca. 1885-1952, 1972, 1999 and undated," Dolph Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas, Austin.

49. Christian Sisters Union Study Committee, *Unity of the Brethren in Texas, 1855–1966* (Taylor: Unity of the Brethren, 1970).

50. Its name was later changed to Fraternal Unity of Bohemian Ladies and its headquarters moved to Chicago. In 1932, it had 16,000 members in 151 clubs in various States. They issued the official quarterly *Ženské Listy*.

51. The organization had 6,955 members in 81 clubs in 1932. The majority of these clubs were located in Illinois and Ohio.

52. Fr. Sekanina, op. cit., 1205a.

53. Daniel D. Droba, op. cit., 195.

54. Ibid., 204.

55. Ibid., 196.

56. Fr. Sekanina, ed., Album representantů všech oborů veřejného života československého. Praha: Umělecké nakladateltsví Josef Zeibdrlich, 1927, 1202a.

57. Daniel D. Droba, op. cit., 205.

58. Fr. Sekanina, ed., op. cit., 1205a.

59. John J. Reichman, *Czechoslovaks of Chicago* (Chicago: Czechoslovak Historical Society of Illinois, 1937), 75; Daniel D. Droba, op. cit., 194.

60. Thomas Čapek, *The Čechs (Bohemians) in America*, 201-202; Janet L. Schmelzer, "Humpal-Zeman, Josefa (Josephine) (1872-1906)," in *European Immigrant Women in the United States: A Biographical Dictionary*, ed. Judy Barrett Litoff and Judith McDonnell (New York: Routledge, 1994), 146-147; Julie A. Noblitt with Alena Zárasová, "Josefa Veronika Humpal-Zeman," in *Women Building Chicago 1790-1990: A Biographical Dictionary*, by Rima Lunin Schultz and Adele Hast (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001).

61. *Notable American Women, 1607-1950* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971); *Jewish Women in America*, 531-532.

62. "Josephine Clara Goldmark, 1877-1950: Papers of Josephine Clara and Pauline Dorothea Goldmark, 1886-1962," Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, Radcliffe College; *Jewish Women in America*, 532-533.

63. Clive Geboire, ed., *Lovingly, Georgia: The Complete Correspondence of Georgia O'Keeffe and Anita Pollitzer. 1990*; Inez Haynes Irwin, *The Story of the Woman's Party* (1921); "Anita Pollitzer Papers," South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Collection, University of South Carolina; *Jewish Women in America*, 1091-1092.

64. Sara Mullin Baldwin and Robert Morton Baldwin, *Nebraskana* (Hebron: The Baldwin Company, 1932); *Who's Who in Nebraska* (1940).

65. John E. Kleber, *The Encyclopedia of Louisville* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001), 866.

66. "Elizabeth Brandesis Raushenbush, 1896-1984: Papers, 1920-1967," Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, Radcliffe College; *Jewish Women in America,* 1129-1130..

67. George T. Marks and Albina R. Cermak, *Woman in Politics* (North Lima, Ohio, 1962)*; Encyclopedia of Cleveland History*, 2nd ed. (Indiana University Press, 1996).

68. OH. 8006 Dr. Mildred Otenasek (b. 1914), Oral History Collections, Library of Maryland History, Maryland Historical Society.

69. Robert N. Rosen, *The Jewish Confederates* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2000).

70. William H. Honan, "Frances Knight, 94, Director of Passport Office for Decades," *New York Times*, September 18, 1999. Frances G. Knight Papers, Herbert Hoover Presidential Library, West Branch, Iowa.

71. See note 3 above.

72. Barbara Bush, *Barbara Bush: A Memoir (New York: Scribner, 1994); Barbara Bush, The First Mom: Wit and Wisdom of Barbara Bush (New York:* Rugged Land, 2004); Barbara Bush, *Millie's Book (New York: Harper Perennial, 1992).*

73. Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "The Moravian and the Bohemian Roots of President Bush and his Contender for U.S. Presidency Senator Kerry," in *Czechs and Slovaks in America* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2005), 259-277; Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "Moravskobratrští Demuthové z Karlova a jejich potomci v Americe" (Moravian-Brethren Demuths from Karlov and their Descendants in America), *Sborník IV, Konference Moravian v roce 2006* (Suchdol nad Odrou: Moravian, 2009), 48-67.

74. Pamela Kilian, *Barbara Bush: Matriarch of a Dynasty* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2002).

75. Oliver James, "So George, How Do You Feel about Your Mom and Dad?" *The Guardian*, September 2, 2003.

76. Robert P. Watson, *The Presidents' Wives: Reassessing the Office of First Lady* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2000).

77. Eun Kyung Kim, "Texans in Congress: Sekula-Gibbs Has Much to Say: As Brief Stint Winds down, She Leaves Her Mark with Votes and Speeches," *Houston Chronicle*, December 9, 2006; *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress* (Washington: Government Printing Office).

78. Justine Wise Polier (1903-1987). Papers, 1892-1990, Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, Radcliffe College; Ellen Herman, "The Difference Difference Makes: Justine Wise Polier and Religious Matching in Twentieth-Century Child Adoption," *Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation* 10, no. 1 (Winter, 2000), 57-98; *Jewish Women in America,* 1091-1092.

79. Miloslav Rechcigl, Jr., "The Czech Character," in *Czechs and Slovaks in America* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 2005), 279-284.

80. Her mother, Erdmuthe Dorothea, Countess of Zinzendorf (1700-1756), was actually a descendant of George Poděbrady, King of Bohemia. See my study in *Bohemia: Journal of History and Civilization in East Central Europe* 36, no. 1 (1995), 126-137.

ESSAY

Jaroslav Seifert (1901-1986), Czech Nobelist

By Zdeněk Salzmann

Introduction

As of the mid-twentieth century, Modern Czech literature had two international stars – Jaroslav Hašek (1883-1923) and Karel Čapek (1890-1938). Hašek was known for his famous novel *Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka za světové války* (The Good Soldier Švejk and His Fortunes in the World War), translated into no less than fifty-eight languages. And Čapek, the well-known playwright, novelist, and journalist, was nominated in the autumn of 1938 by a group of French writers for the Nobel Prize for Literature, but he died on December 25 of that same year. Strangely, his death at that time may have served him well, as he almost certainly would soon have found himself, just as had his older brother Josef, in a Nazi concentration camp, and because Karel was not physically strong, he most surely would have died there under horrifying circumstances. And so it is interesting, if not ironic, that the first Nobel Prize for Literature given to a Czech was awarded only in 1984 to Jaroslav Seifert, a lyrical poet *par excellence* – interesting because unlike novels and plays, lyrical poetry can never be fully appreciated in translation, and Seifert was little known outside his native country.

Communist with His Own Mind

Jaroslav Seifert was born on September 9, 1901, in Žižkov, a proletarian district of Prague. After completing the five years of primary school, the young Seifert began attending a classical gymnasium (secondary school), but did not do well. He failed the sixth year and had to repeat it, and never completed the full eight-year course leading to a school-leaving examination (*maturita*). However, in his upper teens he embarked on a journalistic career. Influenced by his father's socialist leanings, Seifert became active in the Communist press. In 1920, he was one of the founding members of Devětsil, an organization of revolutionary-minded young artists; in 1922, he coedited a collection of articles and poetry; and from 1921 served on the editorial board of *Rudé právo,* the newspaper of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Between 1922 and 1929 he held a position in a Communist publishing house and bookstore. However, his successful career in Communist publishing came to an unexpected end in 1929. He and several other writers opposed the future plans for the Communist Party developed by Klement Gottwald (who eventually became the first post-World War II Communist president of the Czechoslovak Republic). For his insubordination Seifert was expelled from the party and removed from his editorial position. In no uncertain terms did he learn that members of the Communist Party are not expected to speak their minds. But even in some of his early poems there are subtle indications that human feelings, love in particular, were as important to him as considerations of Communist political "correctness." For example, in 1923 he wrote in one of his early poems, "Sloky milostné,"

> Neboť láska, to je něco ohromného
> …….

že kdyby na celém světě byla revoluce,
že přece ještě někde na zelené trávě
milenci měli by čas stisknouti si ruce
a sklonit hlavu k hlavě.[1]

Some of his Communist friends may have wondered how a revolution could succeed if, when the comrades were calling them to action, young people were spending their time admiring nature, holding hands, and looking deeply into one another's eyes.

Following his involuntary exit from the Communist press, Seifert served briefly on the editorial board of a well-known Czech newspaper and theater journal, and then from 1930 worked for various organs of the Social Democratic party press, culminating in his joining the staff of the labor-union daily *Práce* in 1945.

Seifert after World War II

For critical political remarks made several years after the war during a meeting of a group of poets (someone reported him to the authorities), Seifert was punished by the postwar Communist government officials by not being allowed to publish any of his writings for several years during the 1950s. During the political thaw in the 1960s, Seifert was elected president of the Union of Czechoslovak Writers, and the honorary title National Artist (*národní umělec*) was conferred on him by the president of the republic in 1966. After he condemned the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact armies in 1968, he became once again *persona non grata.* He is reported to have said: "If an ordinary person is silent, it may be a tactical maneuver; but if a writer is silent, he is lying." Once again, his opportunities to publish new poetry were limited, or his poetry was censored by the authorities. An example: In his collection *Halleyova kometa* (Halley's Comet), which first appeared in 1967, is a long poem titled "Pražský hrad" (The Prague Castle). Two of the stanzas, which read

Chtěl jsem však do té vřavy vychrlit
pár zajíkavých slov.
Aby už něčí ruka smetla strach
z těch lidských očí, které čekají,
protože chci již uvěřit, že přišel čas,
kdy bude možno říci vraždě do tváře:
Jsi vražda.

Ničemnost, třeba s vavřínem,
zas bude ničemností,
lež opět lží, jak bývala.
A pistole v ruce už neotevře
nevinné dveře.[2]

were either completely, or in part, expurgated in some of the subsequent editions.

When in 1977 he became one of the signatories of Charter 77, a Czech manifesto stressing the indivisibility of human, political, and social

rights, he was already seriously ill. The richness of his lyrical poetry coupled with his honesty and courage was rewarded by his receiving the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1984. His work was cited for "freshness, sensuality and rich inventiveness, [providing] a liberating image of the indomitable spirit and versatility of man." Since his state of health prevented him from traveling to Sweden, the prize was accepted for him by his daughter Jana. Seifert died in 1986 from heart failure – he was 84 years old.

Seifert's earliest poems, his so-called proletarian poetry, were written in a direct, easily comprehensible style, and the poems had titles such as "Monolog of an Armless Soldier," "Revolution," "Sinful City," and "The Poor." Interestingly enough, Seifert excluded one poem from the subsequent editions of his second collection published in 1923 because he thought it would be found too provocative. This poems included the lines

> My občané volní, svobodní, k vám,
> pánům zbabělým,
> dnes do uší hřmíme: my chceme vše,
> my chceme více,
> my také chceme mít k obědu vepřovou se zelím,
> k večeři telecí s nádivkou anebo na paprice …[3]

After the relatively short period of proletarian poetry, Seifert – influenced by his good friend Karel Teige – adopted the style of poetism (*poetizmus*). This was a style Czech poetry took during the 1920s that emphasized fantasy and playfulness and included an unusual graphic appearance of the printed poems. A good example of a poem by Seifert from this period follows; it appeared in a collection first published in 1925 (here cited) and later in a somewhat more traditional form with punctuation added by the author:

> přístav
>
> KOTVA na konec ještě krásnou naději
> mrtvá ústřice stoupá ke korábu vzhůru
>
> KORMIDELNÍK procházeti se večer v Marseilli
> na botách ještě bláto Singapuru
>
> LOĎ v rahnoví stožáru mezi lucernami
> papoušek s opicí myslili že jsou doma
>
> NOC voják a dívka v kavárně zůstali sami
> láhev vrhala stín císaře Napoleona
>
> LODNÍ ŠROUB když všichni již odešli tancovat
> z hlubiny vypluly na povrch lekníny
>
> JEŘÁBY a groteskní žirafy šly v dlouhých řadách spát
> palmami neznámé pevniny[4]

After World War II, Seifert converted much of his poetry to prose form, using free verse and occasional rhymes. In addition to his own poems, Seifert translated into Czech some of the poetry of several foreign writers, among them the Russian poet Alexandr A. Blok and the French poet Guillaume Apollinaire.

What are the subjects of the many hundreds of Seifert's poems? Some are serious but most are everyday, light. Here is a very small sample of subjects of both kinds. Serious topics: being blind, a confessional (the place), a conversation with death, the dead of Lidice, Lenin, Mácha's *Máj*, Napoleon, and the Prague uprising. Light topics: a field poppy, flies on the window, a gargoyle, a lightbulb, mimosa, shoes, a silk handkerchief, sounds of the drum, a wax candle, and a song about all the following – bees, pendulum, spelling book, and tomcat.

Since poems should be read and enjoyed rather than talked about, following this introduction I will cite a few from among the hundreds of Seifert's poems, adding only a few comments here and there. All poems in this essay are cited in their original form – Seifert's punctuation and the use of capital letters have been retained. My translations of these poems in the Notes are literal and given on a line-by-line basis (I wouldn't dare attempt a poetic translation, and I don't think it would even be appropriate).

Selected Poems by Seifert

I begin with a short piece from one of his earliest collections, *Poštovní holub* (Homing Pigeon), which appeared in 1929:

Píseň

Bílým šátkem mává,
kdo se loučí,
každého dne se něco končí,
něco překrásného se končí.

Poštovní holub křídly o vzduch bije,
vraceje se domů;
s nadějí i bez naděje
věčně se vracíme domů.

Setři si slzy
a usměj se uplakanýma očima,
každého dne se něco počíná,
něco překrásného se počíná.[5]

At first reading one's thought is likely to be, "What a modest message" (if not also, "What a simple form to convey it in"). But it is the simplicity of this short poem that makes it difficult to forget. Seifert reminds us that human life is but a long series of both sad and joyful experiences, and that throughout our lives, memories are always taking us back home.

This simple yet profound message is matched by a simplicity of form that reminds the reader of folk songs: not perfect rhymes but assonances at the end of lines (*loučí* and *končí*, *bije* and *naděje*, and *očima* and *počíná*); the use

of a refrain, that is, the regular recurrence of a phrase or a part of a phrase in each stanza; the casual syllabic structure of the lines of the poem; and the use of everyday words. It is the whole of this poem – that is, how the message is wedded to its form – that impresses me so much. (I am reminded of John Ciardi's book *How Does a Poem Mean?* published in 1959 – note his use of the word *how* rather than *what*.)

And speaking of how much one can express with only a few words, my thought goes back to a poem by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, best known for his famous poetic drama *Faust*. As a thirty-year-old, Goethe penciled on the wall of a mountain lodge in 1780 one of his wayfarer's night songs—a poetic gem:

Wanderers Nachtlied

Über allen Gipfeln
Ist Ruh,
In allen Wipfeln
Spürest du
Kaum einen Hauch;
Die Vögelein schweigen im Walde.
Warte nur, balde
Ruhest du auch.[6]

Here is another Seifert poem, this one expressing his love of his homeland. It was apparently written in late 1938 when Czechoslovakia received its first blow from Nazi Germany and was robbed of its Bohemian and Moravian border territories, leaving the country maimed. (The final assault came in March of 1939 when both Bohemia and Moravia were incorporated into the Third Reich as a protectorate.)

Píseň o rodné zemi

Krásná jako kvítka na modranském džbánku
je ta země, která vlastí je ti,
krásná jako kvítka na modranském džbánku,
sladká jako střída dalamánku,
do nějž nůž jsi vnořil k rukojeti.

Stokrát zklamán, rady nevěda si,
znovu vždycky navracíš se domů,
stokrát zklamán, rady nevěda si,
k zemi bohaté a plné krásy,
k chudé jako jaro v čerstvém lomu.

Krásná jako kvítka na modranském džbánku,
těžká, těžká jako vlastní vina
——není z těch, na něž se zapomíná.
Naposledy kolem tvého spánku
padne prudce její hořká hlína.[7]

This poem, too, is written in simple language, with one line repeated three times and one twice. A few explanatory comments: the adjective *modranský* derives from the name of the western Slovakian town Modra, known for two centuries for its handsomely decorated earthenware. And the word *dalamánek* refers to small oblong loaf of white bread; the word derives from the French *pain d'Allemand* "German bread," and its usage was documented from the 1830s by Josef Jungmann in his monumental *Slovník česko-německý*. Seifert was a sentimental man. He was very fond of his mother and in 1954 dedicated a collection of poems to her, titled *Maminka* (Mommy). The poem I am citing is a good example of Seifert's ability to touch the reader by writing simply about simple things.

První dopis mamince

Už vím, dám dopis na zrcadlo
či do košíčku na šití,
však žel dosud mě nenapadlo,
co psát, jak dopis začíti.

Maminko moje milovaná,
a v zubech konec násadky,
přemýšlím; stránka nenapsaná
čeká a čeká na řádky.

Přeji Ti dnes v den Tvého svátku
——ve slově Tvého velké T—
no vida, už mám druhou řádku
a pokračuji ve větě:

štěstí – po t se píše ě –
a zdraví – a pak selhává
už nadobro má fantasie,
tak přízemní a kulhavá.

A trhám papír, muchlaje ho
——maminka stojí nad válem
a chystá něco voňavého –
a v odhodlání zoufalém

přibíhám k ní, tiskne mě k sobě,
očima, mlčky, ptá se mě.
Pak zamoučněné ruce obě
zvedly mě rychle se země.[8]

Seifert had a good sense of humor. Among his early poems was the short one-stanza piece titled

filosofie

vzpomeňte moudrých filosofů

život není nic než okamžik
a přece když čekávali jsme na své milenky
byla to věčnost[9]

Seifert's last collection of poetry, *Býti básníkem* (To Be a Poet), appeared in 1983, and it is a good example of his late poetry in prose, but with some simple yet very effective imagery and phrasing of everyday observations. The town referred to, Kralupy on the Vltava, is a small, quiet old town a short distance north of Prague. As a boy Seifert used to visit his grandfather who lived there, and at the poet's request his remains were buried in the family crypt at the Kralupy cemetery.

Kralupy nejsou krásné město…

Kralupy nejsou krásné město
a nikdy nebyly.
Na jejich okraji vyrostly komíny
jako obludné stromoví bez větví,
bez listí, bez květů, bez včel
a bez ptáků.

Kdo vystoupil z vlaku,
ještě na stupátku vagónu
vdechl nasládlý pach
továrny Maggi.
Byla poblíž nádraží.

Já však bez prodlení spěchával
k tichým dveřím,
kde mě čekalo několik náručí,
do kterých jsem šťastně padal.

Ještě dnes—a co už je to let,
když zavřu oči
a dívám se do řídké tmy svých víček,
zjevují se mi usměvavé tváře,
těch, které jsem měl rád.
Jsou už však bledé
jako světlo hvězd v zimě odpoledne,
kdy se teprve smráká.

Kvečeru a zvláště před deštěm
zavírali lidé okna.
Na město padaly vločky sazí
a do ulic vstoupil dým
podobný podzimní mlze,
ale ozbrojený po zuby.

Dodnes mi tam však rozkvetou
i na ostnatém drátě
šípkové růže.
Stačí jen chvilku postát
a tiše povzdechnout.[10]

And in conclusion, it may be of interest to cite what reportedly was Seifert's last poem before his death. It tells us what was on the mind of a poet who by that time was in his eighties and in very poor health:

Sen

Jako dítě i jako kluk
míval jsem divný sen.
Mívám ho dosud,
tíživě úzkostný
a zároveň vzrušující nadějí:
Hledám svazek klíčů,
klíčů otvírajících všechny zámky,
dveře k blahobytu
i brány ráje.
Ale přitom to nejsou paklíče,
ani se paklíčům nepodobají.
Neskřípou v zámcích,
nejsou ze železa,
nejsou z tvrdé oceli,
nejsou z kovu.
V tom je jejich tajemství.
Po procitnutí jsem se sám sobě smával.
Kdepak něco takového!
Ale teď vím, že jsou!
A jsou tři:
Jeden je pokoj mezi národy,
jeden je nenásilná vláda,
jeden je mír v duši.
Kéž by se našly![11]

Why was the title of National Artist conferred upon a writer who always spoke his mind during those many years when the recognition of outstanding artistic merit was reserved for those who either supported the self-appointed authorities or at least kept silent? Because in his poetry Seifert used ordinary words, and used them well, but primarily because he wrote about the everyday experiences which his many readers shared with him. In short – his poetry spoke to thousands of people, and thousands enjoyed listening to his kind and honest voice.

NOTES

1. In a literal line-by-line translation, as are all the subsequent translations: Love verse / Because love, that's something tremendous /…if there

were a revolution in the whole world, / nevertheless somewhere on the green grass / lovers would have time to hold hands / and bend one head to the other.

2. Translation: However, I wanted to spew out into the uproar / a few faltering words. / That someone's arm would finally sweep away the fear / from those people's eyes that are waiting / because at last I want to believe that the time has come / when it is possible to tell a murder to its face: / You are a murder.

Vileness, even with laurels, / will again be vileness, / a lie again a lie, as it used to be. / And a pistol in hand will no longer open / an innocent door.

3. Translation: We independent, free citizens, to you, / cowardly masters, / today we thunder into [your] ears: we want everything, / we want more, / we also want to have roast pork with sauerkraut for lunch / [and] veal with stuffing or seasoned with paprika for the evening meal …

4. Translation: a harbor /

ANCHOR at the end also a beautiful hope / a dead oyster rises upward toward the argosy

HELMSMAN to stroll in the evening in Marseille / on the shoes still the mud from Singapore

SHIP in the rigging of the mast between the lanterns / a parrot and a monkey thought they were at home

NIGHT the soldier and a girl remained by themselves in the coffee house / a bottle cast the shadow of Emperor Napoleon

SHIP'S PROPELLER after everyone had gone to dance / water lilies surfaced from the depths

CRANES and grotesque giraffes in long files moved along to sleep / through the palms of an unknown mainland

5. Translation: A song / With a white kerchief waves / [the person] who says good-by, / every day something comes to an end, / something beautiful comes to an end.

A homing pigeon beats the air with its wings / returning home; / both with and without hope / we are forever returning home.

Wipe away your tears / and smile [at me] through your tear-stained eyes, / every day something begins, / something beautiful begins.

6. Translation: Over all hilltops / is peace, / in all treetops / you sense / hardly a breeze; / the little birds keep silent in the wood. / Just wait, soon / you, too, will rest.

7. Translation: Song about [one's] native country / Beautiful as the florets on a small jug from Modra / is the land which is your native country, / beautiful as the florets on a small jug from Modra, / sweet as the soft part of a small loaf of bread, / into which you have plunged a knife up to its handle.

Disappointed a hundred times, being at your wits' end, / you are always returning home, / disappointed a hundred times, being at your wits's end, / to a country rich and full of beauty, / poor as springtime in a fresh quarry.

Beautiful as the florets on a small jug from Modra, / heavy, heavy as one's own guilt / —it is not one of those one tends to forget. / At the end, around your temple / the bitter earth will roughly fall.

8.Translation: First letter to [my] mama / I already know, I'll put the letter on the mirror / or into the sewing basket, / but unfortunately it hasn't yet occurred to me / what to write, how to begin the letter.

My beloved mommy, / and with the end of the penholder in my teeth, / I am thinking; an unwritten page / is waiting and waiting for the lines.

I wish you today, the day of your name's day / —for the word Tvého [your] a capital T— / well, after all, I already have the second line / and I am continuing with the sentence:

happiness – after the t [in štěstí] one writes an ě — / and health – and then what keeps failing me / completely is my imagination, / so uninspired and limping.

And I tear the paper, crumpling it / —mommy is standing over the pastry board / and is preparing something sweet-smelling – / and in desperate determination /

I am running up to her, she presses me to her, / with her eyes, silently, she is addressing me. / Then both of her hands covered with flour / lifted me quickly from the ground.

9. Translation: philosophy / remember the wise philosophers / life is nothing but a twinkle / and yet when we used to wait for our sweethearts / it was eternity

10. Translation: Kralupy is not a beautiful town…/ Kralupy is not a beautiful town /and it never was. / On its outskirts chimneys grew tall / like monstrous trees without branches, / without leaves, without blossoms, without bees / and without birds.

Whoever got off the train, / still on the step of the railcar / breathed in the sweetish odor / of the Maggi factory. / It was near the railroad station.

However, I used to hurry without delay / to the silent door / where several pairs of open arms awaited me, / into which I happily would fall.

Still today—and how many years it has been— / when I close my eyes / and look into the thin darkness of my eyelids, / smiling faces appear to me / of those I was fond of. / But by now they are pale / like the light of the stars on a winter afternoon, / just as the dusk begins to fall.

Toward evening and especially before rain / people used to close the windows. /

Flakes of soot were falling on the town / and smoke entered the streets / similar to autumn fog, / but armed to the teeth.

But up to this day, [what] will burst into bloom there / even on a barbed wire / [are] wild roses. / It is enough to stand still for only a short while / and to give a quiet sigh.

11. Translation: A dream / As a child and also as a boy / I used to have a strange dream. / I still keep having it, / oppressively apprehensive / and at the same time I feel an exciting hope: / I am looking for a bunch of keys, / keys that would open all locks, / the doors to prosperity / and also the gates of paradise. / But at the same time they are not passkeys, / nor do they look like passkeys. / They don't grate in the locks, / they are not made of iron, / they are not made of hard steel, / they are not made of metal. / Therein is their secret. / After waking up I used to laugh at myself. / By no means could there be something like this! / But now I know that they [the keys] exist! / And there are three: / One is peace among nations, / one is a nonviolent government, / one is peace in the soul. / If only they could be found!

TRANSLATION

Karel Havlíček Borovský
***Tyrolské Elegie* (Tyrolean Elegies, 1852)**
Translated, with a Commentary, by Charles S. Kraszewski

1
Sviť, měsíčku, polehoučku
skrz ten hustý mrak;
jakpak se ti Brixen líbí?
Neškareď se tak!

Nepospíchej, pozastav se,
nechoď ještě spát:
abych s tebou jen chvilinku mohl
diškutírovat.

Nejsem zdejší, můj měsíčku!
toť znáš podle křiku;
neutíkej, nejsem *treu und bieder*,
jsem zde jen ve cviku.

2
Jsemť já z kraje muzikantů,
na pozoun jsem hrál,
a ten pořád ty vídeňské pány
ze sna burcoval.

By se po svých těžkých prácech
hodně vyspali,
jednou v noci kočár policajtů
pro mne poslali.

Dvě hodiny po půlnoci,
když na třetí šlo,
tu mi dával žandarm u postele
šťastné dobrytro.

Se žandarmem slavný ouřad
celý v parádě,
pupek kordem pevně obvázaný,
zlato na krágle.

„Vstávají, pane redaktor,
nelekají se,
jdeme v noci, nejsme však zloději,
jenom komise.

1
Little moon, shine lightly down
Through the thick midnight shades;
Say, how do you like Brixen town?
Don't make that nasty face!

Wait! Hang around a little while —
Don't go to bed just yet;
The night is young, and you and I'll
Just have a little chat.

I'm not a local, moon — you hear
The accent in my wail.
Wait! I am not a *true und bieder* —
I'm the one in jail!

2
I come from a music-filled land
And my trombone a-roaring
Was heard even in Vienna, and
Disrupted their snoring.

So that after toil-filled days
They'd get their beauty rest,
One night, a cop-filled four-horse shay
Was sent to my address.

Two hours after midnight — dead
At night — closer to three,
A burly cop stood near my bed
And bid good day to me.

Along with him, a whole precinct:
It looked like a parade.
A sword-belt each stout belly cinct,
Each collar choked in braid.

"Morning, Editor. It's time
To get up, if you please.
Fear not! It's night, but there's no crime,
It's only the police.

Od všech z Vídně pozdravení,
pan Bach je líbá,
jsou-li prý zdráv? a tuhle to psaní
po nás posílá.“ —
Já jsem i na lačný život
vždycky zdvořilý:
„Odpusť, slavná císařská komise,
že jsem v košili!“

Ale Džok, můj černý buldog,
ten je grobián,
na *habeas corpus* tuze zvyklý —
on je Angličan.

Málem by byl chlap přestoupil
jeden paragraf,
již na slavný ouřad zpod postele
uďál: Vrr! Haf! Haf!

Hodil jsem mu tam pod postel
říšský zákoník,
dobře že jsem měl ten moudrý nápad,
již ani nekvík.

3
Občan zvyklý na pořádek —
bylo to v prosinci —
přede vším jsem si obul punčochy
v slavné asistenci.

Pak jsem teprv četl psaní —
však ho tuhle mám;
rozumíš-li ouřední němčině,
přečti si ho sám.

Bach mi píše jako doktor,
že mi nesvědčí
v Čechách zdraví, že prý potřebuju
změnu povětří.

Že je v Čechách tuze dušno,
horké výpary,
mnoho smradu po té oktrojírce,
holé nezdraví!

“Herr Bach, and all in Vienna
Send you their very best;
Along with which — you’re well, I
trust? — a
Warrant for your arrest.”
Now, on a point of courtesy
I strive to do my share:
“Pardon, imperial sirs! You see,
I’m… in my underwear.”

But Jock, my bulldog, made a fuss —
Oh, he’s a hooligan!
So stuck on *habeas corpus*!
(Well, he’s an Englishman).

The good gendarme had hardly read
A single paragraph,
When suddenly, from beneath the bed,
He growled out “Grr! Haf! Haf!”

A tome of arbitrary decrees
Beneath the bed I chucked;
Then all was silent as you please —
The poor thing should have ducked.

3
Now, I’m a loyal citizen,
But — this was in December —
Ne’er have such glorious assistants
Helped clothe my shiv’ring members.

I only read the warrant when
I’d covered up my knees.
Read it yourself — here — if you can
Read *Deutsch-officialese*.

Minister Bach writes me — himself —
Full of a doctor’s care:
The Czech climate’s bad for my health;
I need a change of air.

Too humid here for lungs so weak,
The air thick with malaise;
That *oktrojirka* rots and reeks —
It’s sure to breed some plagues!

Že on tedy schválně pro mne
kočár sem poslal,
abych se hned na státní outraty
na cestu vydal.

A žandarmům že nařídil,
ať mne hodně nutí,
kdybych nechtěl ze skromnosti přijmout
jeho nabídnutí.

4
Což je dělat? Že pak musím
hloupý zvyk ten mít,
že nemohu žandarmům s flintami
pranic odepřít!

Dedera mne taky nutil,
abych jel jen hned,
že by chtěli Brodští, až se vzbudí,
třeba s námi jet.

Pravil mi, že nemám s sebou
zbraně žádné brát,
neb že oni mají nařízení
mne ochraňovat.

Že mám též, pokud jsme v Čechách,
inkognito jet,
sic nám dají dotíraví lidé
hrůzu komis hned.

Ještě mi dal pan Dedera
více moudrých rad,
dle nichž se Bachovi pacienti
mají spravovat.

Tak mne vábil jak Sirena,
až jsem obul boty,
oblík' vestu, kabát, pak i kožich,
dříve však kalhoty!

Koně a žandarmi stáli
dávno před domem:
„Milí braši, maličké strpení,
hned již pojedem!"

And thus he's sent, especially,
This carriage into town,
To pluck me expeditiously
Hence, costs borne by the Crown.

What's more, the guards he did command
— In case I should decline —
To urge me to accept his plan,
So caring and benign.

4
What's to be done? It's not polite
The wishes to oppose
Of cops with flintlocks pointed right
At one's ungrateful nose…

Dedera also presses home:
"If, by the break of day,
We're to be out of Brod, come, come,
We must be on our way!"

He also tells me: "You won't need
To take along firearms,
We're under orders strict, you see
To keep you from all harm.

"You'll travel incognito, please,
While we are in Czech lands,
So no welcoming committees
Slow, or upset our plans."

Suchlike learned imprecations
Good Dedera did dispense,
Such as aid Dr. Bach's patients
To reconvalesce.

Like a Siren did he woo me
Till I got my boots on,
Shirt and coat and pants (less roomy
'Cause of my long-johns).

Still on the cobbles cold and dreary
Horse and cop did wait:
"A minute longer, dears, I'm nearly
Ready for our date!"

5
Ó, měsíčku, však ty ženské
dobře znáš a víš,
jaký s nimi člověk na tom světě
často mívá kříž!

Také's mnohého loučení
tajným svědkem byl,
ty znáš líp než každý novelista
hořkost těchto chvil.

Matka, žena, sestra, dcerka,
malá Zdenčinka,
stály okolo mne v tichém pláči —
hořká chvilinka!
Já jsem sice starý kozák,
v půtkách tužený,
tenkrát jsem měl trochu těsná prsa
a zrak zkalený.

Vtisknul jsem však poděbradku
silně do čela,
aby se těm policajtům slza
nezablyštěla,

neb ti všichni blíže dveří
posud stáli stráž,
aby měla tato smutná scéna
císařskou stafáž.

6
Trubka břeští, kola hrčí,
jedem k Jihlavi,
vzadu, abychom nic neztratili,
klušou žandarmi.

Ten borovský kostelíček
stojí na vršku,
skrze lesy smutně na mne hledí:
„Jsi to, můj hošku?"

„Pode mnou jest tvá kolébka,
já tě viděl křtít,
starému vikáři ministrovat,
pilně se učit.

5
Little moon, you understand
The fairer sex, and know
How often, for their sake, a man
Bears crosses here below!

So many partings at midnight
You've been forced to witness,
Such bitter scenes, why, you could write
Better than novelists.

My wife, my sister, mother frail,
And little Zdenka mine,
Encircled me, began to wail —
A bitter, trying time!
Now, this old Cossack's not impressed
With scars and sights of hell,
But then, I felt this battered breast
Heave, and tears begin to well.

I shut my eyelids tight and turned
My face away, from fear,
Lest one of the cops might discern
An unsurpressable tear.

For still they stood in the doorway,
The boys in royal blue,
So that our homey little play
Might have some extras, too.

6
The trumpet yelps, the wheels grind
Jihlava-ward (non-stop);
To make sure nothing falls behind,
Behind us trot the cops.

The little church in my home town
(Borová) comes in view;
From its hillock, sadly gazing down:
"My boy! Can that be you?

"I saw you born and baptized here,
I saw you serve at Mass;
I watched you study, year by year
At the head of your class.

„Táhnout světem na zkušenou,
pak s pochodní jít,
naší chase plamenem veselým
na cestu svítit.

„Vidíš, jak ty roky plynou,
znám tě třicet let-…
ale, chlapče! Jaké to obludy
vidím s tebou jet?“

7
Když jsme jeli přes Jihlavu,
měl jsem Špilberk v mysli,
za Lincem zas myšlénky na Kufstein
z hlavy mi nevyšly.

Teprva když jsme nechali
Kufstein vpravo stát,
začla se mi alpejská krajina
příjemnější zdát.

Hloupá jízda, milý brachu,
když se neví kam:
veselé troubení postilionů
jsou jen bídný klam.

Všude kolomaz a všude
přepřahovali:
kdybyste radš ve Vídni přepřáhli
a namazali!

Telegraf je přece jenom
hezký vynález!
Ten před námi všude, než jsme přišli,
ohlášení nes.

By nám mohla policie,
starostlivá máti,
všude, dříve než tam přijedeme,
kamna rozehřáti.

Nesmím ale zapomenout
Budějovice,
tam Dedera koupil Mělnického
čtyry lahvice.

“Here you grew up within my sight:
You followed, learned and led —
Here first you shone a happy light
On paths your friends would tread.

“Full thirty years I’ve known you! Hey,
Swift flow the days, it’s true.
But boy — those ogres — who are they
Who ride along with you?”

7
Through Jihlava the carriage spins
And Špilberk’s on my mind;
Then as the party rolled past Linz
My thoughts turned to Kufstein.

But only when we rushed on past
With Kufstein on the right
Could I in Alpine scenes at last
Allow me to delight.

But, brother, what a stupid ride,
Not knowing whither bound!
It seems a hollow, mocking lie
Each time the post-horn sounds.

At every stop, fresh axle-grease,
Cares and repairs and such;
Alas! If but the Viennese
The State oiled half as much!

And yet, the telegraph. Now there
’s a marvelous invention:
Outstripping us to those who cared
For us in our detention.

At every stop it was the same:
About the place there swarmed
The cops, who, long before we came
Cared to keep the hearthside warm.

Nor must thou ever be forgot,
Budějovice, where
Dedera pried his purse ope, and bought
Four bottles of thy beer.

Čili se v něm vlastenecké
hnuly myšlenky?
Čili doufal, že pro mne bude
Lethe na Čechy?

Mělnické jsem dávno dopil,
piju Vlaské zas;
ale zdá se, že je v obou stejný
nepokojný kvas.

8
Teď, měsíčku, nechme elegie
a přejděme v heroický tón:
nebo, co ti chci teď vypravovat,
to byl čertův shon.

Cesta z Reichenhallu do Weidringu —
ty ji musíš taky dobře znát —
ta se nedá žádnou ordonancí
přeoktrojovat.

Hory, skály ohromnější ještě,
než jest hloupost mezi národy,
vedle cesty propast bezedná jak
drška armády.

Temná noc jak naše svatá církev
a my jedem s kopce jako mžik;
darmo křičí Dedera: „Drž koně!“
prázdný je kozlík.

Kočár praští, a koně ve větru,
již je ďábel horem pádem nese,
a postilion někde tam za kopcem
do dýmky si křeše.

Dolů jako s věže cesta plytká,
vůz jak šipka klouže hý a hat,
snad nás hodlá někde do propasti
internýrovat.

Ach, to byla pro mne chutná chvilka!
neboť neznám žádnou větší slast
nežli vidět slavnou policii
ouzkostí se třást!

Did patriotic stirrings move
Him to this generous act?
Or did he hope that they would prove
A quasi-Lethean draught?

Long since those four Mělnické beers
Have through my system raced;
The Brixen beers I'm sipping here…
Have the same bitter taste.

8
Now, little moon, we change the scale
From lyric to heroic.
For now you'll hear a frightful tale
Quite far from aught melodic.

The Richenhall to Weidring route —
You know its every feature:
No fiat, however absolute
Will ever win with nature!

Those mountain ranges even outsoar
The idiocy of nations;
The roadside chasms yawn yet lower
Than the gendarme's vocation.

'Twas darker than Holy Church, that night
As we sped on. In vain
Dedera cried: "Hold those nags tight!"
— No one was at the reins.

The carriage creaked, the horses soared
Beneath a devil's strokes —
(Our coachman, long bumped overboard,
Commenced a grateful smoke).

So like an arrow, on we rushed
Tossed here and there, hell-bent.
Was it the horses sought for us
Abysmal internment?

A fearsome pass, indeed! And yet
'Twas not devoid of cheer —
To see the glorious gendarmes wet
Their pants from abject fear!

Napadnul mi — jsem já čtenář bible —
o Jonáši smutný příběh ten,
jak jej k utišení bouře z loďky
vyhodili ven.

„Metejme los!“ pravím, „mezi námi
musí někdo velký hříšník být,
a ten k usmíření nebes musí
z vozu vyskočit.“

Jen to vyřknu, ejhle! policajti
ani svědomí nezpytovali
a kajícně vyrazivše dvířka
z vozu vyskákali.

Ach, ty světe, obrácený světe!
Vzhůru nohami ve škarpě leží stráž,
ale s panem delikventem samým
kluše ekvipáž!

Ach, ty vládo, převrácená vládo!
národy na šňurce vodit chceš,
ale čtyřmi koňmi bez opratí
vládnout nemůžeš!

Bez kočího, bez opratí, potmě,
u silnice propast místo škarpy:
tak jsem cválal sám a sám v kočáře
jako vítr s Alpy.

Svěřiti svůj osud také jednou
koňům splašeným se já mám bát,
občan rakouský? Což se mi může
horšího již stát?

Tak jsem s chladnou resignací v hlavě,
v hubě ale vřelou cigáru,
čerstvěj než cár ruský přijel k poště
v dobrém rozmaru.

Tam jsem zatím — mustr delikventů —
bez ochrany povečeřel hezky,
než za mnou stráž s odřenými nosy
přikulhala pěšky.

Now, I'm a Bible-reader, and
It then occurred to me
How Jonas, to calm a hurricane,
Was chucked into the sea.

"Among us, boys," I said, "no doubt,
But there's some sinful knave.
'Twere best the bastard would jump out
To slake the heavens' rage."

Those words no sooner left my mouth
Than, 'twixt a jolt and reel,
My whole police escort jumped out
In penitential zeal.

O, topsy-turvy world! See there —
The cops sprawl on the stones,
Meanwhile the delinquent sails through air
And clatters on alone!

O, topsy-turvy government!
You'd nations whole command,
And the whole time, it seems you can't
Control a four-in-hand!

Through the pitch black, with coachman gone,
Chasms both sides of the trail,
Alone I galloped on and on
Faster than Alpine gale.

Steeds maddened by the devil's spur —
Should I fear the mad ride?
A citizen of Austria?
What worse might me betide?

In my head — a cool resignation,
In my mouth — a cigar.
I rolled into Weidring station
As calmly as the Tsar.

Unguarded and unbruised, I lounged
Beside the fire, and dined,
Until my escort hobbled round —
Rubbing their sore behinds.

Já spal dobře, ale policajti
měli tu noc ve Weidringu zlou,
mazali si špiritusem záda:
nosy arnikou.

Tu je konec této epopeje,
k níž jsem nepřibásnil ani chlup,
podnes ti to poví ve Weidringu
postmistr Dahlrupp.

9
Přijeli jsme do Brixenu
bez všech turbací;
krajská vláda dala Dederovi
na mne kvitancí.

Místo mne ten kus papíru
vrátili do Čech,
mne zde černý dvojhlavý orel
drží v klepetech.

Krajskou vládu, podkrajského,
žandarmerii,
ty mi dali za anděle strážce
v té Siberii.

I had a pleasant sleep that night;
'Twas not so for Their Graces,
Who soothed with spirits wounded pride…
And other tender places.

With this my epic sands run out.
In Weidring — look it up
If you're inclined my tale to doubt.
Ask Postmaster Dahlrupp.

9
Without further trouble, scare or
Tear, my jolly suite
Arrived in Brixen, where Dedera
Got a signed receipt

From the double-headed eagle,
In whose taloned grip
I now repose. Instead of me, you'll
See in Prague this script.

Fear not lest I be safe and sound,
Know this, Bohemia:
Still guardian angels ring me round
In this Siberia.

The *Tyrolean Elegies*: Background and Commentary

The *Tyrolean Elegies* (Tyrolské elegie) of Karel Havlíček-Borovský comprise one of three great poetic satires from the pen of the Biedermeyer poet and publicist. They describe the course of his sudden arrest and subsequent trip from his mother's home in Německý Brod[1] to the Tyrolean town of Brixen, where he was to be exiled and kept under police supervision from December 15/16, 1851 to May 13, 1855. They are not mean-spirited as the anti-clerical, anti-Russian *Křest sv. Vladimíra* Baptism of St. Vladimir) can be, and they are much more formally mature than his retelling of the Irish Midas myth, *Král Lávra* (King Labhra, 1854). Indeed, in their general eschewing of the melodramatic, and the fine "trickster" humor they display, the *Elegies* are arguably one of the most important fruits of Czech nineteenth-century literature.

One might even go out on a limb and suggest that the *Tyrolean Elegies* are the most noteworthy literary production composed in Czech during that century, at least as far as their contribution to the unique, modern Czech literary voice is concerned. The earlier Romantics, beginning even with the great names of the still-classical národní obrození, such as Jungmann and

Thám, through the Romantics Tyl and Mácha, and into the Biedermeyer with Erben, are all — I say it with respect and fondness — derivative. Havlíček, on the other hand, taps into the wry, sardonic tradition of Czech satire which came to characterize, perhaps with too much emphasis, yet not unjustly, the modern Czech literary voice of Hašek, Havel, Kohout, Skvořecký, and Vyskočil. While the writings of the rest, even those of Mácha, are more European than Czech, the *Tyrolean Elegies* are stamped with the literary regionalism that raises a national tradition, however small, to the notice of the world as unique and noteworthy. Jungmann wished to bring Milton into the Czech consciousness; Mácha, to a great degree, introduces Byron to Bohemia, as Baudelaire brought Poe into France. Havlíček, on the other hand, is Czech through and through, a fact that should not surprise us, as it was his experiences in Austrian Galicia and later Russia that cured him of any Pan-Slav leanings and returned him to Bohemia certain of his Czech identity.[2]

It was his journalistic labors on behalf of the Czech nation — although his attitude to the idea of a Bohemian crown within the Habsburg dynasty never seems to have been completely negative — that eventually led to his literary oppression at the hands of the government, his arrest, and, consequently, the composition of the *Elegies*. His popular *Národní noviny* (National News) were shut down by the Austrians in 1850; this was followed one year later by the closure of his *Slovan* (The Slav). Articles from these journals were published in book form in *Duch národních novin*(The Spirit of the National News) and *Epištoly kutnohorské* (The Kutná Hora Epistles). This latter work, with its anti-clerical tone, was especially militated against by the government, which sought to confiscate the print run and eventually brought Havlíček to trial for "disturbing the peace" — a charge the poet would ironicize in the *Elegies*. Although he was acquitted of the charges, the centralized government of Bach moved against him. In December of 1851, barely a month after his acquittal, he was awakened in the middle of the night by the police and hastened off to exile in Brixen.

The "banishment" to a pleasant Alpine community, where he was to live at the cost of the government, lodged first in the tony Elephant Hotel and later in private quarters, along with his wife and daughter, with significant freedom of movement and a monthly pension, was a particularly mild form of "repression." As Jiří Morava, the author of the seminal *Exilová léta Karla Havlíčka Borovského* (Exile Years of Karel Havlíček Borovský) succinctly puts it:

> At every moment [of my research] I became more and more aware of the fact that today's stifled, impoverished and oppressed Czech intellectual is in a much worse position than his antecedents of earlier days. Those who, in 1948, established in Czechoslovakia a new centralism, have

> immeasurably outdistanced the hated Habsburg monarchy in their repressive practices.[3]

That goes without saying. However, not Havlíček nor Masaryk nor Hašek nor any Czechoslovak opponent of the "hated Habsburg monarchy" could have foreseen the horrors awaiting the denizens of the independent republic in the twentieth century, especially following 1948. We, looking at the development of European history from the early twenty-first century, must set aside any nostalgia for that most benevolent form of autocracy which was Austria-Hungary, with its humanitas austriaca, as Rio Preisner puts it,[4] and refrain from comparisons which can only serve to ridicule or belittle the sufferings undergone by our poet. However benign his oppression in comparison to that which Preisner, Zahradníček or Havel were to experience at the hands of their compatriots, it was oppression nonetheless, as any citizen of a constitutional republic, where civil and personal rights are sacrosanct, must admit.

Form and Substance

The *Tyrolean Elegies* are a series of nine lyrical poems, which could better be described as cantos of a mock folk-epic, as none of these lyrical fragments are autonomous works. Rather, they comprise a freely-flowing narrative; were we to consider any of them without reference to the whole, they would make little sense. The individual "elegies" are of different length, running from three stanzas (1, 9) to eighteen (8). The metrics are carefully patterned on Czech folk poetry, a topic which greatly interested Havlíček. As Bohuslav Indra, the author of the most detailed study of this aspect of his poetry points out, Havlíček devoted a not inconsiderable amount of time during his Brixen exile to a minute study of the meters used by Karol Jaromír Erben's *Písně národní v Čechách* (National folk songs in the Czech lands).[5]

Although at first glance the "canto" breaks seem arbitrary, they do arrange the *Elegies* into loosely thematic segments. Canto 1, the Introduction, contains the sardonic invocation of the moon above Brixen, which, like the author, seems no little displeased at being found in Austria. In canto 2, the Arrest, Havlíček describes the unexpected visit of the police at his bedside. This stanza contains a fine poetic sense of balance in the use of parallels. Following the Czech political proverb Každý čech je muzikantem, Havlíček asserts that it is his "music" that is keeping the neighbors in Vienna up at night. It is only fair then, that he should himself be roused from sleep by the vindictive "officers of the peace."[6] The second parallel in the canto has to do with poor Jock, Havlíček's English bulldog. Just as violence is being done to Havlíček by this sudden irruption of the police, who will tear him forcibly away from bed, family and homeland, he turns upon Jock with violence, flinging the hefty codex of Imperial law under the bed at the growling dog, who immediately is silenced by the thump. This last parallel is the first

thematic parenthesis of "trickle down violence," so to speak, which will be closed in canto 4 with Dedera's introduction.

In canto 3, the Bach canto, we are introduced to the primary instigator of the injustice perpetrated on Havlíček: the Minister of the Interior who, from far-off Vienna, has ordered the arrest of the Czech journalist. Bach was a complex character, the so-called "minister of the barricades," who was active on the side of the 1848 revolutionaries, and then entered official imperial service after the abdication of Ferdinand and the assumption of the throne by Franz Joseph. Modern historians are more subtle in their assessments of his honest aims and good will than Havlíček was. For the poet, he remained a hypocritical enemy of the people and free speech. Blaming Bach for the suppression of Slovan, Havlíček describes him as a man

> který umí tak liberálně mluviti a tak krásně psáti ve svých instrukcích, jenž to ale zcela jinak jedná, který se umí nechat představovat tak, jakoby on sám byl ještě ta poslední hráz proti absolutismu, ježto ale jest právě nejschopnějším a nejpotřebnějším nástrojem k poznenáhlému obmezování všech konstitučních práv.[7]
>
> (who knows how to speak so liberally and write so beautifully in his briefs, yet who acts in a diametrically different manner; who knows how to present himself as if he were the very last bulkhead against absolutism, yet who is actually the most able and necessary tool for the sudden constriction of all constitutional rights).

In a dig at Bach and the Austrian paternalism he represents for him, Havlíček describes the motivation for the arrest in bitterly ironic terms. "Doctor" Bach is doing this for his "patient's" own good. The climate in Bohemia is "bad" for him — the air befouled by that rotten Oktrojirka, Havlíček sneers — and so he is prescribing a change of scenery, "at state expense," of course.

Which of these "bestowals of rights"[8] Havlíček is referring to in the *Tyrolean Elegies* is unclear. He wrote against both of them, that is, the Dubnová ústava (April Constitution) granted by Emperor Ferdinand I on April 25, 1848,[9] and the Březnová ústava (March Constitution) granted a year later by Emperor Franz Joseph I.[10] The first of these was a strong step in the direction of the centralization of government in the Austrian Empire. In establishing a more unitary system of government in the Austrian regions of the Empire, this constitution was seen as a blow against the Czech nation, effectively abolishing the recognition of the Czech kingdom as a separate political unit within the Habsburg state, with its own parliament and guarantees

of linguistic parity between Czech and German. In an article from August 30, 1848, "Článek, o kterém bych si přál, aby jej každý přečetl a rozvážil" (An article, which I would wish that everyone would read and consider), Havlíček came out against a move that seemed to be steering the ship of state closer to absolutism and depriving the smaller Slavic nations of their support against Germanization:

> Nám Slovanům záleží na zachování Rakouska, dynastii Habsburské též záleží na zachování Rakouska, držme se tedy dynastie, držme se monarchistického principu.
>
> Ale na jedno nezapomínejme: ačkoli nám i dynastii záleží na zachování Rakouska, jest v tomto ohledu mezi námi a dynastií veliký rozdíl, na který veliký ohled míti musíme. Nám národům slovanským záleží a záležeti musí na zachování svobodného, demokratického Rakouska: dynastii nemusí záležeti na svobodě a na demokracii, jí záleží hlavně jen na Rakousku, a chceme-li hledati rady v historii, můžeme se domýšleti s velikou jistotou, že dynastii naší záleží více na aristokracii a na absolutismu. aspoň se od jakživa vždy těchto přidržovala a proti svobodě a demokracii opírala. — — Další myšlenky, které z této okolnosti vyplývají, snadno si každý sám v duchu představí. — Postupujme dále ve svém rozvažování![11]
>
> (We Slavs are anxious for the preservation of Austria, and the Habsburg dynasty is also anxious for the preservation of Austria. Let us cling therefore to the dynasty, let us cling to the monarchic principle.
>
> But let us not forget this one thing: although we and the dynasty are anxious for the preservation of Austria, there is in this perspective a great divide between us and the dynasty, which we must take into especial consideration. We, the Slavic nations, depend on the preservation of a free, democratic Austria, whereas the dynasty needn't depend on freedom or democracy. The dynasty is concerned entirely with Austria plain and simple, and if we wish to look to history for advice we must come to the strong conclusion that our dynasty is more

> concerned with aristocracy and absolutism, at least from time immemorial it has always clung to these, in opposition to freedom and democracy. — — It's quite easy for one to imagine for oneself where all this leads. — Let us all continue in our reflections!)

Concerning the latter constitution, in the March 14, 1849 edition of the *Národní noviny*, published a mere ten days after the declaration of the latter oktrojirka, he warned again that the Minstry had "nejdůležitější věci zanechalo za lubem"(reserved for itself the administration of the most important matters), such as freedom of the press, the law of individual freedom, voting rights and other civil rights which should never be dependent on the whims of any government, absolutist or not.[12]

Whatever the case may be, here Havlíček comments effectively upon the tyranny of absolutism. The laws of Austria are not in force so as to protect the Emperor's subjects, they are there for the police to use as a rationalizing veneer for their arbitrary control of subjects they deem dangerous or inconvenient to the interests of the state. Havlíček uses another parallel here. Just as he "controlled" Jock by braining him with the Law Codex in the preceding canto, so here is he controlled, as the full weight of that same law falls upon him.

Canto 4 is the "Dedera canto," which introduces the local representative of Austrian repression to the poem. Coming after the Bach canto, the Dedera canto underscores what Havlíček would see as the enslavement of the Czech lands to the far-away Viennese apparatus. Dedera does what Bach commands. Here again, more vividly, we have that theme of "trickle down violence" that we mentioned in Canto 2, where "repressed" Havlíček "represses" in turn poor Jock, and the parenthesis opened in that canto is closed here. The ironic game of veneers begun in canto 3 with "Dr. Bach's prescription" is continued in this canto, with Havlíček's sarcastic toilette as he dresses and prepares himself for the journey to prison, in terms that recall a young man readying himself for an outing, or an excited debutante preparing for a date.

According to Morava, the rudely awakened editor was in no mood for joking. At the order that he take no weapons with him, he sarcastically asked if he might not, after all, take with him a "Russian knout," and, upon rising to dress, said, "Násilí nutno ustoupiti, půjdu s vámi"(No sense in resisting force; I will go with you).[13]

Before they can leave, however, canto 5 provides the reader with the "Leave Taking" scene. Despite the irony of lines 3-4, in which Havlíček deftly blames the victim by complaining of the "cross" he must bear due to the tears of his family at departure (deftly underscoring, by its absence, the reason for their tears), the stanza has an almost melodramatic quality familiar from genre prints of the Biedermeyer period throughout the world — the "old cossack"

even has to take care to hide his own tears, as he bids farewell to wife, daughter, sister and mother. However, Havlíček saves himself from the maudlin bathos that a poorer poet would fall victim to here, by injecting a note of realism in the final stanza of the canto.[14] The boorish presence of the policemen at the threshold, intruding upon the tender scene, introduces another tone of bitterness that effectively counteracts the saccharine heroism of the scene, and prevents it from devolving into vaudeville.

The stanza form is modeled after naive folk poetry. There are four-line stanzas with a general rhyme scheme A-B-C-B. "The Journey" begins in canto 6. The ironically adventurous tone that the poet employs in canto 4 returns here, with the first stanza chirping in Wanderlied fashion worthy of the staves of Weber. The jaunty mood — if indeed it can be said to endure through lines three and four — is burned off quickly, however, as the carriage and escort head south, and pass through Havlíček's native regions. Although the police have taken care to keep their "patient" out of sight of his compatriots, the parish church in Borový notices him, and in surprise wonders "who those monsters may be" accompanying the former altar-boy along the road below. The introduction of the kindly-personified parish church here — Havlíček will be less indulgent with the institutional Catholic Church in canto 8 — invites the reader to see the injustice perpetrated against the protagonist in Biblical terms: here, "even the stones cry out" against it. This motif of the natural world looking on in horror and surprise at the artificial stratagems concocted by men — signaled as early as canto 1, with the skittish moon — is another theme that will be taken up again later.

The journey continues in canto 7, which is more of a "political gloss" on the incarceration, than a continuation of the journey *per se*. Havlíček is never told where he is headed, and, with another injection of realism into his poem, he recalls how irksome it is for the traveler to hear the postilion's horn at each stage of the journey. Unaware of his final destination, he is unable to gauge relative distances by these mile-markers, and each new departure after each pause only renews the irritated boredom he feels. The journey into the unknown becomes a metaphor of the politics of the Austrian government, seen from the perspective of the Emperor's subject peoples. They, like Havlíček, have no idea where they are headed, nor have they any say in the matter of the "carriage's" direction. "Would they only greased the axles of state there, in Vienna, as carefully and regularly as they grease the axles of this carriage!" the protagonist exclaims in lines 13-16, intimating by the same that, perhaps those ostensibly in power are just as clueless and unable to control the direction of progress as the hapless "captives" they drag along with them. But immediately, in the next stanza, the mention of the telegraph, which hastens the news of the prisoner's progress to each station ahead on the route, dispels that anarchic illusion — Vienna is quite in control of this internal situation, at least; the telegraph becomes a metaphor of the oppressive omnipresence of Bach's net of police control. And as this control fills the entirety of the

Austrian state, so, in the final two stanzas of the canto, does Havlíček opine that, no matter where one is, in Budějovice or Brixen, one still drinks the same bitter brew.

Havlíček's letters from this period are a fascinating record of literary process. Whereas in the context of the *Tyrolean Elegies*, the "care" shown by the authorities for his comfort can only be read as sardonic, in a letter sent to his wife Julie from Brixen on December 22, 1851, the same scene is described in a completely different tone:

> Asi 500 zl. stř. vydala vláda na tu mou cestu a zacházeli se mnou skutečně velmi dobře. Vrchní komisař policie a jeden převlečený policajt jeli se mnou, komisař měl nařízení všechno co chci mi koupiti, všude již telegrafovali před námi, že přijedem, aby byli připraveny pokoje v hostinci pro nás, ano v Salcburku nás ještě tamnější ředitel policie prováděl po městě, abychom viděli znamenitosti.[15]
>
> (About 500 silver guilders were spent by the government on this trip of mine, and they treated me, really, very well. The head police commissar and one policeman in civilian dress accompanied me. The commissar was mandated to buy me anything I asked for; our progress was always telegraphed ahead so that rooms in the inns along the way were made ready for our arrival; in Salzburg, the local chief of police even showed us around the town, so that we could have a look at the places of interest.)

However one might wonder to what degree Havlíček's consciousness of the censorship of his letters, or his desire to set his anxious wife at ease over his treatment, might come into play in the above description of the journey, there is really no evidence to suggest that he is lying, bending the truth, or being ironic, as he most certainly is in the poem. Witness, for example, the letter he wrote on Christmas Eve to Palacký:

> Musím uznat, že komisař Dedera se mnou zacházel na cestě velmi vlídně a musel míti také instrukci podobného druhu. Pozornost jakou mi vláda na této cestě poukazovala nezapomenu nikdy. Všude pracoval telegraf jen což děláš, všude bylo již pro nás připraveno v hostinci kam jsme zavítali, a jako

> strážní duchové očekávali nás sluhové policejní.[16]
>
> (I have to admit that Commissar Dedera behaved very friendly towards me, and must have had instructions as to that effect. I shall never forget the consideration that the government showed towards me during this trip. Everywhere the telegraph was in motion as soon as we moved a little finger; rooms at the inns along the way were already waiting for us before our arrival, and the police functionaries waited upon us like guardian angels.)

One is certainly free to read statements like this as at least somewhat ironic. The trouble is, though, defining where the irony begins, and where it ends. In sum, we can certainly say that the journey enforced upon Havlíček by the Austrian government seems more like a paid vacation at a mountain resort compared to what the political prisoners of the twentieth century were made to experience, both during their "journeys" and after their arrival. As we say above, from a literary perspective, the letters are of supreme interest in uncovering to our eyes the transforming process of writing: the very same tangible experiences are described straightforwardly, and with gratitude, by Havlíček the man, in his letters to family and friends, and with biting irony and sardonic political import in the fictive account of Havlíček the poet, as told by Havlíček the protagonist of the *Tyrolean Elegies*.

Canto 8, the "Epic of the Careening Carriage," is the longest of the portions into which the *Elegies* are divided. It is the most action-filled of all the sections, and our description of the canto as "epic" is suggested by the poet himself in the first stanza: nechme elegie / a přejděme v heroický tón. Indeed, this is the one portion of the *Elegies* in which Havlíček consistently varies his meter, switching from the flexible stanza of folk-song which he employs for the other cantos (four lines of 8, 5, 10, and 5 syllables each, on average) to a more stately, heroic-sounding stanza of 10, 9, 10 and 5 syllables for the eighteen stanzas of canto 8.[17]

The laws of physics take over on the steep descent of the road from Richenhall to Weidring,[18] and soon the carriage bearing captive and captors on to the former's place of incarceration begins spinning madly, uncontrollably, downhill. "No Imperial edict can make that road less dangerous," the narrator muses in lines 5-8, re-introducing the theme of nature unfettered by man's will — there is something, then, more powerful than even the Emperor's edicts — and sounding a subtle note of hope: nature will, eventually, triumph over the unnatural, artificial schemes imposed by man, no matter how "absolute" in his rule. Stanzas 8-10, in which Havlíček's protagonist fools his police escort into abandoning the runaway carriage by suggesting that, as in the case of the Biblical Jonas, "there must be some great sinner among us," who, by leaping

out, can calm the troubled waters of God's ire — leading to all of them leaping out in simultaneous penitence — is a trickster scene worthy of Švejk. Like the hilarious image of the moon over Brixen starting away in fear, as if from a police informant, from the narrator when approached to "chat a while" in canto 1, here we see clearly that the grand tradition of Czech Eulenspiegel comedy, so fully bloomed in Jaroslav Hašek, runs in a direct line through Havlíček to the present day.

Once more, the documentary evidence is of interest. In that same letter to Palacký, Havlíček's description of the event is very similar to that which he would poeticize later in the *Elegies*:

> Příhody mé na cestě nebudu popisovat, ačkoliv byly dosti znamenité: přihodilo se mi mezi jiným v Alpách, že se nám koně splašili, že ostatní z kočáru vyskákali a já sám / ani kočí ne / na kočáře zůstal z čtyřmi koňmi cvalem do své deportace ujížděl, až se mi poštěstilo opratí se zmocniti a koně zastaviti.[19]
>
> (I won't describe my adventures along the route, although they were significant enough: it so happened to me, among other things, that in the Alps our horses were spooked. Everybody else jumped out of the carriage, while I alone / without even the coachman / remained and thus, at a gallop, I traveled on to my deportation, until I was lucky enough to get control of the horses and bring them to a stop.)

Curiously enough, Commissar Dedera's recollection of the incident is a bit different from that of his heroic prisoner:

> Odjel jsem z Unken dosti pozdě a měl jsem čtyři koně. Asi 1 1/2 hodiny před poštovní stanici Waidring musil postilión pro náledí uzavřít zadní kola řetězy. Hodil opratě na kozlík a uzavřel levé kolo; když se však chystal uzavříti pravé, dali se koně do běhu s kopce dolů. Jakmile jsem to zpozoroval, seskočil jsem z vozu, zachytil jsem však pouze opratě zadních koní. Jediný řetěz u kola praskl a já byl sražen k zemi, aniž jsem si však vážně ublížil. Na moje volání vyskočil policejní voják z vozu, upadl však, Hawliczek se zmocnil podruhé opratí zadních koní, nemohl je však v běhu zadržet a vyskočil též ven. Koně se řítili s vozem až

> do Waidringu, kde byl vůz nalezen převržený.
>
> (I left Unken quite late, with four horses. Some 1 1/2 hours before our planned arrival at the Waidring post station, the coachman was obliged to fasten up the rear wheels with chains because of the ice. He tossed the reins up on the coach-box and fastened the left wheel; however, while he was preparing to fasten the right wheel, the horses took off at a gallop downhill. The only chain on the rear wheel burst and I was thrown to the ground, without, however, being seriously injured. I called out to the gendarme inside the carriage and he jumped out; Havlíček took hold of the harness of the rear horses a second time, but was unable to stop them in their course and so jumped out as well. The horses drove along with the carriage to Waidring, where the carriage was found upset.)[20]

It is immaterial which of these accounts is true. Even if Dedera is correct, and the poet himself, despite his contentions to the contrary, also leapt out of the runaway carriage, the fact that he did not do this in panic, but only after striving "a second time" to get control of at least the rear horses, testifies to his *sang froid.* What is important, of course, is the way the scene is transformed in the fictionalized *Tyrolean Elegies*. The comic scene is followed immediately by two gnomic stanzas, in which the narrator reflects upon the "topsy-turvy" situation of the Austrian state, for which the driverless, runaway carriage is a clear metaphor. Yet although the putative "leaders" of the prison conduct have been left far behind, rubbing their bruises from the fall and lighting up their pipes in relieved resignation, the runaway carriage, with the calmly resigned prisoner, arrives all by itself at the next stage. This is a triumphant entry for the protagonist, heroic, if passively described. In her *Satires of Karel Havlíček*, Marie Řepková says of this scene:

> Thus the hero becomes the master of the situation — not only as far as this one adventure is concerned, but also in a general sense. For, verily, this one scene contains in a nutshell everything that Havlíček is trying to say in the entire satire: it is an expression of the superiority of the prisoner over those who imprison him.[21]

It is clearly meant to underscore the idea that the "captive nations" of the Austrian empire could progress quite well on their own, without the "guiding

hand" of the Viennese. It is no coincidence either, that this is also the triumph of nature over artificiality: the same forces of nature that sent the carriage careening out of control of the driver and conduct, led the captive safely to his destination. All will turn out all right, as long as we let nature – and for Havlíček – the Habsburg Empire is anything but a natural entity, take its course.

Canto 9, the Conclusion brings the *Elegies* to an optimistic close. The poet has been handed over to his keepers in Brixen, but "this paper," his poem of protest, returns to Prague in his place — a powerful assertion of the irrepressibility of truth, or the freedom of the word, which is a very strong statement, considering the fact of Havlíček being imprisoned for his journalistic work.[22] But Brixen a "Siberia?" Is he not protesting too much in this over-heavy comparison of the generally benign Austrian Empire to the truly dictatorial Russian Empire, with its unending, arctic stretches of penal camps? Obviously, he cannot be serious in a tautological sense. But despite the fact of his exile being, not in the windswept tundra of northernmost Asia, but in the Italian Tyrol; not alone, but in comfortable surroundings shared at last with his wife and child; at a government pension that allowed him, not only the necessities of life, but even luxuries, such as purchasing books and tame birds; Havlíček reminds us that exile is exile, tyranny is tyranny, and with that somewhat overdone analogy, he deprives the Austrian apologist of his high ground of humanitas austriaca. If only Franz Josef had his own Siberia, Havlíček insists, he wouldn't hesitate to use it. The word "Siberia" is also used in the Czech original as a final rhyming pair with "gendarmeria." Thus, the wry narrative poem describing the arrest and progress into exile of the Czech nationalist ends with a poetic device that emphasizes the foreign element in his oppression.

NOTES

1. Since 1945 Havlíčkův Brod, a small city of some 25,000 people in the Vysočina region, in the geographical center of today's Czech Republic.

2. See Jiří Morava, *Exilová léta Karla Havlíčka Borovského* (Zürich: Konfrontace, 1981), 15. Havlíček's brief stay in Galicia was enough to teach him what the Poles had known for years: the real danger to the smaller Slavic nations of East Central Europe was Russia, rather than Germany. What is more, in a position where true independence was not in the immediate offing, the multi-national Habsburg empire was the surest guarantor of the maximum amount of autonomy in the face of both Russian and German hegemony. It is this Austro-Slavism, however distrusted by Vienna in Havlíček's case, in which we most clearly see the writer's realism.

3. Morava, 9.

4. See, for example, Rio Preisner, *Česká existence* [Czech Being] (London: Rozmluvy, 1984), 282.

5. Bohuslav Indra, ed.,*Havlíčkovy práce o verši české lidové písně* [Havlíček's writings concerning the versification of Czech folk songs] (Prague: Pražský linguistický kroužek, 1939), 28.

6. The allusion is all the more ironic in that František Dedera, the police functionary who arrested Havlíček, tutored as a student the composer Bedřich Smetana when the latter was a youth struggling in school.

7. Cited by Morava, 30.

8. Czech oktrojirka derives from the French verb octroyer, i.e., to grant or bestow.

9. Verfassungsurkunde des österreichischen Kaiserstaates, 49/1848.

10. Which, however, was never ratified into law. It was officially annulled by the New Year's Patents of December 31, 1851.

11. From the Duch národních novin, collected in Fr. Sekanina, ed.,Životní dílo Karla*Havlíčka Borovského*[The life work of Karel Havlíček Borovský] (Prague: Knihovna "Věčné prameny," 1940), 206.

12. See the "Výklad oktrojované ustavy od 4. března" [Commentary on the constitution bestowed on March 4], collected in Zdeněk V. Tobolka, ed. K*arla Havlíčka Borovského politické spisy*[Political writings of Karel Havlíček Borovský] (Prague: Jan Laichter, 1901) Vol. 2, Národní noviny 1848-1850, 363-369.

13. Morava, 39.

14. The great Positivist historians of Czech literature, J.V. and Arne Novák, see in these slices of life a "conscious and thought-out finish put to patriotic Romanticism and the creation of Czech literary realism." See their *Přehledné dějiny české literatury* [Panoramic history of Czech literature] (Brno: Promberger, 1936-39),446. This is perhaps overstated. Due to the general tardiness with which Romanticism stricte arrived in the Czech lands, after the long triumph of classicism under Puttkamer, Jungmann and Šafářík, and its tendency to hang around, here and in Poland, for example, even into the 1860s, the mixing of literary approaches is inevitable. More to the point is the view of the Polish comparatist Władysław Bobek who, in writing of the Slovak poet Janko Kráľ, notices the same phenomenon and acknowledges the great current of "realism" in the Romanticisms of the Czechoslovak lands. See his "Štúdie o Jankovi Kráľovi" [Studies on Janko Kráľ] in Slovensko a Slovanstvo: Stúdie a skizzy zo slovenskej literatúry i iných slovanských [Slovakia and Slavdom. Studies and sketches from the literatures of Slovakia and other Slavic nations] (Bratislava: Nakladateľstvo Slovenskej Ligy, 1936), 14-46.

15. Collected in Sekanina, 233-234.

16. Quoted by Morava, 59-60.

17. Our translation does not mirror the change in meter of the Czech original. Quite simply, I had completed the English version before I noticed the lengthening of the one line. When I returned to the text to bring it more in line with the Czech original, I found I was padding the stanzas for meters sake, and not bettering the translation at all. Thus, I left it alone. I would appeal to the author himself in my own defense. As Indra reminds us, "Havlíček was fully aware of the fact that folk poetry, as far as form is concerned, is 'patient' [trpělivý], but as far as semantics are concerned, it is 'inexorable' [*neúprosný*]. He was conscious of the fact that folk poetry will not suffer an unnatural word order [násilný pořádek slov], verbal distortions, words chosen in unseemly fashion merely so as to preserve the meter or rhyme

scheme. If a choice is to, or must, be made between doing harm to the form or the semantics, only, and fundamentally, form may be so handled in folkloristic verse." Indra, 93.

18. Emanuel Chalupný, an early twentieth century scholar of Havlíček, performed a personal autopsy of the route taken by the poet from his homeland to Brixen, and believes that the accident happened on a different stretch of road. For more information, see Morava, 46-48.

19. Cited by Morava, 60.

20. Cited by Morava, 47.

21. Marie Řepková, *Satira Karla Havlíčka*(Prague: Academia, 1971), 126.

22. However, this was to remain more of a theoretical than practical statement. Morava asserts that Havlíček refrained from taking advantage of the opportunities presented by visiting friends to transfer the manuscript home, and thus, he states, the Elegies were "written for Havlíček himself […] and are thus "the first contemporary Czech literary utterance written expressly for the desk drawer." Morava, 103.

FICTION

Excerpts from *Vagabonds in Cleveland*

By Ginny Parobek

"Vagabonds in Cleveland" is a novel-in-progress, a manuscript that is being written "to honor and commemorate the Slovak Cleveland immigrant community, past and present." It is narrated by four young women. Each has her own distinctive point of view, but they are all interested in their Slovak ethnic heritage and they decide to form a "modern, high-energy polka band." The chapter excerpts given here are all narrated by the character named Gindriska, the most "literary" member of the group, who has a special interest in history. The author plans to dedicate this book to Dr. Edward G. Keshock (1935-2010). He was Honorary Consul to Slovakia for the state of Ohio, President of Cleveland -Bratislava Sister Cities, SVU Cleveland-chapter member, and the author's "first Cleveland-Slovak mentor."

–Editor's Note

Chapter 2
"*Ja pišem*" (I write)

Yeah, that's what I do with most of my time. I write. Nothing earth shattering—a few short stories here and there…I write in my journal almost everyday too; it helps keep the mental clutter down to a small roar. According to people that know me, writing is my *raison d'etre*. I was never a good student all through high school, but my grades were good enough to get me into journalism school down at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio. After graduation, I returned to Cleveland and worked at Penton Publishing for a while, editing various types of manuscripts. I piddled around with some dilettante writing then—nothing serious. After reading technical copy all day at Penton, I was too drained to do much of anything else.

After three years at Penton in downtown Cleveland, I decided to go back to school for a graduate degree in Comparative Literature. Cleveland State University offered a masters program with many of the classes held in the evening, so I walked from Penton down Chester Avenue to CSU. I'd put on my headphones and tune in to the nightly "Tony's Polka Party" on WXEN at six o'clock. Nothing better than bopping down the street in gritty downtown Cleveland listening to some of the town's original polka musicians: Johnny Pecon (whom my father swore by), Johnny Vadnal (who was second only, in his opinion, to the former).

…So what did I want to do with my writing degree when it was all said and done? I aspired to have my own column in the *Cleveland Edition* ala "Hambone," my favorite *Edition* columnist. I'd practice writing sly, cynical, hip columns like hers. Grandma would see me writing away and demand "*Čo píšes*??" (What are you writing?) I'd show her the *Edition* and try to explain my dreams but she would just shrug incomprehensibly and wave her hand at me.

But *stara matká* was pleased to see me devote a good portion of my time to reading traditional Slovak authors. She approved of my reading Jozef Ciger-Hronský's *Chlieb* (*Bread*), *Josef Mak*…I must have had lots of my Slovak ancestor's genes for I naturally bonded with Slovak writing and themes

more so than I did with any American writers. Most of the latter tackle such "heavy" subjects like their love life, sex, marital problems…they couldn't see past their solipsistic navels if you forced them to.

Contrast this with European writers who often write about the struggle just to survive and grapple with philosophical issues much more often than their American writing counterparts. I loved Slovak village literature and was fascinated to learn about village life circa 1900s.

Chapter 3

The Vansova Guild, named after a Slovak woman author, gets together once a month to discuss serious Slovak works. It's a group of serious women, very interested in Slavic literature in general and we have a lively give-and-take all evening….Besides reading books for the Vansova Guild, I also write for *Denný Hlas* (*The Daily Voice*). *Denný Hlas* is Slovak Cleveland's weekly newspaper (which used to be a daily at one time), edited by Mr. Ján Pankúch of whom I am extremely fond. I write about Slovak literature, movies, culture…anything that strikes my fancy for right now; Mr. Pankúch gives me almost a free reign. Of course its all written in Slovak for right now. I'm forever indebted to my parents that I learned Slovak alongside English when growing up. I think its important for a person to be bilingual. Too many Americans are not and I think that's a shame. To be sure, my cousins in Abelová, Slovakia, are all desperately trying to learn English and now want all-things American.

Sigh.

Why should America get to export all of its cultural crappings and yet import little of quality from Europe? Tatjana and Laska accuse me of being too pollyannish in my views that Europe is superior to the US in so many ways.

Chapter 4

…One of my favorite words in all lexicons is *autarkeia* which I gleaned from the writings of the late Jerzy Kosinski. I do my daily utmost to rise above the petty things in life and focus on what is important to me. Like even though I like Cleveland as far as a city goes, I still pretend that I'm not living in American, but that I'm in Bratislava, the capital of the Slovak Republic. I read and write stuff in Slovak, listen to Slovak folk tunes on the stereo and pretty much pretend that I'm already there. You see, I'm planning to spend a month there soon and I'm gearing up for it in a big way. It'll be one of the most important things to happen in my 25 years.

…For fun I like to haunt the used bookstores in downtown Cleveland: Publix, Kays, Ole Erie Street Bookstore, Six Steps Down…I ran into a novel called *Year of the frog* (*Dzin*) by Martin Šimečka, a Czecho-slovak guy my own age (a Czech father; Slovak mother). I read *Year of the frog* cover to cover in 24 hours. A great look into contemporary life in Bratislava! Energized by this find, I dash off yet another letter to our relatives in Abelová.

Chapter 5

I love all the local little newspapers and publications that come out of our town. I love the *Cleveland Edition*, as I told you earlier. My favorite col-

umnist, Hambone, likes to hang out at the Big Egg Palace, a venerable greasy spoon on Detroit Avenue with an egg-shaped menu and an electic urban ambience. I also liked Eleanor Prech's ethnic column for the *Cleveland Press*. I coveted this newspaper beat covering the city's eastern European communities! Did I tell you that I write a regular column for *Denný Hlas?* I get my material from several sources in the Slovak-Cleveland community from its myriad of clubs and spokespersons: Mr. Andrew Hudak from the Slovak Institute; Rudy and Gil Bachna of the Slovak Dramatic Club and Dr. Edward Keshock of Cleveland-Bratislava Sister Cities. The latter club was my favorite, naturally, as it involved my beloved Bratislava. Pavlina Martinek, a CBSC member, upon hearing that I liked Martin Šimečka's *Year of the frog*, recommended that I read Iva Pekárková's *Truck Stop Rainbows (Péra a perutě)* as it was a valuable look at Prague life under communism, much like *Year of the frog* was for Bratislava. *Truck Stop Rainbows* has since become my second-favorite novel.

Chapter 6

…Speaking of the Wojtila brothers, I wrote an article about them for *Denný Hlas* this week: Slovak polka boys make good:" Don, Dan and now Mike Wojtila, whose band won the Best Young Polka Band in 1991. I wrote my article in English this time so it could reach English readers as well. Some of the oldsters in the Slovak community don't want to see the start of English articles in *Denný Hlas*, but I feel going bilingual is the way to keep the publication afloat, as our Slovak-speaking members slowly age and die out. Heck, the number of parishioners at Slovak services at our church, Doctor Martin Luther, on W. 14th St., is down to 75 per Sunday. Once upon a time not so long ago, Slovak service was more attended than the English one; now it's the opposite.

I got a letter from our relatives in Abelová. They're thrilled that I'm coming to stay with them this summer. I'll stay with them for two weeks and then I'll stay in Bratislava the final two weeks. Abelová and Bratislava are about three hours apart by car travel. They assure me that the train from Detva (the closest "big city" to Abelová) will get me there in about the same amount of time unless it breaks down which, they admit, happens fairly regularly. My *sesternicy* (cousins) are all aware that I'll be gone the month of August, so unfortunately our polka band, The Polka Dolls, will not be able to play in the Olde Worlde Festival on E. 185th St. this year.

Chapter 7

I'm continuing my study on the Slovak language for when I go over there to stay. I sign up at Lakeland College for classes with Tatiana Jarošová, the ex-wife of well-known Slovak writer, Peter Jaroš. I learn that the omnipresent, pan-Slavic, pan-Cleveland habit of greeting one another with "*Yak sa maš?*" is actually incorrect. It's "*Ako sa maš?"* (How are you?) And I learn the alphabet again, Slovak style with all letters. We learn to count to 100. Slides of everyday life in "B'lava" are shown much to my salivation: people at the market, the tramstop, the railway stations.

In consternation, *stara matká* asks why I'm taking beginning Slovak language classes since I can speak it "like any good Slovak." I just shrug and fib to Grandma that it's a place to meet other Slovaks. That satisfied her. In

truth, I wanted to learn standardized Slovak, not just the central Slovak-Hungarian dialect spoken by our family and church family. When I get to Slovakia this summer, I want to blend right in with everyone else.

That'll happen, right?

Chapter 8

For my *Denný Hlas* column this week, I did a feature story on the newly reopened Slovak Institute of Cleveland on Buckeye Road. Mr. Hudak and his staffers have done a smash-up job of renovating the Institute which, interestingly enough (or unfortunately enough, depending on your point of view) was a refuge for Josef Tiso supporters once the Red Army "liberated" Slovakia in 1948. It's really a cool place now, too; back in the 1950s, it was a gathering spot for Roman Catholic clerics and scholars like Jozef Cincik and Mikuláš Šprinc.

Mr. Hudak has the "wall of fame" up in which he has displayed portraits of dozens of prominent Slovak citizens. At the top of the pyramid of these folks is Rastislav, the ruler of Slovakia from 846-870 AD, and who asked the emperor of Constantinople to send Christian missionaries to the region. Next to Rastislav is the portrait of Father Josef Tiso.

Now, a lot of people would disagree with this. Probably Laska has already told you about how the first Slovak Republic was established in 1939 at the behest of Hitler, and that Josef Tiso, a Slovak priest involved in politics, was its' "puppet dictator" according to some opinions. I'll leave the Tiso legacy debate to the historians; the truth probably lies somewhere in the middle as it usually does.

So anyway, the Institute has been renovated and its museum/library is open to the public now. Laska, our volunteer queen, is thinking about volunteering her time there now. Books cannot ordinarily be checked out of the Institute—its holdings are quite rare—but pages from a book can be photocopied. I took my trusty camera with me on the interview with Mr. Hudak and Mr. Hornack and came away with a roll of interesting film.

The Vansova Guild is reading the short stories of female writer, Timrava, in the original Slovak. I have the English version of her stories, *That Alluring Land*, but not the Slovak version. Mr. Hudak was only too gracious to loan me one of the Institute's copies. Timrava, the pen name of Božena Slančiková (1867-1951) hails from Abelová, the same village as our family! Her father was a Lutheran pastor and she worked as a schoolmistress in Abelová and later on further south in Gemer county.

A funny thing happened yesterday. I went out to lunch with a Penton coworker. No big deal, but when *stara matká* heard about this, she frowned and scolded me for not being out with *rodiny* (family). Lordy—I'm with my family enough already, let alone have an innocent lunch hour with a colleague. "*Cudujem sati*." (I am surprised at you). "Why didn't you take your cousin Geneva with you?"

I just shrugged and said she is *nezáujimavy* (uninteresting). *Stara matká* looked worried and said "Geneva like Janko. *Divný* (strange).

Grandma was talking about Janko Král' (1822-1876), a Slovak writer who wrote folk poetry with a lot of dark emotional atmosphere. He was supposedly notoriously unbalanced. I saw some irony in her comment, for Král' did exhibit a life of unrest, vagabondism and stormy emotion. He went

through jobs and relationships like water. In more modern times, he would probably have been diagnosed as a borderline personality like cousin Gypsy-Geneva.

Chapter 9

I really like belonging to the Vansova Guild. It's a rare opportunity to read and discuss Slovak literature with others. The club is run by Emily Uhrin, who started the club in 1937. We still meet at the original meeting place at the International Institute on Prospect and E. 16th Street, an old mansion next to a YMCA.

Madam Terézia Vansová (1857-1942) wrote mostly women's novels and women-themed stories. Even though *stara matká* was glad that I was reading Slovak authors, she generally disapproved of Madam Vansová's work. I think she probably equates her work on a par with Harlequin romances or something, but I like her stuff, especially *Danko a Janko.* Professor Gerry Sabo S.J., Ph.D., of John Carroll University was kind enough to show me some of the Vansová Guild archives, housed in the Slovak room at the university where he is an associate professor of Russian and Slovak languages. One of the items in the archives is a black fringed shawl Madam received in Paris one year as a reward for her writing.

Madam Vansová was the daughter of a Lutheran minister and she in turn married a Lutheran minister. Most of the Guild members were Lutheran as well; they celebrated their 50th anniversary at my church, Dr. Martin Luther, back in 1987.

I had a few minutes recently to sit down with Ján Pankúch and chit chat (in Slovak, which he prefers). Being a Slovakaphile he was, of course, a Slovak cheerleader "of which we are in dire need of more." Like Mr. Hudak and Mr. Hornack, Ján feels that the Slovak-Americans have been slighted for the past 100 years—that we're the underlings of the eastern European communities. Admittedly, Slovakia is a small nation, he allows, but the Slovak community in Cleveland is huge; yet real numbers cannot ever be discerned because of the old immigration practices at Ellis Island. With Slovakia being part of the old Austria-Hungary Empire during the time of great emigration, many immigrants were persuaded to write Hungarian or even "other" on their official applications for entry to the U.S.

Another staunch Lutheran, Ján Pankúch didn't buy the Slovak Institute's declaration of the Roman Catholic Father Stephen Furdek as "the father of the Slovak peoples." Mr. Pankuch felt that Peter Rovnianek, a Protestant, was the more dynamic leader of the two, but felt that in the field of Slovak American publishing, Cleveland's Slovak community was far ahead of Rovnianek's Pittsburgh endeavors.

But this is all ancient history as far as I'm concerned. To be sure, what happened in 1890 still affects us all today to some degree, but it's time to move on!

Chapter 10

Class with Tatiana Jarošová is going well. I can now see how much our family talks in Slovak dialect. Tatiana was kind when she pointed it out; she's teaching the standard western Slovak language and as our family hails from the central Gemer area of

the Republic, we have a significant dialect. Yet not as much of an accent as the eastern Slovaks have. I'll try not to talk "western" style, though, with *stara matká*. It would probably upset and insult her.

Tatiana gave an interesting lecture about how the Slovak language is closer than any other language to the matrix of Slavic languages, so much that Slavic philologists consider the Slovak language to be key to understanding them all because Slovak contains the greatest number of forms common to all. Cousin Tatjana kids me that Slovak is a sexist language, but I counter that it just has the usual genderizing of everything like French or any other European tongue. Ph.Dr. Tatiana also said that real Hungarians cannot bear to speak Slovak and go so far as to say "It's not a book if it's written in Slovak." Tatiana, a native of Bratislava, feels that English is a cosmopolitan, yet imperial language. But no English-speaking country ever went communist. Is there something inherent in our language that intrinsically supports freedom of thought?

There is a new girl in church who hails from Rimavská Sobota, another town in the Gemer area. Daša Hrbeková emigrated to the US at the age of 21. Now 30, she has personally convinced Lake Erie University in Cleveland to open a Slavic Studies program, arguing that it's not fair that Columbus University in Columbus, Ohio, have the only Slavic program in the Midwest. Daša created this department then, interviewing and hiring professors to teach Russian, Czech, Slovak and Polish languages. She teaches Advanced Slovak I and II and "Slovak literature in English translation." A lot of folks in northeast Ohio got admitted to Lake Erie University just so they could take these classes.

"Slovak literature in English translation" features a curriculum of her own devising, of course. The latter course starts with the work of Timrava on up through the years to the 1990 novel, *Year of the frog*, by Martin Šimečka that I told you about earlier.

Once I completed my graduate studies in Comparative Literature with a concentration in central European lit at Cleveland State, Daša Hrbeková graciously invited me to join the Slavic Studies faculty at Lake Erie to teach "Slovak lit in translation!"

Chapter 11
"*Je to tak*" (That's the way it is).

When I write to our cousins in Slovakia, I always tell them that I pretend I live in Bratislava and that I can't wait to visit. They always write back with "*Why*??" and then proceed to ask me a thousand questions about American pop culture stuff (Britney Spears, Terminator movies). So I guess I'm as perplexing to them as they are to me. Forget about American "culture" I advise: it's all junk. They counter that with: Slovakia is boring and backward.

Je to tak. That's the way it goes, back and forth with my cousins.

Yep, despite my *sesternicy* non-enthusiasm, I can't wait to visit Slovakia this summer. Laska jibes me that I'm already more Slovak than the average Slovak citizen. So be it. *Je to tak*. I feel like I've been born into the wrong country; most of everything in American "culture" irritates the heck out of me. We are such a superficial people, badly uninformed about world affairs, but as my cousins point out—you live in America, land of the free. You can afford to be ignorant of world affairs. You're all perennially safe from political tyrants.

Well, I guess so. I must admit that I am not the most well-versed per-

son in the world when it comes to modern-day foreign policy; the communist era in Eastern Europe intrigues me, but little other historical matters interest me.

That's why I'm so glad that Mr. Pánkúch gives me free reign to write almost whatever I want to in my *Denný Hlas* column. My favorite things to write are reviews. Reviews of books, records, restaurants…anything like that. This month I am writing a retro review of the award-winning Czechoslovak movie "The Shop on Main Street" (*Obch o Na Korze*). Next week I'll review the dumplings at John's Café on E. 52nd Street.

But hey, what's foremost in my mind these days are my teaching stints at Lake Erie University. Pinch me if you must: am I, Gindriska Simic, really on faculty at LEU?? Daša Hrbeková is proving to be an all-around, all-weather friend. After classes some evenings, she and I and some select students go dancing down in the Flats. She can really get down with the best of them.

Chapter 12

Language classes with Tatiana Jarošová are going well. We're knee-deep into the case endings of nouns and verbs. It's kinda weird to have every single object—animate or inanimate—be of either the male or female gender. I'll bet that this ingrained gender-specificity of their language will hinder the Slovak culture in overcoming gender prejudice. Believe me, misogyny and anti-feminism run deep in the culture's very lifeblood and will unfortunately set them back from achieving a gender equality anytime soon. My male *sesternicy* my own age in Abelová are major proponents of women belonging to the *kinder/kuchen* club. Thankfully, these views would not fit in with today's young Americans; they would even be viewed as dinosauric.

Chapter 14

…So if it's three months to the Polka Dolls debut at the Saint Vitus festival, then it's four months until my August sojourn to Slovakia. I've been keeping up with class work and Tatiana claims that I speak standard Slovak (not dialectic) at an intermediate level now. Wow. People like Professors Michael Kopanic and Stanley Kirschbaum claim that my *Denný Hlas* articles—the ones that I write in Slovak—have greatly improved, too. Wish somebody had told me about my "dialect defect" before this; now I feel embarrassed about it, although I know I shouldn't.

Anyway, I'm getting good teaching experience at LEU teaching Slovak Lit in English Translation. We're halfway through the semester and we're up to *básnik* (poet) Ivan Krasko's works now. I've got a great set of students, enthusiastic not only for my course on Slovak lit, but also in pursing Slovak language classes with either Daša or Tatiana. This teaching stint at this time in my life is such a godsend; at Comenius University in Bratislava, I will be teaching a short seminar on the same subject, but in Slovak.

Speaking of *Denný Hlas*, I made this week's column all about the new Slavic Studies department at Lake Erie U and wrote a great deal about my mentor, Daša Hrbeková. Other universities and personalities were starting to sit up and pay attention. Daša received an invitation from the chair of Slavic Studies program at Northwestern University, Dr. Andrew Wachtel, to give a presentation about the challenges and rewards of starting up such a program.

Professor Daniel Regular of Columbus University's Slavic department lobbied a few nasties our way, something to the effect of us being the new, green kids on the block and sniffed that if students really wanted the Slavic experience, they'd opt for CU.

No dice to that, I personally counter. Columbus, Ohio, has nothing authentically Slavic besides their CU program. Cleveland, on the other hand, with its teeming eastern European communities, has a built-in Slavic culture. Classes of students can go out and sample authentic cuisine, churches, dances…and let's not forget John Carroll University and the very learned Professor Gerald Sabo. JCU offers Russian, Czech and Slovak language classes, most taught by "Father Gerry," as we affectionately call him (he is a Jesuit priest as well as holding a doctorate). So JCU is a jewel in Cleveland's crown, absolutely.

Chapter 16

My *sesternicy* in Abelová wrote me a letter voicing their support for deceased politician Jozef Lettrich. What?? First of all, the guy is long gone, but apparently his legacy in Slovakia is not. He was the political rival of Karol Sidor (a personal friend to the Slovak Institute of Cleveland) and was a leader of the SNP in 1944. Then for the next 3 years, he was the Speaker for the Slovak National Council. After the Russian takeover, he fled to the US where he was overtly pro-*SME*, then and now a leftist rag (apologies to my beloved Martin Šimečka). Jozef Lettrich wrote *The History of Modern Slovakia* in 1955 and wrote it to the tune that the vast majority of Slovaks wanted the Uprising and opposed the Tiso regime. Mr. Hudak and his contemporaries feel very strongly against these sentiments.

It's like "nationalism" is a dirty word. A person is suspect if they hold pro-nation sentiments. Even in Slovakia, a "backwater country," (according to some of my academic peers) "the Slovak nationalist is disappearing fast. Dying out. The old notions of an unfortunate country and romantic martyrdom exists now mostly in the minds of Slovak-Americans who seem out of touch."

Including *moi?*

BOOK REVIEWS

Jozef Banáš. *Zastavte Dubčeka! Príbeh človeka, ktorý prekážal mocným* (Stop Dubček! The Story of the Man Who Annoyed the Powerful). Bratislava: Ikar, 2009. ISBN: 978-80-551-2107-9. 360 pp.

Alexander Dubček (1921–1992) is probably the best-known Slovak, although most people still think of him as being of Czech origin. As the symbol of the reforms of the *Prague Spring* of 1968, Dubček's fate after the invasion of the Warsaw Pact troops resembled, to some extent, that of his fellow citizens. The conservative Communist party members whom Moscow put into power after August 1968 ousted him as soon as they had gained full control of the country and its people. The normalisation period of the early 1970s saw a return to the old Stalinist-Brezhnevist course and purges of party members thought potentially unreliable, as well as blacklisting of forbidden authors and artists. Also included in this trend was an expansion of the powers of the StB (state security service) that thoroughly silenced any critical voice – at least until *Charter 77* was founded in January 1977. The atmosphere in Prague in the first half of the 1970s was depressing and monotonous. Social and cultural life was being brought into line to such an extent that Václav Havel, then a forbidden author and soon to be a dissident, in *Fernverhör. Ein Gespräch mit Karel Hvížďala* (*Dálkový výslech. Rozhovor s Karlem Hvížďalou*) recalled it as follows: "… the era of the grey, totalitarian everyday consumerism began … to me, the first half of the 1970s is blurred like an amorphous fog, there is no distinct event that would enable me to tell the year 1972 from 1973 (145)."

"Not another book about 1968, about hopes that were so gruesomely crushed and about the painful memories of the cruel *normalizace*," I thought when I began to read Banáš's *Stop Dubček!* Many scholarly volumes have been written about Dubček, the events of 1968, the normalisation and the beginnings of *Charter 77.* Among the most prominent are Vladimír V. Kusin's *From Dubček to Charter 77: A Study of Normalization in Czechoslovakia, 1968–1978;* Jan Pauer's *Prag 1968: Der Einmarsch des Warschauer Paktes*; *Rok Šedesáty Osmý: V usneseních a dokumentech ÚV KSČ*; Gordon H. Skilling's *Czechoslovakia's Interrupted Revolution*; Kieran Williams's *The Prague Spring and its Aftermath: Czechoslovak Politics, 1968–1970*. The many works that exist on this topic cover a broad range, such as assessment of the politics, relations with Moscow, and domestic and international response to the invasion. Moreover, Dubček's autobiography was published in 1993.

But I soon had to admit that this book is both very well written and based on meticulous research. One might think that nothing new can be written about Dubček, but already in the first few pages the reader is surprised to learn that Dubček was born in the same house in Uhrovec where Ľudovít Štúr, the "father of the Slovak language," had lived as a young child in the first half of the 19th century.

Banáš describes these painful post-1968 years in Dubček's life and provides a rare glimpse into Slovak political life under the normalization. For example, he writes:

> In August 1974, the 30th anniversary of the Slovak National Uprising was commemorated in Banská

> Bystrica. The highest echelons of party and state gathered on the tribune. Most of them had nothing to do with the uprising. Those who had actually fought in the uprising stood in front of the tribune – or did not come to Banská Bystrica at all. Among the absentees was Alexander Dubček. He and his wife were at the chaťa in Senec (287).

Jozef Banáš became known to the Slovak public primarily because of his political roles. In the 1980s, he was a Czechoslovak diplomat in East Berlin. In November 1989, as a member of the Slovak Communist Party, he expressed his support for the *Velvet Revolution* and VPN (*Verejnosť proti nasili*, Public Against Violence), the Slovak pendant to the Czech OF (*Občanské Forum*, Civic Forum), in a speech in Bratislava. There are critical, and also pseudo-critical, voices that insist on despising Banáš as an old *nomenklatura* communist or a cynical turn-coat. Be that as it may – and I am the last person to condemn anybody for joining the party for reasons of economic survival in those difficult years after 1968 – one cannot ignore his literary success: he came to the attention of Slovak readers in 2007 with his political satire *Idioty v politike* (Idiots in Politics). In 2008, he published the novel *Zona nadšenia (*The Zone of Jubilation*),* which was translated into German (*Jubelzone*) and Czech (*Zona nadšení*). Thanks to its success, he was awarded the Slovak Book of the Year prize in 2008. Afterwards, *Kód 9* (Code 9) was published in 2010.

Stop Dubček! Is neither a work of fiction, nor a scholarly analysis, nor is it a political biography, but something in between, a compelling account of the life of a Communist leader, who, unlike others, was actually loved by his fellow citizens. Banáš's literary talent enables him to present the story of Dubček's life in a gripping fashion. The pace of the narrative, the meticulous presentation of the facts, and the clear distinction between facts and interpretations make this book a welcome new contribution to Czechoslovak history. And it reads very well; it is, especially for young people, an "unputdownable" account of Czechoslovakia under Communist rule. Everyday life, domestic economic problems and in-party power struggles come to life as if one were watching a movie, with Alexander Dubček in the leading role. (If Hollywood were interested in making a movie about Dubček's life and his impact and role during the Cold War, I would suggest the Swedish actor Stellan Skarsgård as Dubček.)

The author clearly knows his subject. He has thoroughly researched the origins of Dubček's family, young Sasha's early years in Kyrgyzstan, his membership of the Communist Party, his participation in the Slovak National Uprising of 1944, and his rise to power that, with the support of Leonid Brezhnev, effectively ended the era of economic stagnation under Antonín Novotný. Banáš approaches Dubček like a figure in a novel. He does not fictionalize facts and events: he sticks to authenticity, creating a dramatic and gripping narrative. His Dubček is, above all, a living human being with positive features, but also failings, fears, doubts and normal human joys:

> From him radiated what one calls the magic of charisma. He conquered people by taking a genuine interest in them and with a pure and direct smile.

> From his eyes sprang kindness and benevolence. He was not ashamed to admit that he did not know something. He was not a convincing speaker, rather the opposite, but it was wonderful that people believed him. For the first time, a Communist leader stood before the people who, they felt, had a human heart (145).

Banáš sketches Dubček's wavering, his naivety and mistakes, but, above all, he presents him in the context of the social and political conditions of the Czechoslovakia of his day.

He takes the reader on a long journey, as gripping as a detective story. The author's style is dynamic, masterfully presenting events and their backgrounds in a vivid picture, which reveals all their hidden connections and connotations. His interpretations and knowledge of the historical facts render his empathy with his subject believable: he not only shows Dubček as a politician, but also brings him to life as a human being.

This book is a must-read for anybody interested in Czechoslovak history. And for anybody interested in the vividly told story of what shaped and drove one of the great heroes of the 20th century.

Josette Baer

Jan Bažant, Nina Bažantová, and Frances Starn, ed. *The Czech Reader: History, Culture, Politics*. The World Readers. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 2010. 548 pp.

Students, academics, and others will enjoy this volume of readings in English about Czech culture. The editors were well qualified to have taken on the project. Jan Bažant is a senior researcher at the Institute of Philosophy in Prague in the Czech Academy of Sciences and an associate professor of classical studies at Charles University. Nina Bažantová is an art historian and was the curator of historical textiles at the Museum of Applied Arts in Prague. Jan Bažant and Nina Bažantová have published volumes on Czech culture in English, both separately and collectively. A novelist and critic, Frances Starn has authored a novel and a number of pieces on events in 1989 in Czechoslovakia and Czech literature. She also helped translate a novel by Jan Bažant into English.

The 13 chapters in the book contain 67 selections that date from the beginning of written Czech history to the present. There is no need to outline the table of contents, which is available on-line in detail from major book outlets and in brief from the publisher. It is more constructive to state what is not in the book–readings that could have given more depth to the reader, but they would have added more weight to an already hefty volume. Given the importance that Czechs assign to Charles IV, it is surprising that there is nothing from his remarkable autobiography. The segment on the Renaissance could have benefitted from a selection from the Middle East travel memoirs of Kryštof Harant z Polžic a Bezdružic, from the noble and traveler Václav Budovec z Budova, or from the medical doctor Jan Jesenský-Jesenius, all of whom were executed in 1621 for their part in the Bohemian Estates' revolt. From the era of the national revival, a sample of the work of Josef Jungmann or Josef Dobrovský would have been desirable. Absent are selections from authors who wrote at various times, such as Fráňa Šrámek, Jaroslav Durych, Eduard Bass, and Ivan Klíma. The editors often refer to popular culture in their introductions, but there are no samples in the readings. There is no mention of the famous composer and lyricist from between the world wars, Karel Hašler, who penned the touching piece *Ta naše písnička česká* (Our Czech Song). There is nothing from Jiří Voskovec and Jan Werich or the team of Jiří Suchý and Jiří Šlitr. Since the 1960s, among the most important comedic works today for Czechs are those dealing with the famous fictitious writer and inventor from the last years of the Habsburg Monarchy, Jára Cimrman. This "uncelebrated genius," the creation of Ladislav Smoljak, Zdeněk Svěrák, and in the early years Jiří Šebánek, receives only a brief note in an introduction (397). Absent are any examples of the works of three noted political figures: presidents Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and Edvard Beneš, as well as Jan Masaryk, whose broadcasts from London were so important during the Second World War. Although now understandably unpopular, there is nothing that is supportive of communism either from writers or politicians. It is impossible to include everything in an anthology, but the works of several of the above-mentioned figures seem impossible to ignore. A bibliographic essay of what could not be included as a means of recommending alternative sources to the reader, some of which might appear in English, would have been helpful.

One difficulty with the volume that is characteristic of many publica-

tions since the 1990s is that the development of Czech politics and culture appears in a vacuum. The choice of readings between 1918 and 1993 hardly reflects the marriage of the Slovaks and Czechs. Ironically, that stands in contrast to the chapter introductions, where the editors explain the relationship between Slovaks and Czechs. Complicating this matter is the disconcerting habit of the editors to refer only to Czechs when they should include the Slovaks, such as their characterization of Tomáš Masaryk as the founder of "the first Czech independent state" (48) and reference to the Czech Communist party (302). Likewise, there is little to reflect Bohemian German culture. Although Franz Kafka's humorous "Report to an Academy" is in the volume, there is nothing from any other German writers at the time, such as Egon Erwin Kisch and Franz Werfel. The editors also did not include anything from the German-Jewish writer Lenka Reinerová, who won the 2003 Goethe Prize. No readings by Bohemian Germans appear from earlier periods.

There is only a brief five-page introduction to the book and a three-page epilogue, but each chapter has an extensive introduction that puts the readings into historical context. More than a simple commentary, these chapter introductions, which comprise 139 pages, stand alone as a solid survey of Czech culture and history. They contain a number of shortcomings, most of which are inherent in any summary of more than a thousand years of history. Czech industry between the world wars was heavily dependent on exports, despite the editors' statement to the contrary, and German industry in the Czech Lands was not tied to German banks, unless the editors meant German banks in Czechoslovakia (246). When presenting the cubist architectural style, the authors describe the Legion Bank in Prague as late cubism, instead of using the more common term, *rondokubismus* (rondocubism), so called because of its incorporation of curves and circles (253). On the next page, they failed to state that the nude woman in Gustav Machatý's *Extáse* (Ecstasy, 1933) was the Austrian actress who became the famous in Hollywood as Hedy Lamarr (254). There is no discussion of the 1935 alliance between Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union, nor is there mention of the Soviet policy regarding Czechoslovakia during the Munich Crisis (297). The authors also did not explain that during the Second World War, Beneš promoted the view that the Soviets could not help Czechoslovakia and that they would be more reliable than the West in defending the reconstituted state. The editors wrote that in 1948 Jan Masaryk "jumped–or was pushed" from a window in Černín Palace to his death, but official investigators after 1989 determined that he had been murdered, even though they could not identify the perpetrators (304). A brief explanation of General Svoboda would have aided less-informed readers understand why he became president of Czechoslovakia in 1968 and why he was so respected (346). When discussing the popularity of American country melodies in Czechoslovakia in the 1970s and 1980s, it might have been helpful to point out that the officials promoted the genre, which was considered too American for other East European regimes, because Czechoslovak censors had clamped down so heavily on jazz, which ironically enjoyed more freedom in other Soviet bloc countries (394-395). When discussing music, the editors mention Karel Gott, but they do not explain the basis for his popularity and his success with German audiences. The editors stated that the Czech Republic entered NATO, but they did not account for the Czech Republic's accession to the European Union (472). Václav Havel did not resign from the presidency in 2003, but his

second term simply ended (467). Furthermore, although the behavior of Slovaks when Havel visited Bratislava on 28 October 1991 was deplorable, the editors should have noted that Havel purposely entered a crowd of fervent Slovak nationalists (466).

Each reading has its own introduction that relates some information about the author and places the piece into the context of the time. The editors occasionally included a few explanatory notes for some of the readings, but they could have added many more for the sake of less-informed readers. For example, the distance in time from events in 1989 require that younger readers receive a brief explanation of what Jáchym Topol meant in the quotation from *City Sister Silver* when he said that "it could easily go Chinese-style" (480).

The editors do not specialize in politics, but it would have been helpful to clarify a number of things. An English-speaking audience, especially American students, certainly will be confused when they read how the Communists claimed victory in the 1946 election with "40 percent of the vote in Bohemia and Moravia and 38 percent in Slovakia" (303). The editors also contend that the flaw of the Czechoslovak political system between the world wars, which they claim is even worse today, is "proportional representation with a figurehead presidency" that leads to weak governments (467). Furthermore, they maintain that votes today are wasted on the Communists, who are discredited and have no chance at entering a coalition (467-468). Presumably, they would agree that votes are also wasted on other small parties. Some Czechs would like to shift to a two-party system, but each time any such action seems imminent, public pressure and legal action prevent it. The difficulty of Czech politics is less a problem of the political system than it is the machinations of those who would institute a winner-take-all system, taking the gamble that they will be the winners, as opposed to investing their political capital in meaningful compromise within coalition governments that are typical in Czech political culture.

A number of errors, inevitable for any publication, are worth mentioning for the benefit of non-experts. Errors in chronology (e.g., pages 297 and 345) and inaccurate dates mar the text and may confuse the reader. For example, the authors state that the Munich Agreement occurred in 1939 (302). A few minor difficulties result from proofreading oversights, such as the frequent appearance of "an" instead of "and." At times, the translations leave much to be desired. For example, the jab at the Soviets after the Czechoslovak hockey team won 2-0 in the 1969 World Ice Hockey Championship, "neměli tam tanky, dostali dvě branky," which is better rendered as "they didn't have tanks there; so they had two goals scored against them" (386). In the introduction to the 1997 bilateral Czech-German declaration, the editors failed to translate Potsdam, leaving it as Postupim (489). These and other criticisms in this review by no means detract from the immense value of this publication.

In the epilogue, the editors conclude that Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk was incorrect and there is no mission for the Czechs, even though they have good stories (505). Considering the rich selection of writings in this volume, one also can conclude that the Czechs mirror Western cultural trends. For anyone who wishes to explore that connection, *The Czech Reader* is indispensable. It is a long-awaited replacement for William E. Harkins's *Czech Prose: An Anthology* (1983) and an important supplement to other readers.

Daniel E. Miller

Zdeněk V. David. *Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening: Legacies of the Bohemian Reformation*. Washington, DC and Baltimore: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010. 479 pp.

Zdeněk David has established himself as a leading student of the Bohemian Reformation, especially through his study *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (2003). In the present volume, David develops themes from his earlier work in two major directions, to far-reaching and unexpected conclusions. One direction leads David, with his customary scholarly erudition and breadth, to an original contribution to the long-running polemic about "the meaning of Czech history." The other direction takes him even more audaciously through the development of a Central European, realist and empiricist "Austrian" philosophical tradition that he contrasts with a metaphysical, idealist "German" tradition. In the process he reaches conclusions about the relationship between the "mellow, tolerant" traditions of mainstream Utraquism, Czech political culture, and the development of modern analytical philosophy.

Though arguments over the "meaning" of Czech history did not begin in the late nineteenth century, the exchanges between Josef Kaizl and Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, and continued between Masaryk and the historian Josef Pekař, established the main lines of an ongoing discussion (see the two-volume *Spor o smyslu českých dějin*, [1995, 2006], with key contributions from 1895 to 1989). In the conflict between Masaryk and Pekař over whether modern Czech national life derived from the Hussite and Reformation sources or whether aspects of the Counter-Reformation and Baroque Catholicism had to be included, David sides with Masaryk, but with important reservations. Where Masaryk favored the Bohemian Brethren, David argues that the intellectual sources of the Czech national renascence should be sought in the liberal, tolerant, and non-aristocratic ("plebian") inheritance of mainstream Utraquism, as mediated by the Austro-Bohemian Catholic Enlightenment. Recent historians, David argues, have considered the enthusiastic rediscovery of the works of the Utraquist "Golden Age" by the "awakeners" purely from the linguistic viewpoint, without considering that they also found the ideas attractive, regardless of the language in which they were expressed.

This discounting of the ethnic and linguistic aspect of the Czech national renascence provides a connection to David's second, broader theme. Here David claims that Utraquist ideas helped develop a rational, empiricist philosophical tradition in Austrian Central Europe exemplified by K. H. Seibt, Bernard Bolzano (who dominates the middle section of the book) and Franz Exner. This tradition was resistant to J. G. Herder's cultural pluralism and to the metaphysical idealism of such German philosophers as G. F. W. Hegel. In discounting Herder's influence on Czech nationalism David treads on well-established toes, but he argues that a misunderstanding of Jan Kollár's position in nineteenth century Czech culture accounts for such views, and that it was rather among the (mainly Lutheran) Slovak intellectuals that Herder found truly fertile soil. Czech nationalists were happy to cite Herder's positive passages about the Slavs to defend their culture against outside prejudices, but they did so, David argues, without abandoning the empirical realism and cultural universalism of their own intellectual milieu.

Other soil, David argues, was more fertile for Herder's and later Hegel's philosophical views, and his tracing of the contrapuntal interplay of his "Austrian" and "German" traditions ranges widely across Bohemia and its neighbors Austria, Germany (especially the Lutheran states of Saxony and Prussia), Slovakia, Hungary, Poland and Russia. The empirical, universal "Austrian" tradition leads in David's account through the Vienna Circle and Berlin's Society for Empirical Research to the international tradition of analytical philosophy—and thus links the Czechs' national culture with a broader, Euro-Atlantic world instead of with the "German" philosophical and cultural tradition that dominated Central and Eastern Europe. Herein lies the major contribution David seeks to make in the arguments over the "meaning of Czech history": that the source of the "exceptional tenacity of liberal democracy" in Czech political culture is to be sought in the inheritance, via the connections he lays out in this work, of the Bohemian Utraquists.

Some historical works are important because they change predominant historical understandings; others are important by forcing a re-examination of those understandings, even when they do not succeed in transforming them. David's study will most likely fall into the latter category—it is rooted in careful reading of voluminous sources, but will likely be criticized by some for discounting Baroque influences on Czech culture; by others for using the term "liberalism" in an anachronistic way; yet others for denying the ethnic -linguistic aspects of Czech nationalism; and still others for accepting uncritically the idea that Czech "political culture" (whatever that is) is marked by a tenacious attachment to liberal democracy. By stimulating such critical reactions, however, David's work will make a significant contribution to our understanding of important aspects of Czech history.

Hugh L. Agnew

Charles Ota Heller. *Dlouhá cesta domů.* Translated by Irena Zíková. Prague: Mladá fronta, 2011. ISBN: 978-80-204-2379-5. 238 pp.

Dlouhá cesta domů is a shortened Czech version of Charles Ota Heller's three-volume memoirs, *Out of Prague: A Memoir of Survival, Denial, and Triumph*. This English version is scheduled for publication in the fall of 2011.

The first chapter of *Dlouhá cesta domů* that bears the same title as the Czech national anthem, "Where Is My Home?" begins with this startling statement:

> In one of the last days of World War II, I drew the revolver Walter and shot a blond, blue-eyed German Nazi. When from the door I heard his companion screaming in the hated German, I rejoiced. It was a triumph! I felt that, by raising my left hand, I had won the war and had taken revenge on the Germans for the six years of cruel suffering that they had inflicted upon my country and family. And for that, I had to keep hiding as an animal. I was nine years old (12).

During WWII, Hitler's army occupied the Czech part of Czechoslovakia and renamed it, *Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren.* The Germans persecuted the Jews there in the same manner as they did in the *Reich.* Because the author's father was Jewish, Ota was not allowed to go to school. His Catholic mother did not want to further complicate his life; therefore, she told Ota that it was because his father, Rudolf Heller, was fighting against the Germans as part of the British Army's Czechoslovak Division. That was true, but it was not the reason for Ota's scholastic and other problems. When his mother was taken to a slave labor camp, he had to hide in a closet of a farm that belonged to family friends.

The author devotes considerable space to the description of Heller's ancestors, i.e., the intermingled Neumann and the Heller families. His loving childhood memories are touching. His father came back in 1945 with the first Allied units. After taking power, the Communists confiscated his family's clothing manufacturing factory and began to persecute the Hellers anew. The family escaped over the mountains to Germany and spent one year and a half in refugee camps before emigrating to the United States. Twelve-year old Ota then began to use his other name, Charles, as a part of his parents' decision to forget the past and concentrate on building a new life in America. Charles states: "From the moment we arrived here, one thing was drummed into me by my parents: 'Forget everything that happened to you on the other side of the ocean. Remember nothing. We're starting a new life'" (151).

In spite of his lack of previous schooling and the need to learn everything in English, he soon prospered. He had to overcome some unpleasant consequences of his past traumas (like bed wetting). He read a lot: "The librarians knew me," he writes, "and always welcomed me with a smile" (166). At New Jersey's Morristown High School, he became sports editor of the newspaper. His athletic prowess also proved useful: a basketball scholarship helped him to get to Oklahoma State University. He began to contribute to *Oklahoma State*

Engineer Magazine and became its editor. Under his leadership, it was named the "Best College Magazine" in the nation.

In 1952 presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson became his "first American model who did not belong to the world of sport ... and spoke sensibly" (171). While *s*wimming in a lake that same year, he met his future – and only – wife, Sue. They were married seven years later. His first job as a structural engineer took him to southern California. "I am proud of the fact," Heller admits, "that I designed the outer mantle of the space engine Thor Delta" (178). He also took part in the projects designing various communication satellites.

In 1962 Sue and Charles returned to Maryland to be closer to their aging parents. He worked for Bell Telephone Laboratories in Baltimore. His team projected the trans-oceanic telephone cable between North America, Europe and Asia. Already in California, he had enjoyed teaching evening classes in aeronautic engineering at UCLA, and now he accepted a position of professor of space engineering at the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. His wife was able to teach at the Academy's kindergarten for thirty years. Charles decided to complete his Ph.D. at the Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. He became a popular management consultant and also assisted in training basketball and soccer players: *"*I worked and studied eighty hours a week," he confides, "and helped Sue to take care of our Davídek [first child]. It was a beautiful life" (180).

In 1968 he eagerly followed all the news about the "Prague Spring": "Unexpectedly," he confesses, "somewhere in the depth of my soul, a spark of Czech patriotism ignited" (181). However, he returned to Prague for the first time only in October 1970 when the National Academy of Sciences in Washington, D.C. sent him there for three weeks to lecture at the Institute for Theoretical and Applied Mechanics. The Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences agreed to his mission, in spite of the fact that he had left the country illegally. His apartment in Prague, nevertheless, was full of listening bugs. He found the country sad and devastated. His new colleagues were more interested in life and employment opportunities in the United States than in projecting with the help of computers.

After his return home to the States, he ran software companies and served on several boards of directors. He became a venture capitalist – Director of Athlone Global Security and General Partner of Gabriel Venture Partners. As an academic, he started to work as Director of Dingham Center for Entrepreneurship at the University of Maryland and was an Associate Professor at the U.S. Naval Academy. In addition to these activities, he also co-founded two software companies.

He would also like to complete his ambitious and rewarding writing career. *Dlouhá cesta domů*, the just published Czech version of Heller's memoirs, is much shorter than the English publication, but it does reward the reader with an extremely interesting account of a twelve year old immigrant's very successful career and is an enjoyable reading experience.

Peter Hruby

Daniela Kapitáňová. *Samko Tále's Cemetery Book*. Translated by Julia Sherwood. London: Garnett Press, 2011. ISBN: 978-0-9535878-9-6. 130 pp.
Samko Tále. *Kniha o cintoríne*. Levice: Slovakia: L.C.A. Publishers Group, 2002. ISBN: 8089129498. 148 pp.

When I read the Slovak original of *Samko Tále's Cemetery Book (Kniha o cintoríne)*, I was captivated by the black humor-ridden anecdotes that at first seemed funny but then disturbing. I was enthralled by the novel which is a monologue of the anti-hero protagonist, Samko Tále, a narrow-minded, nationalistic and retarded dwarf in his mid-forties, who is also a die-hard Communist and racist. While his first "Cemetery Book" is one page long, resembling a child's poor homework, his second attempt at writing is the novel itself. Samko has taken a break from collecting cardboard in the Slovak town of Komárno, located near the Hungarian border and heavily populated with Hungarians and Roma, because the rear-view mirror of his handcart has broken, it is raining and furthermore, the alcoholic fortuneteller Gusto Rúhe told him to write it. I was impressed at Daniela Kapitáňová's portrayal of someone who divides his world into what is allowed and what is forbidden, one of the reasons Samko is a limited narrator.

The themes of writing and publishing are significant elements of the book. Samko's writing has no goal: he writes because it is raining and because Gusto Rúhe has ordered him to. Does that make him a writer? Samko asserts, "I am a writer because I write" (29). Is a person only a writer if one has an objective? Or perhaps it is publishing that makes a person a true writer? These are noteworthy questions posed by the author. A tool for expressing this theme involved Samko Tále's name appearing on the cover of the Slovak edition as the fictional writer of the book and as the holder of the copyright. Yet in the English version that symbolism is lost as Daniela Kapitáňová's name appears as the author. In this respect, what had been a poignant theme loses some of its significance.

What intrigued me the most, though, was the manipulation of language and word play. In the Slovak text Samko's unique writing often consists of the wrong word order and many incorrect grammatical constructions as well as a lot of misspelled words. He uses words that do not conform to society's rules, such as Gypsy instead of Roma. (Translator Julia Sherwood even capitalizes "Gypsy," enhancing the racial potency of the word.) Rhymes also punctuate the original. Due to Samko's one-of-a-kind dismemberment of the Slovak language, I was certain that this book could never have such an astounding and riveting effect when translated into English.

Yet Sherwood proved me wrong. Very wrong. In the English version the translator has remarkably preserved the simplicity and repetitiveness of Samko's defective language. Samko writes that his only friend Tonko Szedilek was "born out of bedlock" (39) instead of "out of wedlock" and states that he "was excepted from P.E" (39) instead of exempt from it. He also mentions that he was "caught offguarded" rather than "offguard" in another sentence (29). The words "a iné," literally meaning "and something else" are often repeated in the original. This colloquial phrase is defective linguistically, yet Sherwood aptly translates the phrase as "anyway." It is also intriguing that in the original, Samko always uses the neuter form of "a iné." Such a distinction cannot be

expressed in English. While in the original Samko misspells "demokracia" as "demokracija," in the English version Sherwood opts for capitalizing the word, adding emphasis and perhaps sarcasm to the term of Slovak democracy. The rhymes are ingeniously preserved. In the original people yell at Samko: "Samko Tále/ smrdí stale," (40) which Sherwood translates as "Everybody thinks/ Samko Tále stinks" (36). Another example is Samko's Dad's rhyme about first Czechoslovak Communist president Klement Gottwald, whom he hates. In Slovak it is "Malý Klement / veľký dement" (111). In English it rhymes as well: "Little Klement/ Big excrement" (98).

Samko's perspective on the world is marked with contradictions. He admits that Gusto Rúhe is an alcoholic, whose words mean nothing, yet he takes him seriously about writing the cemetery book. His only friend Tonko was Hungarian, though Samko asserts "…nobody in the world likes the Hungarians because they are Hungarian. But everybody in the world likes Slovaks because they are Slovak" (37). He shares his profession of collecting cardboard with Roma Angelika Édesová, yet he claims: "What I don't get is why there have to be Gypsies in the world. I don't want there to be Gypsies in the world, they should go somewhere else, for example to Gypsy land where they came from…" (36). His self-assertion does not make sense, either: "I am not a racist because I am very nice" (76). Even though he is a racist, he likes Vietnamese because they only speak their native tongue among themselves.

Anecdotes seeping with black humor and reminiscent of those by Czech writer Bohumil Hrabal abound in the text. Samko relates how Pavol Orság was able to get free drinks in the pub by dropping his glass eye in other people's drinks and then finishing them. Finally, though, Orság commits suicide because he got cancer in his other eye, a remark that makes the anecdote more disturbing than humorous (27). Another case in point is Adam Miller. His last wish was to be buried with his pants unzipped so his penis was visible. Then there's a family-related tale: After eating mushrooms picked in the forest, Samko's grandmother from Detva and the fiancée of his Dad's brother died from mushroom poisoning, and his Dad's brother's face turned purple (49) .

However, the most vibrant character besides Samko is his Uncle Otto, who appears to be like Hrabal's pseudo-autobiographical, crazy and vibrant Uncle Pepin. Samko describes how his uncle used to do things that were not allowed in society, writing that "everyone knew that he was disabled regarding his nerves due to a bolt of lightning that went in at his shoulder and out of his foot, so everybody knew that he wasn't doing it on purpose but due to being disabled. Which was regarding his nerves" (33). Also, notice the use of phrases with "regarding" and "due to." Sprinkled throughout the text, they give a sense of the wrong word order that is exhibited in the Slovak original. Uncle Otto becomes obsessed with mushrooms and is convinced that the Siberian Woodrot could save mankind from a nuclear explosion. He talks to mushrooms and eventually disappears.

While the Komárno cemetery is literally mentioned throughout the book, it is also symbolic. Literally, it is the place where many family members who have influenced his life – his grandparents and parents – are buried. His neighbor Alf Névéry and his friend Tonko are there as well. Throughout the text Samko mentions a chance meeting with Darina Gunárová, his former classmate on whom he had a crush. Kapitáňová executes the scenes perfectly, adding more and more details each time Samko describes the meeting. Finally,

Darina asks Samko to walk with her to the cemetery. Samko refuses, citing that he would have to walk the wrong way down a one-way street. His black-and-white perspective on life could be considered a symbolic one-way street as well. It is also significant that Samko saw Darina at her mother's funeral nine years earlier with her second husband, a black American. Unlike Samko, who has not changed, Darina has distanced herself from her Communist father and has overcome the stereotypical prejudices of society by getting a divorce and moving to the USA, where she married an Afro-American. For Samko, the cemetery's figurative meaning is the dead world in which he lives, the world of Communism from the 1970s and 1980s, although the book is set in the democratic 1990s.

To be sure, Samko often becomes nostalgic for what he remembers as the good old days of totalitarian life. He reminisces about his time as a Young Pioneer, when he was chosen to recite the Young Pioneer's Oath for the whole class because he was informing on his family and others to high-ranking Communist Karol Gunár. Samko claims he was given the opportunity "because I was normal just like everyone else." (13) Though he feels as if he belongs in society under totalitarian rule, Samko had to wear an orange scarf rather than the typical red one as a Young Pioneer, something probably meant to single him out from the others. Samko loved the Communist version of hello – "Proletarian greetings" – and adored the May Day Parade, calling it "the most beautiful thing in the world" (112).

Samko's black humor is reminiscent of that in Jaroslav Hašek's mammoth, pseudo-autobiographical novel *The Good Soldier Švejk*. Both tell stories that are funny yet disturbing. Also, both characters represent the eras in which they live. Yet the reader has no sympathy for Samko, while readers see Švejk in a positive light. In addition, the Švejk character is the narrator's literary tool; he is fictional, not real. Yet Samko's character is very real in the Slovak society of the 1990s and even today.

The book also shares characteristics with Bohumil Hrabal's novel *I Served The King of England*. While Hrabal's protagonist Jan Dítě does whatever it takes to belong to the upper echelons of society during Nazism and capitalism, Samko informs on his family and friend in order to make the best impression on Karol Gunár, doing whatever it takes to be in his favor, to belong to the world of Communism and to better the chances of being noticed by Gunár's daughter Darina. It is also noteworthy that Jan Dítě's Nazi supporter wife stole stamps worth millions from Jews taken to concentration camps during World War II. Similarly, Samko's grandmother has a black marble table that was bought at an auction of confiscated property of Jews who had been taken to concentration camps.

The black humor along with Samko's unique language make this translation a tale not to be missed as it not only reflects on Samko's life but on the ills of Slovak society as a whole. Readers can both enjoy and ponder over this masterpiece of contemporary Slovak literature. Kapitáňová shines in what is a largely masculine genre of the anti-hero tale. *Samko Tále's Cemetery Book* was Kapitáňová's first novel in Slovak, which she wrote when she was a 44-year old inhabitant of Komárno, and is her first to be translated into English. Since her debut, she has written two more books. One can only hope that Sherwood will take up the task of translating them, too.

Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr., *Czechmate: From Bohemian Paradise to American Haven. A Personal Memoir.* Bloomington: Author House, 2011. 771 pp.

Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr. has aptly entitled his autobiography *Czechmate: From Bohemian Paradise to American Haven.* Czech he is, by birth and affection. Míla, as Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr. is usually called, was born in 1930 to Marie and Miloslav Rechcígl, Sr. He spent an idyllic childhood at the family mill in Chocnějovice, a village in the north-northeastern part of Bohemia near the region of "Český Ráj" or "Czech Paradise." When Míla was five, his father was elected to the Chamber of Deputies as a representative of the Agrarian Party, but the family continued to live in Chocnějovice, where Míla took great pleasure in the countryside and activities of the mill, as well as his mother's excellent Czech cooking. He attended a gymnasium in Mladá Boleslav for four years when his country was under German occupation and another four years after the end of World War II. Then his life, like that of many other non-Communists, changed drastically: after the 1948 Communist coup, he fled Czechoslovakia.

Even in the United States, Rechcígl continued to be a "Czech." He was active in the Czech community locally in Washington, D.C., where he spent most of his adult life, as well as nationally and internationally. In 1962, he organized the first world congress of Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences (Společnost pro vědy a umění [SVU]) and edited its proceedings, *Czechoslovak Contributions to World Culture.* Rechcígl performed the same services for the Society's second congress, whose proceedings were published in two volumes, *Czechoslovakia Past and Present*. He first became president of the SVU in 1974. This term lasted until 1978; he again served in that post from 1994 to 2006. Along the way, Rechcígl received many honors of which arguably the most appropriate was the "Gratias Agit" award given to him by the Czech government for significant contribution to and promotion of the Czech Republic abroad. He was one of the first laureates in 1997, when this honor was created.

Shortly after arriving in New York, Rechcígl read Josef Koudelka's *Pán na české řece* (Lord on the Bohemian river) and credits this account of the life of Augustine Herman for sparking his interest in the history of Czechs in the New World. His historical research and writings, however, did not start in earnest until he retired from government service. Along with his wife Eva, he edited an SVU directory, which has come out in eight revised editions since 1966. This interest led to further research and the publication of articles and books on educators, legislators, scientists and others groups with Czech roots. Míla also has written about Augustine Herman, his descendants and contemporaries, as well as early settlers from the Czechs lands, such as Jewish immigrants and the Moravian Brethren. Written for an American audience, these publications were in English, but Rechcígl also authored a series of vignettes in his native language about notable Czech-Americans for *Československý týdeník*, later renamed *Americké Listy*.

Not only the incident of birth, but also a deep affection makes Míla a Czech. He writes:

> This inner love of one's homeland is not at all limited to the mere physical craving for a piece of land

> or other property. It goes deeper than that. The inner feeling is far more personal, encompassing spiritual facets as well. It is also the love of one's family, the love for one's ancestors, as well as for the family values in which one was brought up, the love for the fellow countrymen, for the nation, and, above all, pride in the historical traditions that have transcended the history of these people for the last millennium (28).

Miloslav Rechcígl's life did not unfold in a straightforward way; rather it moved in complicated and complex patterns like a chess game. His father, who had to flee Czechoslovakia after the 1948 communist coup d'état, had arranged for his children to cross the border to join him, but the attempt failed. At the second try, Míla was successful; his mother and sister, however, remained in communist Czechoslovakia. (Later. his mother was put on trial by the Communist authorities on trumped up charges.) Míla joined his father in a refugee camps in Germany and emigrated with him to the United States in 1950.

Míla's path in the United States had its twists and turns. His and his father's first job upon arriving in New York was in a costume jewelry factory. Míla relates: "Ever since I started working at the Czech Quality Goods I knew that this was a temporary job and that sooner or later I would need to resume my education" (119). Míla was accepted at Cornell and obtained a scholarship from the Free Europe Committee. One of its conditions was that he study something that would be useful in Czechoslovakia "where we would return after the removal of the communist regime" (120). Although he would have preferred medicine, Míla chose nutrition. Cornell at that time considered nutrition solely an area of graduate study and required an undergraduate major in biochemistry offered only in the School of Agriculture, which in turn required a certain amount of farm or laboratory experience. So Míla spent the summer working on a turkey farm. In spite of being offered a permanent job there, Míla began his studies at Cornell. True to his roots, he earned some much needed extra money by teaching a Czech conversation class and working at a dairy farm. Ultimately, Rechcígl earned a B.S., M.N.S. and Ph.D. at Cornell. He earned the last degree in 1958.

He attributes his award of a Postdoctoral Research fellowship at the National Institute of Health to his publication record during his graduate studies and immediately afterwards. After two years, his career continued with an appointment as a research biochemist at the National Cancer Institute. In 1968, Rechcígl was chosen for a special United States Public Health Service executive program in health administration, research management grant administration and science policy. An appointment as Special Assistant for Nutrition and Health in the Health Services and Mental Health Administration followed. In 1970, he began to serve as a Special Assistant for Nutrition and Health at the United States Agency for International Development, where later he was in charge of the research program.

While making his way in the labyrinthine paths of academia and government science establishment, he was a devoted and productive scholar, authoring or editing more than 30 monographs and handbooks. For several

years, he edited the *RCR Handbook of Nutrition*.

The chess game of Miloslav Rechcígl's life also had a personal dimension. Míla met Eva Edwards at the Masaryk Club in New York City shortly after his arrival in the United States. He admits to choosing Cornell because he, a European unaware of American distances, thought that because it was in the same state as New York City it had to be close; therefore, he would be able to continue his courtship of Eva. Love, as they say, conquers all, even American distances: Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr. married Eva Edwards in August 1953. They have two children, John (Jack) and Karen, and five grandchildren.

Miloslav Rechcígl, Jr. overcame many, many challenges and much adversity as he journeyed from the Bohemian Paradise to the American haven. A deep life-long devotion and sterling service to his native land, an outstanding career and an exemplary family sum up his well-lived life, which can be described not only as "Czechmate," but also with a victorious and resounding "checkmate."

Mary Hrabík Šámal

Contributors

Francis D. Raška is Associate Professor of Modern History at the Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague. He has lectured in the Department of American Studies since 2000 and has published widely in both English and Czech. Among his publications are two monographs: *The Czechoslovak Exile Government in London and the Sudeten German Issue* (2002) and *Fighting Communism from Afar: The Council of Free Czechoslovakia* (2008). Another book project dealing with the post-1968 Czechoslovak exile in the West is nearing completion.

Ota Konrád is a researcher at the Masaryk Institute and Archives of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and lecturers at Charles University Prague, Faculty of Social Sciences. His fields of research are Sudeten German History, University History and History of the Humanities, Czechoslovak -Austrian Relations (1918-1938) and the German Policy of Edvard Beneš. This year his book *Dějepisectví, germanistika a slavistika na Německé univerzitě v Praze 1918-1945* (Historiography, Germanic and Slavonic Studies at the German University in Prague 1918–1945) was published in Prague.

Zdeněk V. David is a Senior Scholar at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. His publications include two monographs: *Finding the Middle Way: The Utraquists' Liberal Challenge to Rome and Luther* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), and *Realism, Tolerance, and Liberalism in the Czech National Awakening: Legacies of the Bohemian Reformation* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010). He is currently working on a manuscript, *Thomas G. Masaryk, a Scholar and a Statesman: Philosophical Background of His Political Views.*

Andrew M. Drozd is Associate Professor of Russian at the University of Alabama. In recent years he has been working on the topic of Czech-Russian literary interrelations. His goal is a monograph on František Ladislav Čelakovský.

Míla Rechcígl is one of the founders and past president (1974-78, 1994-2006) of SVU. He is an authority on immigration history from the territory of former Czechoslovakia. Among his many publications are *The Czechoslovak Contribution to World Culture* (1964), *Czechoslovakia Past and Present* (1968), *Postavynaší Ameriky* (2000), *Czech American Historic Sites, Monuments and Memorials* (2004), *Czechoslovak American Archivalia* (2004), *Czechs and Slovaks in America* (2005) and, most recently, *On Behalf of Their Homeland: Fifty Years of SVU* (2008), *Czechmate: From Bohemian Paradise to America Haven* (2011), and the *Czech American Bibliography* (2011).

Zdeněk Salzmann is a linguistic anthropologist and professor emeritus from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. His latest book, *Linguistic Anthropology: A Short Introduction,* is about to appear in Prague.

Charles S. Kraszewski's most recent scholarly works are "Samotność i hermetyczność w wierszach amerykańskich Czesława Miłosza" [Loneliness and

Hermeticism in the American Poems of Czesław Miłosz] *Odra* (May 2011) and "Poland and Poles in the Consciousness of the Anglo-American Modernists," *Paideuma* (2011). His newest book, a translation of St. Robert Bellarmine's *De aeterna felicitate sanctorum*, is in production at the Institute of Jesuit Sources in St. Louis. His poetry has appeared in the *Red River Review*, *OVS*, *Chaparral*, *Poetry South*, *Valley Voices*, *The California Quarterly*, and elsewhere. He was editor in chief of *The Polish Review,* 2008-2011. He currently teaches at King's College in Pennsylvania.

Virginia Parobek, of Lancaster, Ohio is a member of the Cleveland chapter of SVU. She has a BA in Comparative Literature from Ohio University and has been a member of the National Book Critics Circle since 1996. Parobek was the past secretary of the Slovak Institute of Cleveland and has published Slavic articles and reviews widely.

Josette Baer studied Slavic philology, political science and East European history at the University of Zurich, where she is currently a senior lecturer. She has done research and taught in Seattle, Minsk and St. Petersburg. Latest among her numerous publications is *Revolution, Modus Vivendi or Sovereignty? The Political Thought of the Slovak National Movement from 1861 to 1914.* She also edited the forthcoming *From Post-Communism toward the Third Millennium: Aspects of Political and Economic Development in Eastern and South -Eastern Europe from 2000 to 2005.*

Daniel E. Miller is a professor of history at the University of West Florida in Pensacola. He is the author of *Forging Political Compromise: Antonín Švehla and the Czechoslovak Republican Party, 1918-1933* (Pittsburgh, 1999) and a number of other works dealing with Slovak and Czech history, particularly agrarian politics. His most recent publication is "Antonín Paleček: novinář, ale i politik a historik" in *Osobnosti agrární politiky 19. a 20. století* (Slovácké muzeum, 2006 and http://www.slovackemuzeum.cz/doc/311/).

Hugh Agnew is a Professor of History and International Affairs at the Elliott School of International Affairs of the George Washington University in Washington, D.C. His first book examines a group of intellectuals in late 18th and early 19th century Bohemia whose linguistic, literary and historical studies laid the foundations for the subsequent Czech nationalist movement. His most recent book surveys Czech history in its European setting, from the arrival of the Czechs in Bohemia to the present. Agnew's current research explores the use of symbol and ritual in the Czech nationalist movement, which will be the theme of his next book.

Peter Hruby was born in Prague, then Czechoslovakia, graduated from Charles University, received his PhD in Geneva and taught at American, Canadian and Australian universities. Before his retirement to Annapolis, MD, he taught at Charles University in Prague. His last book was *Dangerous Dreamers: The Australian Anti-Democratic Left and Czechoslovak Agents.*

Tracy A. Burns is a creative writer, journalist, proofreader and editor living in the Czech Republic. She publishes in Czech, Slovak and English. Her writings

in English have appeared in *The Washington Post* and *Kosmas*, among other journals and newspapers. Her work in Czech has been published in *Reflex*, *Literární noviny*, *Listy* and numerous other periodicals. She has published articles in Slovak in the daily *SME*.

Mary Hrabík Šámal, *Kosmas* Book Review Editor, teaches at Oakland University in Rochester, MI. While her writings on Czech, Slovak and east European politics, women and culture have appeared on both sides of the Atlantic, she has maintained an active interest in Czechoslovak agrarianism, which was the topic of her doctoral dissertation. Šámal has also published translations into English from Czech and other languages.

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 as an email attachment or 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.